



Joint Community Development Authority and Village Board Special Meeting Minutes Monday, July 13, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

via Tele/Video-Conference

CDA Present: Chair Peter Hammond, Tr. Davida Amenta, Tr. Kathy Stokebrand, Michal Dawson and Desty Lorino

Village Board Present: Pr. Allison Rozek, Tr. Davida Amenta, Tr. Jessica Carpenter, Tr. Arthur Ircink, Tr. Kathy Stokebrand and Tr. Wesley Warren

Also present: Art Davis, Mikaela Huot, Village Manager, Rebecca Ewald, Planning and Development Director Bart Griepentrog.

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 6:02 pm.

2. Roll Call

Chair Hammond noted that all members of the CDA were present with Jon Krouse and Joe LeSage excused. All members of the Village Board were present with Tr. Tammy Bockhorst excused.

3. Statement of Public Notice

Director Griepentrog confirmed that the meeting had been properly noticed.

4. Consider CDA & Village Board Strategic Goal Setting – Meeting #1 meeting minutes – March 12, 2020.

Chair Hammond noted that he would provide staff with some minor grammatical changes. Ms. Dawson moved to approve the minutes; seconded by Mr. Lorino. Both bodies approved the minutes unanimously.

5. Strategic Goal Setting Work Session – Meeting #2

Chair Hammond opened the conversation by stating that the groups cannot do everything all at once, and that the goal was to focus on key points of consensus. Art Davis and Mikaela Huot of Baker Tilly presented the survey results, housing study recommendations and highlights of the March 12, 2020 conversation. They suggested that prior work could provide the foundation for consensus and guidance to staff and the community. They reiterated the point that a sense of priorities should be established with an understanding of the need to be flexible as things arise.

The groups were requested to ask questions or provide comments on the housing study and none were offered at this time.

The groups were requested to ask questions or provide comments on the survey results. Tr. Stokebrand questioned the weakness of use of public funds. Ms. Huot confirmed that comment was a result of the survey. She also confirmed her interpretation of the comment related to grants, loans and subsidies. Tr. Stokebrand questioned if the lists were weighted. It was noted that the bulleted list was not weighted. Tr. Amenta questioned the meaning of focused retail development. Ms. Huot interpreted that to mean a focus on specific areas. She noted that if this action were to be prioritized, identifying the specific area would be needed as a next step.

Tr. Warren noted that the strengths, weaknesses and priorities were collected prior to COVID-19, and a lot has changed since then. He questioned if anything needed to be reevaluated. Tr. Carpenter agreed and suggested that support for housing maintenance should be considered, so that the quality of the Village's housing stock is not lost. Chair Hammond noted that the current realities related to COVID-19 should be part of the discussion. Tr. Stokebrand asked if the consultants had any thoughts on the impacts of COVID-19. Mr. Davis acknowledged that more people will be working from home. Ms. Huot noted the assistance offered to businesses from the Village or through CARES funding has been designed as a response. Additional focus could result through the exercise of strategic planning. She suggested a focus on retaining businesses versus attracting new businesses could be discussed. Chair Hammond noted that things will continue to change and that staff should be provided with flexible guidance. He stated that the groups cannot be too prescriptive with expectations.

Mr. Davis reminded the groups that successful strategic planning should be both short-term and long-term and should identify whether or not the groups want to be proactive or reactive. He summarized the three primary goals that were identified at the last meeting and requested that one or two priorities or actions should be identified to support them.

Mr. Davis referenced the suggested priorities and actions listed with respect to the first goal and asked the groups to discuss.

Tr. Carpenter noted that the AMI project has been placed on hold and stated that she believed fixing the sewers in the southeast section of the village was the Village's most important public infrastructure program. She noted that priorities are constantly shifting in response to the current pandemic. Manager Ewald noted that the AMI project was deferred for a year because it could not be implemented under social distancing requirements and that the southeast sewer improvements were delayed for evaluation, but are now in the process of starting the design.

Manager Ewald reminded the groups that strategic planning started prior to the pandemic and was also delayed. She noted that it will be important for the groups to leave the discussion with a majority level of understanding about how to proceed with actions. She also said that certain things may not be priorities at this time or may compete with each other. With respect to the immediate future, she reminded the groups that a decision about whether or not to extend TID 1 for affordable housing needed to be made before the end of the year.

Tr. Warren questioned the specifics of the EDI training, which was listed as a sample action item. Mr. Davis noted that training could impact all priorities. Chair Hammond stated that he believed EDI training would involve the whole village and was beyond the scope of the CDA.

Chair Hammond requested that all of the priorities and actions be stated and discussion take place after they had been collectively absorbed. Mr. Davis read through the priorities and actions listed under the Goal A.

Tr. Stokebrand requested that preventing housing displacement be explained. Ms. Huot indicated that it partly related to assuring that the village maintained housing at different levels of affordability, so that if development were to occur other options would remain for existing residents. Tr. Stokebrand questioned if the BID could maintain the business occupancy database. Director Griepentrog confirmed that they theoretically could, but informed the groups that historically that database had been maintained within his department, but would need to be updated. Tr. Amenta suggested that other types of data, such as sales data, rent per square foot and land values, would also be useful.

Mr. Davis introduced the second goal of encouraging a variety of housing options and read through the suggested priorities and actions. Chair Hammond noted that zoning code updates likely related to goals

throughout the discussion. Tr. Warren requested an overview of the suspended Neighborhood Home Loan Program, and Director Griepentrog provided that it formerly covered down payment assistance, duplex conversion and attic improvement loans to qualifying projects. Tr. Carpenter questioned if home reassessments could be modified so that homeowners would feel incentivized to make improvements. Ms. Huot also added that COVID-19 has impacted the rights of tenants and owners. Tr. Stokebrand asked for an example of advocating for inclusionary zoning, and Director Griepentrog noted that the State relatively recently prohibited local municipalities from adopting inclusionary zoning. As a result, inclusionary housing developments, where a certain number of units are reserved for affordable housing, are only allowable if the Village is a participant in the development. Private, as-of-right development cannot not be required to provide affordable units. Mr. Lorino noted that the Village should encourage privately owned housing, such as condos over apartments, in new developments.

Mr. Davis introduced the third goal of supporting a healthy business district and building jobs and tax base. With respect to the proposed action of increasing daytime population, Chair Hammond suggested that specific actions that would lead towards daytime population increases be identified. Mr. Davis noted that increasing office space or destination attractions would encourage additional daytime customers for existing commercial establishments. Tr. Warren agreed that increasing daytime population was not a clear action item.

Chair Hammond noted that there was a lot of potential crossover with suggested priorities and actions. He suggested that in order to help Shorewood survive, the CDA should focus on supporting existing businesses and current housing stock, while targeting opportunities for senior and affordable housing development options. Tr. Warren agreed and noted that we are currently on the defensive and that other actions could be pursued after COVID-19 has subsided. He suggested that the Village could opportunistically work on removing obstacles to building diversity and full life cycle housing by updating its zoning code. He did not believe increasing daytime population was a current priority. Tr. Amenta noted that the zoning code could be updated to allow “granny units” or tiny houses to facilitate families living together.

Tr. Amenta questioned if code enforcement was intended to support the housing stock or the people living in the housing stock. Chair Hammond noted that the Village’s suspended Neighborhood Home Loan Program could potentially support maintenance and funds from extending TID 1 could be considered. He reiterated that the groups need to provide clear direction to staff so that they can bring back suggestions and programs for consideration that support the desired goals and priorities.

With respect to potential tools, Chair Hammond mentioned both the Neighborhood Home Loan Program and Business Loan Program are currently suspended and could be reoriented. He noted it would take time and work to rebuild either. Tr. Stokebrand suggested that the most important decision could be related to the potential TID extension. She questioned how much discussion would need to take place. Chair Hammond concurred that it needs to be one of the top priorities and would require work from both staff and the CDA to bring it to the Board. Director Griepentrog noted that various programs could be developed, if there was consensus to extend it. Direction on whether those programs should develop new housing options, support existing residents or attract development would ultimately need to be provided. Tr. Warren stated that the TID 1 extension is a current priority.

Tr. Amenta suggested that that the Metropolitan Milwaukee Fair Housing Council should be utilized for an evaluation of our zoning code or other specific advice on bringing more affordable housing to Shorewood.

Tr. Stokebrand questioned if condos could be owner-occupied affordable housing. Ms. Huot noted that it all depends on how much it costs to build and sell on the market, and the other part relates to how much assistance would be needed to allow affordable households to purchase it. Tr. Stokebrand

questioned if there would be anything in this type of deal for the developer. Ms. Huot summarized that the program would write down the cost so that the household could purchase it, which in turn would allow the developer to build the product. The goal would be to provide the benefit to the buyer.

Mr. Davis summarized that he heard priorities to support existing businesses, focus on current housing stock and target opportunities for affordable housing. Chair Hammond noted that the TID extension will involve a lot of work and would relate directly to these priorities. Director Griepentrog concurred and stated he heard clear direction to prioritize work on options for the possible TID 1 extension.

Director Griepentrog reminded the group that various other suggestions remained on the table and wanted to make sure the groups understood this was the opportunity to discuss them. Tr. Amenta noted that she did not want to lose track of senior and supportive housing, and aging in place within these priorities. She noted the success of the Eastwood Condos. Tr. Ircink stated that he wanted to add improving energy efficiency of homes and lead service line replacement to the list of priorities. Chair Hammond noted that those items would be subcomponents of supporting the current housing stock, possibly through the TID 1 extension.

President Rozek mentioned that Milwaukee County would be supportive of Shorewood extending TID 1 for the purposes of affordable housing, and she agreed with that path. However, she also stated that she believed that the affordable housing would need to be senior-oriented. She noted that the recent housing study indicated that the senior population was growing, and it would be smart to plan for that, either in new units or retrofitting of existing homes.

President Rozek noted that the Business Loan Program was underutilized and should be reprogrammed, perhaps as a loan guarantee. She also stated that the money for duplex conversions is outdated and no longer serves a valid purpose. She noted that funding sustainability would be a good option, as it would lower utility bills and save the environment. She was also in favor of funding senior-friendly upgrades, like grab bars. She stated that programs always need to be periodically reevaluated. She summarized that her two priorities would be retaining seniors who want to stay in Shorewood and green infrastructure.

Tr. Carpenter noted that she had some reservations with extending TID 1, since it would delay property tax relief, even though she acknowledged it was not hugely significant. She noted that keeping property taxes low was an interest of all residents, not just seniors. Chair Hammond acknowledged her point and noted that additional details and communication would be required with any decision.

Tr. Amenta questioned if the boards needed to provide greater direction as to what types of projects the Village was willing to participate in, so that staff could respond to requests from developers. President Rozek suggested that answering the question of what we would not want to finance would be more practical. Director Griepentrog noted that establishing TIF policies and procedures was listed as a possible priority option.

Tr. Stokebrand asked for a summary of the four priorities under consideration. With respect to supporting local businesses, Chair Hammond noted that the former Business Loan Program could be repositioned. Tr. Stokebrand stated that supporting existing homeowners could be accomplished through a reconfigured Neighborhood Home Loan Program that was focused on senior, ADA or sustainable improvements. TID policies and procedures was identified as the third priority, and extending TID 1 for an additional year to support affordable housing was detailed as the final topic.

President Rozek noted that what the Village is or is not willing to fund would be tied to economic conditions and may change over time. She indicated that the process was the most important aspect to define, so that requests would be appropriately detailed, analyzed and taken to the decision makers.

Manager Ewald provided her support for the four identified priorities and suggested that they be taken up in the following order: TID 1 extension; TIF policies and procedures, particularly an application process; then followed by the Neighborhood Home Loan Program and Business Loan Program. Consensus was provided on these priorities to be acted up on the suggested order.

6. Adjournment.

Tr. Amenta motioned to adjourn the meeting at 8:05 pm; seconded by Tr. Carpenter. There were no objections.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bart Griepentrog". The signature is written in a cursive style.

Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director