



Plan Commission Meeting Minutes

June 22, 2021

3930 N. Murray Ave. Village of Shorewood, WI 53211

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m.

President Ann McKaig - Chair	Aye
Trustee Tammy Bockhorst	Aye
Eric Couto	No
Therese Klein	Aye
Barbara Kiely Miller	Aye
Josh Pollack	Aye
Daniel Wycklendt	Aye

Others present were Planning Director Bart Griepentrog and Planning Administrative Clerk Crystal Kopydlowski.

2. Approval of June 1, 2021 special meeting minutes.

Trustee Bockhorst moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Wycklendt.

Ms. Kiely Miller suggested a change/clarification to paragraph two on page 15 of the meeting minutes in which she was discussing underground parking. She requested language be added that reflected the following. *“She said yes it is more expensive to have underground parking but thinks there are physical constraints that prevent meeting the requirement without having underground parking. She added that the three mixed use buildings on Kensington and Oakland provide underground parking and those lots are not any deeper than the lot where this development is to be placed.”*

A roll call vote was taken: Ms. Kiely Miller – Yes, Mr. Pollack – Yes, Trustee Bockhorst – Yes, Mr. Wycklendt – Yes, Ms. Klein – Yes, President McKaig – Yes. Motion passes by a Vote 6-0.

3. Discussion and possible recommendation of modifications to Chapter 535 Zoning Article IX Off-Street Parking.

a. Overview

Mr. Griepentrog introduced the item per the memo that was provided and a slide presentation. He said the information is meant as an introduction and overview of the existing regulations within the zoning chapter as well as some general comparisons with our two adjacent municipalities and then a larger and broader overview discussion section at the end to gather feedback from the Commission in preparation of a future discussion and a possible recommendation. He said off-street parking has been a top Plan Commission initiative second only to the Comprehensive Plan update. He explained that the Plan Commission’s role is advisory to the Village Board and they will deliberate this and make a recommendation to the Village Board. The recommendation gets considered by the Village Board after a public notice and public hearing. President McKaig said she did not expect a recommendation at this meeting. She said the goal is to give Mr. Griepentrog direction and feedback so he can develop a draft to be considered at the next meeting.

b. Public Comment

President McKaig opened public comment at 6:53 p.m.

Andrew Rothrock, 4024 N. Prospect Avenue, moved into their house in 1998. He said that they talk about the 1951 regulations and his house was built 37 years prior to that and they saw far enough ahead at that time to build a garage that would fit a Model T or motorcycle so they have a driveway. He said over the years he has been pushed back by the greenspace requirement. He said when they tore out the green middle part of their driveway they received some indication from the Village that they were going to have to pay for that loss of greenspace. He said they have always been very mindful of the 30% greenspace requirement. He said one neighbor of his was allowed to build a double garage and the neighbor on the other side was not allowed to. He said when they moved in they knew Shorewood was very strict on parking. He said to keep in mind that when discussing the 1951 regulations many of the houses here were built years prior to those. He said if we end up with a lot of people parking on our streets day and night it could be frustrating to those who have made long term investments in their homes.

Kimberly Luedke, 3900 N. Prospect Avenue, said she received an email to sign up for Village meeting notifications and received a confirmation after she did that but never received advance notice of this meeting. She asked what meetings are included with the notifications and how this meeting was communicated to the public. Mr. Griepentrog said he can look into what she signed up for and confirm that with her. He said the meeting was notice last Tuesday on the Village website and the three locations required by code.

Karen Desing, 3952 N. Stowell Avenue, said that comparisons were being made between Whitefish Bay, Milwaukee and Shorewood and questioned if Shorewood is trying to make itself into Milwaukee. She said when you make zoning changes/recommendations regarding the parking that affects the neighborhood and how it feels and what environment residents are trying to create. She said, in regards to an earlier comment about developers knowing the market that of course a developer would want to make a development profitable for themselves but to be considerate of the neighbors who live around those areas. She said making a development profitable could be to the detriment to the neighborhood. She asked that developers not be allowed to define the number of parking spaces that are required and to consider what type of environment is created in the Village. She said there were greenspace requirements discussed regarding residential properties and asked for recommendations to be considered for commercial/multi-family developments.

Rosina Bloomingdale, 3958 N. Stowell Avenue, said there had been comparisons between Whitefish Bay, Milwaukee and Shorewood as well as between Downer Avenue and Brady Street. She said her nephew lives in the Downer area and parking is a nightmare. She said she would like to go to Brady Street but the parking is a big barrier to that. She said the Village is not Milwaukee and not an urban area. She said they need to be mindful of what our area is and what we would like our area to be. She said yes we want to be active in development but we don't want it to change our neighborhood into an urban looking type of neighborhood. She said there are cars parked right up to the intersection on the north side of Stowell and you nearly have to be in the intersection to see if cars are coming. She said that maybe we need to survey the whole community and ask how many vehicles there are and how often they use mass transit.

Elizabeth Beeghly, 2413 E. Shorewood Blvd., commented that she is a city planner that had worked for the City of Portland. She said, as a current planner for five years, during her time in Portland she watched development happen. She said Portland was at the forefront of what was happening with green streets and getting rid of cars. She said when you do this though you have to have the infrastructure behind it that provides busses and light rail or other sorts of transportation options. She said we have to remember where we live and the environment. She said Portland has one week of winter whereas Wisconsin has three months of winter with subzero temperatures in which people have to drive to the grocery stores, work etc. She said it would be very unlikely that Shorewood would ever get to a zero use of cars level. She said when she returned to Portland she worked on over 200 development proposals and is ashamed of some of the things they created and the problems created in very livable neighborhoods. She said it is a nightmare in Portland now. She said this didn't work in Portland and it is making it less desirable. She said if people have any questions about city planning to talk to the city planner. She said there is one planner for the Village of Shorewood and that when she worked on projects in Portland there were twenty planners total and ten on her team she could talk to at any time. She said there are zero planners on the Plan Commission and that is a tragedy and not what we want in the Village. She said planners should be making these decisions who understand the impacts of all these decisions. She said the Village has only one planner and he is doing a great job but he only understands what he knows and having different planners brings different information and expertise to the table.

Geoff Davidian, 4101 N. Prospect Avenue, said that he disagreed with the previous speaker who said the planner should make the decisions. He thinks the Plan Commission and Village Board should make decisions based on what the public wants and find a way to facilitate it. He said there is a reason why there is a public comment section for these meetings it is because the elected officials are supposed to do what the public wants. He said we have seen in the last few meetings where the public rose to that challenge and they have been slapped in the face. He said the only way to make this work, to make decisions about the future of Shorewood, is to come up with a proposal and put it on a referendum and let the residents vote on it. He said the elected officials are not doing what people who live here want.

Erin Cutraro, 3915 N. Stowell Avenue, said they moved from an area out of state that faced a similar decision and ultimately one of the components that was overlooked was vacant properties. She said the development in her previous neighborhood resulted in it being difficult to actually lease because the parking was so challenging. She would like to hear what thought has gone into the vacancies on Capitol Drive. President McKaig asked if she was referencing commercial vacancies. Ms. Cutraro said yes.

Dan Walsh, 4024 N. Stowell Avenue, said that it is often brought up how transit affects parking requirements and feels that we don't have it here in Shorewood. He said we don't have transportation we can rely on and ridership is down half of what it was in 1990. He said there is not data that supports the idea that this density will drive ridership and the transit infrastructure will replace cars. He said to not make zoning changes based on a fiction. He said the idea of zoning by Xerox is not accurate. He has lived in the Village for 30 years and parking has been a fight for 30 years. He said this is because developers and owners do not want to build it and residents do not want parking sprawling into their neighborhoods. He said standards have been set by this fight. He was not saying they are correct or shouldn't be changed. He stated they are not fake or made up and have been fought on over and over again. He said it is not fair to say there is no basis for them. He said there is a lot of really good information in the

Village and said it would not be the hardest thing in the world to get survey information of what the actual requirements of some of these projects are based on some of the data in the projects (the footprint of the units, the number of bedrooms, the total parking available, and rents). He said there is very strong correlation between value, rents, taxes, parking and demand. He said get that information and make a zoning decision based on real information from what is really happening in Shorewood. He said we have done an experiment over the last 14 years and let's figure out how it worked and use that information to guide us in good decisions. He said that market forces are going to do nothing but advantage the people with the most money and the ability to get large projects approved. He said it is very hard to be a resident fighting a larger project. What protects the residents, occupants, and businesses in the Village is the zoning code. So when you mess with the zoning code and make special exceptions and variances you say were about to make changes and things will be different and that is why neighbors get upset because they don't know what those changes are going to be. This is why the developer was asked to bring real valuable reliable information to meetings. He said to make sure we get the right data when we make this decision and we don't rely on market forces to protect the charm of the Village.

Steve Filmanowicz, 4314 N. Stowell Avenue, said he believes Shorewood is an urban suburb with a good supply of parking. He said there are underused properties and underinvested properties on Capitol and new investment will help make our neighborhood more vibrant and enrich our tax base in a much needed way. He said if we turn away development because of the concern about parking we are making a decision to keep our city and our tax base underdeveloped and creating an increased tax load on all existing property owners. He said he knows there are concerns about parking but believes that these plans will add parking and also homes and businesses in the area have a good ability to absorb parking off-street with garages and driveways. He said the new development will add parking just not at the unrealistic rate required by the old requirements. He thinks vacant and underused properties are a bigger problem and parking is a much smaller problem.

President McKaig asked if any further comments and reminded that comments can be submitted by email to be included.

President McKaig closed the public comments at 7:18 p.m.

c. Plan Commission deliberation

President McKaig asked Commissioners for their interests and concerns regarding simplifying some of the categories in the code. She is interested in what is resonating with them and what questions they may have as well as what information may be missing for them. She wants to hear any thoughts on ratios, reductions, general assembly and office /retail.

Ms. Kiely Miller said that this was added to the Plan Commission initiatives list a couple years ago because they kept getting requests for parking special exceptions including The Ruckus, North Shore Bank, Soul Cycle and Fiddleheads. She said these came before them because of change of uses and/or major renovations. She said they wanted to look at it but not because they were unhappy with parking requirements for residential developments. She said this is a big piece of policy/zoning code to look at and they may want to review each part individually instead of trying to solving the whole puzzle at once. She said it often seemed like they were counting the same number of parking spaces on Oakland more than once whenever they received a new request. She said there is also a difference between people coming to a one hour exercise class

or people out to dinner for two hours versus an employee that may be parking for 8 hours. She said this is a tricky thing to think about when requiring parking based on staff/employees and/or square footage. She agreed with some of the residents that spoke but said Shorewood is a village and basically a bedroom community where residents are working elsewhere in the county or beyond. She said comparing the village to major cities that have central downtowns is not relevant. She agreed with the comparison to Whitefish Bay. She said if we are going to continue comparing ourselves to Milwaukee why we are maintaining an independent village. She agreed with one of the residents that mentioned the parking around Brady being a nightmare.

President McKaig appreciated Ms. Kiely Miller's comment on breaking down the different sections of the code and reflecting on what is an easy decision and what is harder and what level of change you'd be comfortable with.

Mr. Pollack asked which parking studies they should be reviewing that would help them understand how parking is currently utilized in the Village and if there was any analysis on the frequency of parking special exceptions in the past to get a baseline of what the functional parking requirements were in practice. Mr. Griepentrog does not have that data off hand but it is available and he can provide that. He will prepare data on the last ten years.

President McKaig asked if Mr. Pollack was requesting the number of parking that was provided in comparison to what is required. He said yes and that if the code says the ratio is 1.75 but we keep granting exceptions at a rate of 1.25 then we know a 1.25 rate keeps the quality of life about like this and is a good way to benchmark what the status quo is instead of referring to a code that it 50 plus years old.

Trustee Bockhorst appreciated Mr. Pollack's question about what studies to review. She would like this qualified list also. She said a thing that strikes her about this has been the numerous exceptions and discussions about changing this code because it is antiquated and formulated in 1951 more than a half century ago. She said the village has undergone a lot of change and life is much different than in 1951. She said to keep in mind the multimodal options and opportunities that exist in the village in addition to ones we have had in the past that could be brought back (Bubl bikes and zip car). She said she appreciates the gathering of data from other communities (locally, regionally, nationally and internationally). She asked to keep in mind parking requirements for short and long term uses. She referenced business employees parking and not moving cars all day. She said they dealt with this at the Village Board level around Kensington Square and worked with businesses to get extended parking in municipal lots for their employees. She understands that some employees of business are taking up prime parking real estate all day. She said they can find a way and maybe changing the code to not allow that. She said there have been a variety of visioning processes such as Vision 2025 and the Comprehensive Plan with a great deal of community input. She said they have received a variety of public input and understands that when a project is close change can be difficult but they have to think globally. She said she is glad they are using qualified data and that they are not just copying another municipality but being thoughtful about the differences between municipalities and tailoring our zoning code to the needs of our municipality.

Mr. Wycklendt said he appreciated the great robust public comment. He said that one thing he wants to keep in mind is to look at the exceptions that have been granted in the past and see exactly what has been done in the past. He would like recommends based

on things they have done before and data that has already been put out. He appreciated the articles and information that has been provide to them also. He said that they need to frame this around the entire village as a whole. He knows public comment has been focused these last few meetings on the project off of Capitol. He said they need to come up with something that is smart, well thought out and grounded in data that is good and something they can rely on. He said some residents have commented that we should not cater to developers but the Comprehensive Plan is based off of putting together new development in the region and growing the community and residents to lower the tax base. He said the corridors to do that are Capitol and Oakland. He wants to be smart about this update and have something the Village Board can rely on and have a reasonable discussion about.

President McKaig clarified that what Mr. Wycklendt may have meant was to lower the tax burden but expanding the tax base. Mr. Wycklendt agreed.

Ms. Klein agreed with Mr. Wycklendt. She likes the idea of simplifying the code as there are a lot of things in the code currently that do not need to be so specific. She said there really are very few categories. She would like time for the Plan Commission to talk through that and see some of the data that was asked for and as well as discuss what the goal really is and what they are trying to implement.

President McKaig asked if a good exercise for tonight would be two questions for commissioners. One asking if individuals are comfortable with simplifying the code and two asking where the commission are on changing the parking ratio. Mr. Griepentrog said he is comfortable discussing the five components of the code. He is comfortable providing a draft of what he is hearing and what, as the zoning administrator, makes sense in terms of these general concepts. He said specific requirements is where he will need more specific input and it sounds like more data is being requested to make that input. He felt the numbers component of the discussion was not just there yet.

Mr. Griepentrog asked about the code's applicability and when it should be triggered. He said currently the code is triggered for all new construction. He said there is also a category for substantial alteration which relates to improvements within a building. He said a tenant in a ten unit building will likely never have an improvement project that would trigger this. He said from an administrative standpoint it is his recommendation to either remove it or modify it to relate to substantial alterations/enlargements or use changes (when the use category changes). He is looking at simplification of when the code would be triggered so that can be clear on an application. President McKaig said the choices are to leave the code as is, check if the commission is in agreement on all new construction triggering the code and whether to remove the substantial alteration category or clarify it. Mr. Griepentrog suggested to remove the substantial alteration category because it does not make sense. He said a business should not be punished for improving their space but said if a business wants to double their square footage or go to a more intensive use that makes more sense when triggering the code. President McKaig asked commissioners if they agree (confirm) with Mr. Griepentrog's thought process. Mr. Wycklendt confirmed. Ms. Klein confirmed. Trustee Bockhorst confirmed. Mr. Pollack confirmed and added that anytime there is an enforcement question or the trigger is ambiguous or you don't like it that should trigger. He said we should not have laws we cannot practically enforcing as it invites discriminatory enforcement. Ms. Kiely Miller said she is of two minds about this. She agrees with Mr. Griepentrog that if the use stays the same we should not recreate the wheel by asking a new tenant to meet standards that the older tenant didn't have to or where impossible to meet. She said

when there is new construction they should look at it with fresh eyes. She said it was interesting when Mr. Griepentrog said we shouldn't be punishing businesses who want to improve their spaces because listening to the residents off the main business corridors they would say they are the ones being punished. She said on page 21 of the packet it discusses off-street parking requirements and how it falls on the adjacent neighborhoods and questioned why we are asking these residents to sacrifice for the greater good. She thinks it is important to separate the issues. She said if the use is going to stay the same we can let that go but if the use is substantially different they need to look at it and require more information. She said someone had mentioned doing a survey of existing properties and had thought of that herself as well. She said with all the apartment buildings the village has it would be interesting to find out from the owners the number of tenants, how many bedrooms and the number of cars they have. President McKaig confirmed.

Mr. Griepentrog said there are currently four use categories currently which are lodging/dwelling, schools/institutions/auditoriums/assembly, recreational uses and business district. He noted that he is not sure what the recreation use relates to. He said the village does not build new parks and do not have occupancy for parks. He suggested removing the recreation use category and going down to three categories (lodging/dwelling, assembly areas and businesses). President McKaig confirmed. Mr. Wycklendt confirmed. Trustee Bockhorst confirmed. Mr. Pollack confirmed. Ms. Klein confirmed. Ms. Kiely Miller confirmed.

Mr. Griepentrog asked whether or not there were certain thresholds, locations or amenities exceptions that they would like to be built into or considered in the code. He said an example would be if a project is near a parking structure. He said the village spent a lot of money to develop structures and there are public parking lots also. He asked if this would be something to give credit towards. He said other codes give credit towards providing bike parking or vehicle charging stations. He said this could be a larger discussion but wanted direction on what they would like him to research. President McKaig asked if a credit meant a reduction. Mr. Griepentrog said yes. President McKaig confirmed. Mr. Wycklendt confirmed. Trustee Bockhorst confirmed. Mr. Pollack confirmed. Ms. Klein confirmed. Ms. Kiely Miller said that spaces have been counted multiple times over the years with parking exceptions and they would need to really know how many spaces in lots are already committed. She said with this information she would be moving favorably in that area. Mr. Griepentrog said he could clarify or try to make that clear in the code when spaces do or do not qualify.

Mr. Griepentrog asked, in terms of the requirement section, if they wanted to look at thresholds. He said an example of this would be square footage of a space. He said that they had discussed this in the past when reviewing conditional use applications for a small clinic. He said the comment is typically this is so small that it doesn't make an impact. He said they don't want to remove clinics from a conditional use but they don't necessarily need to see the small versions of them. He asked if they were comfortable with building in thresholds for a large space that would trigger the code and said the exact numbers can be calibrated. He said if the average retail/small business space is a 1000 square feet and we know that that is what has been developed there in the past and are living with that history perhaps the code says we do not review it. But if you are planning to redevelop the district making it new or different then we would review it. President McKaig confirmed. Trustee Bockhorst confirmed. Mr. Pollack confirmed. Ms. Klein confirmed. Ms. Kiely Miller confirmed. Mr. Wycklendt said he would apply thresholds for sure if he understood this correctly. He mentioned the code in regards to

restaurants and how they realized the code for restaurants does not even make sense but said if a restaurant like McDonald's came the code is different and asked how they tackle those differences. Mr. Griepentrog said he struggled with the example because when he thinks about McDonald's he thinks of it as a drive-thru. Mr. Wycklendt said to consider larger restaurants that require a lot of parking then instead. Mr. Griepentrog said his quick response was that a threshold would help because a smaller independent restaurant would not have the capacity to develop parking but larger restaurants would have corporate requirements/standards that would not allow them to franchise into a location without the parking. He said their market forces would not allow them to invest in properties without it.

Trustee Bockhorst said that the requirements for medical center would potentially be something she would like to keep in the code. She said that one of the contingencies in the developer's agreement for the Metro Market was that they could not use the retail spaces for ten years for that type of need (medical) because they do not bring in vibrancy to the area. Mr. Griepentrog said with respect to the three categories he would also be researching or providing a recommendation for a general use category.

Mr. Griepentrog asked about the pass through prohibition (tandem parking). President McKaig asked why the prohibition and fear. Mr. Griepentrog said he does not know what the fear is as long as you control both spaces. He thinks perhaps they were not contemplating that scenario when they approved tandem parking at the Cornerstone. He said this is a benefit to the Village to get the parking off the street and onto the private property and allowing tandem or stacked parking with control would allow the maximized use of spaces. He thinks it can be written better to allow the flexibility and allow the maximum use of land. President McKaig confirmed. Mr. Wycklendt confirmed. Trustee Bockhorst confirmed. Mr. Pollack confirmed. Ms. Klein confirmed. Ms. Kiely Miller confirmed.

President McKaig asked if there were parking codes that cover valet parking. Mr. Griepentrog said he was sure there are but would have to research further. He said it could be under shared or off-site parking requirements. President McKaig asked him to look into it and see if it is possible.

Mr. Griepentrog said the code currently require wheel stops and this is an enforcement nightmare because we plow in the winter. He understands the purpose of wheel stops to prevent drivers from hitting landscaping, alleys, driveways etc. but believes that is the responsibility of the driver and that wheel stops go too far. He said we have not required it even though it is in the code. He recommends removing it. Ms. Kiely Miller asked what the purpose of wheel stops. Mr. Griepentrog said the purpose is to ensure cars remain in a parking lot and do not encroach into landscaping, sidewalk or alley. President McKaig confirmed. Mr. Wycklendt confirmed. Trustee Bockhorst confirmed. Mr. Pollack confirmed. Ms. Klein confirmed. Ms. Kiely Miller confirmed.

Mr. Griepentrog asked about screening requirement triggers. He said currently there are outdated parking lots without screening that meets the code and because they are already developed there are no triggers for compliance. He said that at his last place of employment parking lots were triggered with new occupancies. The Village does not have an occupancy trigger and is instead based on the development of the parking lot. He suggested changing the trigger to be not on new development or substantial alteration but instead with occupancy. President McKaig confirmed. Mr. Wycklendt

confirmed. Trustee Bockhorst confirmed. Mr. Pollack confirmed. Ms. Klein confirmed. Ms. Kiely Miller confirmed.

Mr. Griepentrog said the code currently only allows single family parcels to develop one external parking space. All single family residences are required to have a garage and then allowed one external parking space. He said duplexes are allowed to have two extra external parking spaces but often these lots are the same size as single family lots. He said he would have to look into how to word this but thinks that the greenspace requirement may need to be adjusted allowing single family residences to develop the second space if the greenspace can be maintained. Ms. Kiely Miller asked about screening these parking spaces and if it would be screened from the neighbors or the alleyway. Mr. Griepentrog said currently the code requires screening of any parking space but said he has not seen the requirement along alleys but where it has been required at all times is if you have a parking space in your street side yard lot on a corner property. Mr. Griepentrog said there are two components. One to allow single family residences a second parking space and two whether to require screening. He suggested the openness to allowing the second parking space but said screening is difficult from an enforcement perspective. President McKaig asked if he still suggests screening the street side yard spaces. Mr. Griepentrog said yes. Ms. Kiely Miller wondered about screening because no one wants to sit on their porch and stare at a parking lot. She asked if there will be a requirement of open space along the alley lot lines for snow removal. Mr. Griepentrog said he does not know if that is currently reviewed but would look into it so not to create more issues with allowing the second parking spaces. President McKaig supports flexibility to allow residents to create a second parking space for themselves if they own the property. She is not sure they can require snow storage on private property so would like more information on that. President McKaig recapped and said they are considering keeping the screening from the right of way along corner lots, remove the screening requirement in rear yard parking and allowing flexibility to add a second parking space for single family residences. President McKaig confirmed. Mr. Wycklendt confirmed. Trustee Bockhorst confirmed. Mr. Pollack confirmed. Ms. Klein confirmed. Ms. Kiely Miller confirmed.

Mr. Griepentrog said the last topic is the special exception component. He said it does not require any neighborhood notice at this time. He said it makes sense to align those notification standards with the same as the conditional use standards. He said from a consistency and administration standpoint it makes sense. President McKaig confirmed. Mr. Wycklendt confirmed. Trustee Bockhorst confirmed. Mr. Pollack confirmed. Ms. Klein confirmed. Ms. Kiely Miller confirmed.

Mr. Griepentrog said these were his main overall points and that the ratios will be a larger discussion that he will have to compile data for. He will pull the data and provide recommendations for the July meeting. President McKaig asked the difference between parking code and regulations. Mr. Griepentrog said parking code is within the zoning code and regulations are in the traffic section of the code.

President McKaig asked if commissioners wanted to weigh in on parking ratios. She said the village was 1.75, Whitefish Bay was 1.5 and Milwaukee was 1:1 in the low density areas and 2:3 in the high density areas. Ms. Kiely Miller said it was hard to have an opinion without more data. She said until they really know about the tenants in existing buildings and how many bedrooms and cars they have it would be hard. President McKaig asked if she would not make a decision without that type of data compiled apartment by apartment. Ms. Kiely Miller said surveys have been mentioned

and that the data would be helpful. She said that the gentleman who spoke at the last meeting who owned the apartment building at the corner of Prospect and Capitol stated his surface lot was insufficient for his tenants and this was the only information she had. President McKaig just wants to set a clear expectation for staff of what they are coming back to and if it is manageable for the July meeting. Mr. Griepentrog said it is not possible and that he could provide the number of apartment buildings and the number of spaces they offer but does not have the resources to go unit by unit to gather data. He will do his best to get a list of multi-family buildings and spaces they offer.

Mr. Wycklendt asked for more articles and information on trends. He does not want to match other municipalities as Shorewood is unique. He would like data put into a format so they can have a more robust discussion.

Mr. Pollack said in lieu of estimating demand by asking each complex we could look to see how many daytime and overnight parking permits were requested. Trustee Bockhorst asked if they could get lists of how many permits are requested by those in single family homes and duplexes. She said in some of the congested areas residents of multi-family buildings cannot get a daytime parking pass. She does not see the need of reaching out to owners of apartment buildings for data.

Mr. Pollack thanked residents for the public feedback. He said he was interested in understanding what residents want regarding quality of life and for them to describe that so he can be crafting policy for it because he does not have the same perception.

President McKaig asked how they assess for what is a problem areas. She said they did a parking analysis and a traffic study and neither identified any problem areas. Trustee Bockhorst encouraged people to read the planning and vision statements/documents to help find ways to improve the vision of the Village moving forward. Ms. Kiely Miller added that the Plan Commission spent six plus months crafting the Comprehensive Plan that is the highest plan in the Village. She said when they are looking to do anything in the village that should be the bible.

4. Future agenda items.

Mr. Griepentrog stated there will be two conditional use applications on the next agenda in addition to consideration of off-street parking.

5. Adjournment.

Trustee Bockhorst moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:29 p.m., seconded by Mr. Wycklendt.

Vote to adjourn 6-0.

Recorded by,



Crystal Kopydlowski
Planning Department Administrative Clerk