

April 27, 2015 (Plan Commission Meeting)

**PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
MONDAY, APRIL 27, 2015
6:30 P.M., ALLOUEZ VILLAGE HALL**

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chairperson Kopperud called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

Present: Hansen, Ropp, Retzlaff, Kornowske, Kopperud, Dart (arrived at 6:36 p.m.), Culotta (arrived at 6:46 p.m.)

Also Present: Lange, Fuller

MODIFY/ADOPT AGENDA

Motion by Kornowske/Retzlaff to approve the agenda as presented. Motion carried.

MINUTES FROM MARCH 23, 2015

Motion by Retzlaff/Hansen to approve the minutes from March 23, 2015 with inclusion at the end of Zietlow's Plan Presentation, "Petitioner asked to be denied if the Plan Commission was not satisfied with their plan." Motion carried.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Lange

- A raze permit was taken out for the old Dialysis center on Derby Lane and Webster Avenue.

PUBLIC APPEARANCES

Jim O'Rourke, 2339 Oakwood Avenue, invited the Plan Commission to the Fox Wisconsin Heritage Parkway annual meeting on May 21, 2015 at 5:30 p.m., at High Cliff Park for a presentation on remaking the Urban Waterfront, concentrating on the lower Fox River from Appleton to Green Bay.

APPROVAL OF PETITION FROM HILLCREST LUMBER – REQUESTING AMENDMENT TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT ON HAVEN WAY CONDOMINIUM; LOCATED AT 1997-1999 LIBAL STREET

Dan Doro, Project Manager for Hillcrest Homes, presented the information on the amendment to the plan. The original plan has two story buildings which cannot have basements anymore, the original plan does not have egress windows that are required, and, residents want one story condos. Doro talked to Captain Gabe of the Green Bay Metropolitan Fire Department, and the width of the driveways may have to be changed to meet fire code. The storm water management needs to be updated. The original plan had 10 eight unit two story buildings, the amended plan has 9 eight unit and 1 four unit one story buildings. There will be an additional entrance off of St. Joseph Street.

Discussion:

- Will this mean that there will be half as much green space? No, the green space will remain very close to what the actual plan had.
- Why is there an additional driveway that wasn't on the original plan? That is for the last unit on St. Joseph Street. The original driveway off of Libal cannot be extended to accommodate the last building on the east side.
- The buildings themselves are not changing in volume; they are just changing in the footprint.
- The original plan had a 65 foot setback to the building face and now there is a 30 foot setback. Does that mean the whole berm on the corner of Libal and St. Joseph Street will be eliminated? No.
- Could the buildings be shifted to the north? That is a possibility.
- Why was the berm put there? In 2005, when the PDD was first approved, it was presented with 2 options; Option A was sidewalks and trees, and Option B was a berm and trees. And, it appears the Planning and Building Committee opted for the berm.
- Was there any resident issues?

Retzlaff/Hansen moved to open the floor. Motion carried.

Rebecca Nyberg, 214 Simonet Street, attended some of the planning meetings for the initial PDD plan, and stated that the residents on St. Joseph Street did not want car headlights flashing in their front windows. That is why the berm option was chosen.

Retzlaff/Dart moved to return to regular business. Motion carried.

- Will each unit have their own trash containers, so there is not a need for a dumpster? Yes. The village picks up trash there.
- Much of the building area is in the floodplain, is that part of the building scenario, or are they going to build above the flood elevation? It is governed how high they need to build above the floodplain, the requirement is 2 feet above.
- Most of the driveways are 19 feet, with the exception of one that is 16 feet. Will the one that is 16 feet meet fire code? When Doro talked with Captain Gabe of the GMBFD, he stated that the driveways need to be 20 feet. Doro stated that the buildings can be made smaller.
- What kind of pedestrian access will there be to these residences? Village sidewalks and the blacktop area. There are also sidewalks from the buildings out to the blacktop area.
- Is the main access driveway wide enough for two cars and a pedestrian? Did you consider pedestrian access with the original PDD? It is 24 feet; there should definitely be enough room.
- It is a part of the Comprehensive Plan to provide pedestrian access?
- Maybe the driveway could be striped for vehicles and pedestrians.
- Will staff be looking at the vegetation that needs to be put on top of the berm?
- It appears that the big problem is where the paved areas end close to St. Joseph Street, and dense landscape screening around the ends of those would resolve the light penetration problems if it would be a problem to put a berm there.
- Will there be any additional lighting other than building lighting? Will there be any poles? No there will not be any additional lighting.

- Was there any discussion about bicycle parking? It wasn't in the original plan, but can be looked at. Doro said they are not opposed to putting them in.
- Is the facility specifically designed for older adults? No.
- Is there any plan for a play yard if families are living there? There has not been anything like that designed originally, but can be looked at.
- A little area with benches for people to sit on would be nice. Doro stated they would explore these ideas.

Recommendations

- Would like to see the driveway striped with noted marked pedestrian walkway between the vehicle lanes and curb.
- Addition of bike rack.
- Concerns about the berm being reduced to accommodate the new buildings and parking.
- Additional screening and landscaping at the berm to screen the property to the south from headlights.
- Adding a central gathering area with tables and chairs.

Kornowske/Dart moved to recommend to the Village Board for approval with above conditions and with the condition that staff concerns also be addressed. Motion carried.

There will be a public hearing May 19, 2015 at the Village Board meeting with potential to take action that night.

DISCUSSION OF BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLAN

Fuller spoke with the County Planning Department and they sent him their recommendations. He created a flow chart to make it easier to visualize their recommendations:

- Committee make-up.
- Items to include in the plan.
- Timeline of events.

Discussion:

- Will people who walk be included? Yes.
- People with visual impairment, or a wheelchair or transit users should be considered to be on the committee.
- Would be helpful to have some people who have personal knowledge of barrier free access.
- Include a Bike Club Member or someone from the Economic Development Committee.
- How would the plan move forward once a committee is established? In-house staff would work with Brown County and give direction as to where to start.
- A community survey was suggested be a part of this to get general feelings from a wide variety of people.
- How intense will this plan be? Will it include engineering drawings? Fuller stated it is nothing too specific, and are looking at some of the suggestions from the committee, and whatever the suggestions are they want to make the plan achievable.

- DPW, Berndt is the one that brought up the Plan Commission's involvement in the Bike/Ped Plan and his concern was where the community members want bike/ped lanes. So as he plans roadwork, he can incorporate that as design criteria into the plans.
- A shared streets ordinance was suggested which protects pedestrians using the street for transportation and recreation.
- There is also a recreational component. The Parks Department will want to know how people want to use the parks.
- It might be good to take some counts on the East River Trail to see how people get there, and where they are coming from.
- Access and safety issues on the Fox River Trail should also be identified through this plan.
- Keep reaching out to other communities.

Retzlaff/Culotta moved to open the floor. Motion carried.

Rebecca Nyberg 214 Simonet Street is very excited that a group is being put together as part of the Village, because since 2004 she has been working with the Brown County Health Department with the Safe Routes to School Plan and had a larger grant that kept getting smaller and smaller. She is still working full time at the Health Department, but at a different job, so any support that she gave to Allouez Walks that came through the Health Department, like using their computers to take notes and things is gone after July 1. She is very excited that the community is seeing this as important. She is willing to volunteer outside of her work to continue with the group. Allouez Walks and Bikes petitioned the Village Board to become a standing Bike/Ped Committee after the ad hoc group forms a plan.

Fuller stated that the petition was read at the last Village Board meeting and they felt that it needed further discussion by the Plan Commission.

Jim O'Rourke, 2339 Oakwood Avenue, stated it is imperative to address State Highway 57, Riverside Drive, and the State is obligated to give us $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile of sidewalk on the west side from Highway 172 up to Stambaugh Road, and it is not in their plans right now, and if the State doesn't do it and after the construction is done and it is decided that a sidewalk should be there, that will fall on the Allouez taxpayers instead of the State.

Retzlaff/Hansen moved to return to regular business. Motion carried.

Kopperud asked if Lange or Fuller knew where the State is at with the design on Riverside Drive, and if there was sidewalk in the plan where O'Rourke was talking about?

Lange

- There is sidewalk on the East side of the street, and a proposed plan drawn up by O'Rourke was sent to the DOT regarding sidewalks on the west side of the street as well.
- At the last Village Board meeting the board made a motion to send a letter to the DOT to keep sidewalks and all biking and pedestrian facilities, in the planning process for Riverside Drive with the caveat that the village could pull out of those depending on funding.

April 27, 2015 (Plan Commission Meeting)

- Received an electronic copy of the proposed plan today, and will send to Plan Commission members.

DISCUSSION

- Would the bicycle plan include parking? Fuller stated it would be appropriate to include bicycle parking in the plan.
- The plan should also include signage for bike route designation, way findings, signs guiding bikers to the Fox River Trail, where we need additional crossings to access bike facilities.
- This plan is going to take a lot of time, effort and resources.
- It will be a challenge to produce a good result.
- We do have full time staff that can do research and generate the process.
- When members of the committee are selected they need to understand they have the support of the staff, and the staff needs to know they need to support the committee so the best product is produced.
- The committee members need to know that they will be an advisory group.
- They need strong leadership.
- It is important to do it right.
- It sounds like the county will be available to assist with the plan, and has gone through this process before, so they know what is needed.
- The county hasn't typically done some of the more incremental things that a municipality would do.
- The idea of an ad hoc committee would be a body of people that have the Bicycle Pedestrian Plan as their only concern.
- The group should be monitored by a staff person, so there is consistency and communication.

Fuller will reach out to one of the Planners in Green Bay for recommendations for the plan. He will also do some research to see what resources are available, and what type of funding the Village has?

UPDATE ON CORRIDOR STUDY

Tonight was supposed to be a joint meeting with the Village Board, but GRAEF needed some information from the DOT that was unavailable.

NEXT MEETING DATE AND AGENDA ITEMS

The next meeting date: May 18, 2015 at 6:30 p.m.

Agenda items: Joint Village Board Meeting (Presentation by GRAEF), Action for Bicycle Pedestrian Plan, Election of Chair and Vice Chair.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Dart/Retzlaff to adjourn at 7:47 p.m. Motion carried.

Minutes submitted by Sherri Konkol, Deputy Clerk