



**Plan Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
January 28, 2020**

3930 N. Murray Ave Village of Shorewood, WI 53211

**1. Call to order.**

The meeting was called to order at 6:38 p.m.

**2. Roll call.**

President Allison Rozek	Aye
Trustee Jessica Carpenter	No
Leah Blankenship	Aye
Eric Couto	No
Tim Hansmann	No
Therese Klein	Aye
Barbara Kiely Miller	Aye
Sangeeta Patel	Aye
Daniel Wycklendt	No

**3. Statement of Public Notice.**

Staff posted and publicly noticed the meeting according to local and state regulations.

**4. Approval of December 17, 2019 meeting minutes.**

Ms. Kiely Miller moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Ms. Klein.

Ms. Kiely Miller noted that she provided some grammatical corrections and one change to page 12 of the minutes under Question 9(3) to read *“Two prior submittals were to stop subsidizing luxury housing and instead provide grants or low-cost loans to seniors who would like to stay in their homes and stop allowing developers to go beyond village plans for height or other aspects when it is just apartments/condos.”*

Vote 5-0 to approve with noted corrections.

**5. a). Public Hearing: Consideration of Conditional Use Permit application to construct one chimney that will exceed the maximum building height on a new single-family residence at residential property 4450 N. Lake Drive in the Village of Shorewood, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin. TAX ID 237-0002-000.**

President Rozek opened the public hearing at 6:40 p.m.

Planning Director Bart Griepentrog introduced the item per the memo that was provided to the Plan Commission.

Stephanie Engelking, speaking on behalf of Wade Weissmann Architecture, stated that the firm designed a residential property which included the chimney in the design since the duration of this project and was included when the project went before the Design Review Board and passed. The firm believes they designed something that is sympathetic to the neighboring properties. They are required, by code, to have the chimney exceed the ridgeline of the house and the chimney is not out of the ordinary for the function of the chimney.

With no further public comments the public hearing was closed at 6:45 p.m.

**b). Consideration of Conditional Use Permit application to construct one chimney that will exceed the maximum building height on a new single-family residence at residential property 4450 N. Lake Drive in the Village of Shorewood, Milwaukee County, Wisconsin. TAX ID 237-0002-000.**

Ms. Kiely Miller asked for a brief explanation of why the Village has height restrictions on residential homes and the purpose of the restriction. She also asked when projects like this go before the Design Review Board why they are not taking height restrictions into consideration or if that is not in their purview. President Rozek also asked if the Design Review Board is aware that heights that exceed the limit require a conditional use and if it matters at that level and also has the Plan Commission ever denied a chimney and if not why should they continue to be a conditional use.

Mr. Griepentrog stated that Design Review Board is not specifically aware of it but he does indicate that their approval is subject to a conditional use being granted by the Plan Commission. He said the Design Review Board looks at the project in regards to the scale of the architecture and understand that it requires further approvals before it gets constructed. It is not in the Design Review Board's purview to deny a design based on height. Other restrictions/approvals come into play when the full construction plans are submitted with the building permit.

President Rozek asked if it would be beneficial for the Design Review Board to be aware of the conditional use for height so that if a design has to be redesigned it could be done sooner rather than later. Mr. Griepentrog said that often he tells applicants to apply for the design they want first as he wouldn't want to have them redesign a project if it is okay and approved by the Design Review Board and Plan Commission as proposed.

Mr. Griepentrog said the general concept of height limitations is to protect the neighboring properties both in context, scale, and aesthetics but also light and ventilation. In general it is to provide some consistency within the zoning district. He added that he has never seen the specific requirements of a chimney being above the height restriction in a zoning code prior to this. He said that in a zoning code it is generally the height of the roof that is measured. President Rozek asked if he has ever seen a chimney built abnormally large that it should be regulated. He said that in a residential district it most likely would never be an issue but in the commercial district a large chimney could be an issue. The regulation makes sense to be included in the commercial district but not the residential.

Mr. Griepentrog also added that with this particular application and the area where it is being built, larger houses typically have larger chimneys. In the context of this particular address he does not see it as being an outlier of the neighborhood. President Rozek added that typically no one is going to design a chimney larger than is required/necessary because of cost.

Ms. Patel asked if the roof of the house to the south is at 30 feet allowing the chimneys to remain under the limit because they are off to the side. Mr. Griepentrog stated most likely the house was built before the current zoning code. Ms. Patel asked if the chimney was meant as a limitation on the 30 foot roof line or if the 30 foot roof line was what they should care about more. Mr. Griepentrog said the roof line is what should be cared about the most. Mr. Griepentrog said it does not take much to get to a 30 foot roof line with a two-story house and 30 feet is average for a building height.

President Rozek asked how tall a chimney can be without needing a conditional use and Mr. Griepentrog stated 30 feet. This would require rooflines to be lowered to meet the requirement. Mr. Griepentrog said he was okay changing the code to remove chimneys as a part of the height requirement or state chimneys have to be built to no more than the code requires.

Ms. Kiely Miller said that when you think about 30 feet being between the eaves and the top ridgeline of the roof it stands to reason that the chimney is going to be taller.

Ms. Klein moved to approve the conditional use application to construct a chimney that exceeds the maximum building height on a new single family residence at residential property 4450 N. Lake Drive. Seconded by Ms. Kiely Miller. Vote to approve 5-0.

**6. Consideration of CDA/Village Board strategic goals and priorities survey on economic development and housing.**

Planning Director Bart Griepentrog introduced the item per the memo that was provided. He explained that last meeting the Commission went through a lengthy discussion of some answers to the questions that were provided within the survey. This meeting is meant to whittle down the answers to the required number of submissions allowed and prioritizing them. The list provided is what was discussed at the previous meeting. Mr. Griepentrog suggested going over the survey responses question by question. The following are the answers that were decided by consensus.

***Economic Development Programs***

*Question 1. Would you like to give feedback on the Village's economic development activities and priorities?*

Yes

*Question 2. What do you think are the Village's greatest strengths when it comes to economic development?*

Strength #1 – Location near urban center within major metropolitan area and other North Shore communities

Strength #2 – Dense, walkable community with foot traffic and proximity to commercial district

Strength #3 – Diverse economic profile (higher incomes, multi-age, higher education and purchasing power)

*Question 3. What do you think are the biggest issues or challenges facing the Village when it comes to economic development?*

Issue/Challenge #1 – Outdated regulations (zoning and parking) and business related programs

Issue/Challenge #2 – Spread out commercial district and developments (non-contiguous with varying conditions and configurations)

Issue/Challenge #3 – Low daytime population

*Question 4(1). What is the most important thing the Village should start doing as it relates to economic development?*

Update zoning code and design regulations to preserve character and improve aesthetics

*Question 4(2). What is one important thing the Village does related to economic development which it needs to do better?*

Reevaluate current economic development and business programs and develop new programs for targeted business development to be more competitive with other communities

*Question 4(3). What is one important thing the Village does related to economic development which it should stop doing?*

Stop using TIF without public purpose or adequate protections

*Question 5(1). What is the most important economic development outcome that you would like to see the Village achieve in the next 1-3 years?*

Increased business development with increased fiscal control on subsidies

*Question 5(2). What is the most important economic development outcome that you would like to see the Village achieve in the next 4-10 years?*

Prioritize redevelopment to improve contiguity and community character of commercial district

President Rozek added discuss the concept of consolidating district.

### ***Housing Programs***

*Question 6. Would you like to give feedback on the Village's housing activities and priorities?*

Yes

*Question 7. What do you think are the Village's greatest strengths when it comes to housing?*

Strength #1 – Physical stock (type, size and style)

Strength #2 – Location and walkable proximity via sidewalks with streetlights to amenities (commercial district, cultural and natural assets)

Strength #3 – High resale values, due in part to reputation of School District

*Question 8. What do you think are the biggest issues or challenges facing the Village when it comes to housing?*

Issue/Challenge #1 – Lack of senior-friendly options to age in place in house or village

Issue/Challenge #2 – Affordability (taxes, fees and home prices)

Issue/Challenge #3 – Supply/no room to grow – limited availability, single story options, small units or senior affordability

*Question 9(1). What is the most important thing the village should start doing as relates to housing?*

Update regulations to increase stock, supply and options (adding units to homes/duplexes, accessory dwelling units, work/live units)

*Question 9(2). What is the one thing the Village does related to housing which it needs to do better?*

Define housing goals and consistently implement programs based on community desires and market data

*Question 9(3). What is one thing the Village does related to housing which it should stop doing?*

Stop subsidizing market rate and luxury housing

Ms. Kiely Miller added to enforce zoning regulations pertaining to building height.

*Question 10(1). What is the most important housing outcome that you would like to see the Village achieve in the next 1-3 years?*

Increase focus on homeowners' needs (quality of life) and housing programs to restore a balance between commercial and residential interests

*Question 10(2). What is the most important housing outcome that you would like to see the Village achieve in the next 4-10 years?*

Additional innovation in housing (whether it be row housing, additional living spaces on existing properties such as over detached garages to maintain green space, or live/work developments) and update supply

*Question 11(1). How can the CDA communicate most effectively with you and your stakeholder group?*

Reports or email links/summaries through the staff liaison (Planning Director)

*Question 11(2). How would you prefer to provide comments and feedback to the CDA going forward?*

Through staff liaison (Planning Director)

Ms. Patel moved to approve as discussed the Plan Commission's answers to the CDA/Village Board strategic goals and priorities survey. Seconded by Ms. Kiely Miller. Vote to approve 5-0.

## **7. Discuss and provide recommendation for RFP for Comprehensive Planning services.**

Planning Director Bart Griepentrog introduced the item per the memo that was provided. The comprehensive plan will be updated this year and the Village Board approved, within budget discussions, up to \$30,000 of assistance for an update to the plan. It was discussed at the May 28, 2019 and June 25, 2019 Plan Commission meetings that an update rather than a re-write was acceptable and that the Village would use previous and current planning efforts to fill in the gaps.

The Plan Commission was provided a draft RFT for comprehensive planning services. Mr. Griepentrog stated he felt the primary discussion point would be on the project scope.

Within the primary scope, Mr. Griepentrog identified in Task Three the required plan elements based on State Statutes and suggested areas in which the consultant would take the leading role versus other areas where they would assist the Village with documenting what we currently have. He said that the largest area of Task Three and the area the Plan Commission would like to work on would be land use discussions including the land use map and the zoning chapter. This area is where Mr. Griepentrog feels a bulk of the consultants work will occur. He felt that a consultant could be found for \$30,000 to help with the update (exhibits/maps) and take the lead on public participation aspect and writing issues, opportunities and land use.

President Rozek stated there should be a framework for the Village to use on how to involve the public anytime a planning effort is done. Mr. Griepentrog asked if she was

referring to efforts beyond the comprehensive plan. President Rozek said it would be for any planning effort. Mr. Griepentrog said that Task One of the Project Scope is the consultant's responsibility. He said that every planning effort is situational and public engagement can vary. The Village Board will have to approve any proposed public engagement plan moving forward.

Ms. Patel added that what she feels President Rozek was asking is if a public process would be part of the comprehensive plan, not necessarily for this plan, and for future efforts. President Rozek said for any planning effort going forward that there should be a public participation process documented for the Village to refer to.

President Rozek asked if there was value in focusing on intergovernmental and if there is a way to identify ways that we can improve on intergovernmental sharing of tasks and coordinating with regional units. President Rozek felt there was not much sharing other than with the North Shore Fire Department and Health Department. Mr. Griepentrog said this was a policy decision and if the Plan Commission felt there was additional opportunities for sharing that could be discussed. President Rozek said this is not outlined anywhere. Ms. Kiely Miller asked if President Rozek was referring to situations similar to how Shorewood recently worked with other surrounding communities regarding an emergency management program. President Rozek said yes and questioned if there were other opportunities that could be researched and documented. Ms. Kiely Miller said it is good to identify who would have a seat at the table when planning efforts occur and how broad participation would be on a particular effort. President Rozek said the comprehensive plan is where everything should be documented (other plans referencing, intergovernmental relations). Mr. Griepentrog said if it is a matter of documenting that would be the village taking the lead and describing current efforts. He felt the question being asked is if we want someone researching if we could and/or should be doing other things. President Rozek agreed adding other opportunities should be researched including things other municipalities could be doing that the village is not doing and involvement in other groups the village could be participating in. Mr. Griepentrog said he has no problem switching intergovernmental cooperation from an assist role to a lead role. He said if the switch comes back as too expensive then the Village Board would decide how to move forward.

Mr. Griepentrog said it was clear that the Plan Commission's recommendation was to prioritize land use. President Rozek asked what he meant by land use. Mr. Griepentrog stated a review of the zoning code, zoning/land use map and future land use map. Ms. Kiely Miller said the future land use map was reviewed within the last ten years and suggested a relook at what the current zoning is for each area and if it still serves our purposes to keep it as it is. President Rozek stated that she felt zoning was not a part of comprehensive planning (to review the code) because the zoning code is to be one mechanism to implement your comprehensive plan, land use map and zoning map and that it should be separate. She said it is the major general policies that go into your comprehensive plan. Mr. Griepentrog added that one cannot look at the land use and zoning maps without looking at the zoning code. He clarified that the entire zoning code would not be reviewed and it would be sections referring to land use regulations and how those are displayed on the maps. President Rozek said that policy is in the comprehensive plan and agreed the code has to be reviewed to do that. The policies included would be general and then how to implement the policies (code changes) would follow. Mr. Griepentrog agreed.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked to confirm the square footage of the village (page one of RFP) and confirm the correct number stating it has been referenced as closer to 1.6 square miles (includes the parks). She also asked about the estimated timeline and giving the

consultants 8 days to submit their proposals if interested and questioned if it was enough time. Mr. Griepentrog stated the dates are to express interest by March 11, 2020 and if consultants have any questions they need to be submitted by March 18, 2020. The questions will be answered and sent to all who are interested. The proposals themselves are due March 27, 2020 giving them from March 11, 2020 to prepare. Mr. Griepentrog stated the Village can be flexible with the dates and timeline.

President Rozek asked about Task Four and the plan's presentation and whether hard copies or digital copies are required or both. She said this all has a cost too but that the Village should request some copies. Mr. Griepentrog said he usually just needs a digital copy. President Rozek suggested five hard copies.

President Rozek asked what regions the consultants would come from and if that should be limited. Ms. Patel said that travel would be included in their RFP and someone who is local may provide more services. Mr. Griepentrog stated travel costs are not covered in the RFP and that could limit who submits.

President Rozek asked to include in Task Two's previous planning effort documents the Human Relations Commission's foundation/plan document because of its social/human aspects.

President Rozek asked about the payment terms and if the payments are attached to deliverables or by the hour. She prefers the payments attached to deliverables. Mr. Griepentrog stated he could add language to the payment terms basing payments on deliverables.

Ms. Kiely Miller suggested that in the first paragraph under the estimated timeline the last sentence should read "*Interviews will be with staff and representative(s) of the Plan Commission.*"

President Rozek asked if Mr. Griepentrog was the lead on public participation and he stated no that the consultant would be. She said we should be as specific as we can on what we want and expect for public participation and feedback. Ms. Patel said it could be generalized such as "*to include at least 50% of the plan includes public participation*". President Rozek felt like with the plan being an update the public involvement would perhaps come at the end of the process with a survey etc. Mr. Griepentrog stated he was hesitant to put in the RFP any recommendations on public participation and was looking forward to the consultant's suggestions. During interviews, consultants could be weeded out by saying their public participation suggestions would not work in Shorewood.

Ms. Patel moved to recommend as discussed the Draft RFP for Comprehensive Planning to the Village Board. Seconded by Ms. Klein. Vote to approve 5-0.

**8. Discuss on 2020 Census Complete Count Committee Communication Plan.**

Planning Director Bart Griepentrog introduced the item per the memo that was provided. He said this was discussed at the December 2019 meeting as well and this time he has provided a more formalized timeline document to review. He said this is a discussion and if any commissioners had ideas they could be added to the document. This topic will be on every meeting agenda until the census occurs to discuss if other opportunities can be added. The document identifies various avenues for communication and there are weekly census partner liaison briefings where other communities discuss what they are doing for ideas.

President Rozek asked what the signage is saying and what the message is. She said messaging is important and statements like an accurate census count can get correct accurate funding from our partners at the federal and state levels. Ms. Patel added that

the other thing to add is addressing that there are no negative consequences to completing the census form.

President Rozek said important bullet points addressing why the census is important would be helpful.

Ms. Kiely Miller said that on March 1<sup>st</sup> the Woman's Club and the League of Women Voters are hosting a candidate forum and that could be a good opportunity to discuss the census. Mr. Griepentrog said a brief summary could be prepared for anyone going. She also thought the Senior Center was hosting a meet and greet as well as the Men's Club.

Mr. Griepentrog said that there are a thousand reasons for filling out the census forms and prioritizing the best bullet points for the Village is important. He said he can send his top three reasons to commissioners.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked if instructions are going to be mailed to each house regarding how to fill the papers out online and for those who prefer paper forms will the village hall or library have forms available. Mr. Griepentrog said paper forms can be requested but won't be available at village locations. The first mailer is a postcard introducing your options and timeline. Next is a letter detailing how to respond to each option. He said his understanding is if you don't respond initially you are mailed a form and if that is not completed then a representative visits your residence. Every verified address in the village will receive the postcard and letter. President Rozek felt it was important to have a space in perhaps the library for seniors and others to fill out the form. Mr. Griepentrog stated currently there is nothing designated for that but if the Plan Commission felt it was necessary/important he could discuss that need with the Library Director or Senior Resource Center.

Mr. Griepentrog said this is a work in progress and things/events will be added when they are learned about.

**9. Schedule next meeting.**

The next meeting will be scheduled for February 25, 2020.

**10. Future agenda items.**

President Rozek requested to be provided with examples of other municipalities' comprehensive plans when moving through the update process.

**11. Adjournment.**

Ms. Kiely Miller moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:56 p.m., seconded by Ms. Patel. Vote to adjourn 5-0.

Recorded by,



Crystal Kopydlowski  
Planning Department Administrative Clerk