

Commercial Zoning Update Working Group



Meeting Notes Monday, February 28, 2022 5:30 p.m. **Teleconference**

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm.

2. Roll call

Present: Barbara Kiely Miller, Josh Pollack, Scott Kraehnke, Lybra Loest, Jon Krouse, Tr. Kathy Stokebrand, Tr. Arthur Ircink, Chuck Hagner, Maggie Pipek, Matt Weiss, Gary Brunk, Kate Flynn Post, Leslie Oberholtzer, Bart Griepentrog

Excused: Jake Bresette

3. Role of Working Group and introductions

Members of the Working Group introduced themselves to each other and provided their background and interests in the project.

Ms. Oberholtzer noted that the role of the working group will be to provide a keen eye on the initial draft of the code, ensuring that it is complete, readable and representative of the working group's representative goals.

4. Project overview

a. Scope

Ms. Oberholtzer noted that the project related to the Village's Commercial and Mixed-Use Zoning Districts. She stated that the project would involve both incorporating best practice form-based elements and updating use classifications. She noted that the project's goals related to more predictable redevelopment, compatibility with existing context and aligning the code with community expectations.

Ms. Oberholtzer reminded the group that the scope has been broken out into five tasks. She noted that the first task was about getting to know the community by understanding what was physically on the ground and listening to the people. She noted that the second task involved a public design process with a series of three public workshops. She stated that the third task involved drafting the proposed code updates for internal review. The fourth task will involve an open house, public review of the proposed code updates. The final task would take the proposed code updates through the approval process.

Tr. Stokebrand questioned whether historic preservation would be built into the code update. Ms. Oberholtzer noted that an actual historic preservation ordinance, which would identify historic properties and processes for demolition, would be a separate topic, but that the code update could support historic preservation by ensuring that new buildings fit in with the corridor's existing context.

b. Timeline

Ms. Oberholtzer shared the project's timeline in relation to the five tasks. She noted that we were approximately a month behind schedule as a result of establishing the foundations of the Working Group. She stated that the three public workshops, which would now likely take place in March – April, would ideally be scheduled three to four weeks apart. She noted that she would be drafting the initial code updates concurrently with those meetings, so that it could be reviewed once those workshops had ended in the end of May or beginning of June. She pointed out that the timeline had three months built-in to present and refine the code with the public prior to approval consideration.

5. Overview of Form Based Codes

Ms. Oberholtzer noted that reviewing the Comprehensive Plan was the first step in understanding where the project will lead, followed by a review of the existing Zoning Code and the Central District Master Plan Design Guidelines. She noted that the Village's Planned Development District (PDD) process would also be reviewed.

Ms. Oberholtzer provided a brief overview of form-based codes similar to what was presented in the first Kick Off Meeting on January 12, 2022. She noted that the predictability granted by a form-based code will come down to how it is written. She noted the difference between shall (must) and should (sometimes). She reiterated that a form-based code includes use regulations but prioritizes form and management. She noted that the physical form is the organizing structure of the code and that the code will focus on creating a high-quality public realm through objective regulations.

Ms. Kiely Miller questioned if this project could also involve updating the Comprehensive Plan so that the proposed code updates are consistent with it, as required. Ms. Oberholtzer noted that tweaks to the Comprehensive Plan may need to be considered, but stated the need to be careful on attempting to amend too much, since adopting a comprehensive plan is a huge community-wide process that involves a lot of input. She noted this project was not intended to revisit big ideas within the Comprehensive Plan.

6. Confirm proposed groupings of stakeholder interviews, timing and suggestions for participants

Ms. Oberholtzer noted that small group and individual listening sessions were designed to be held within the project's initial review phase. She stated that Code User listening sessions with designers, architects, engineers, developers and attorneys were desired to understand how the current code and development process were working. These sessions were planned to take place the week of

March 14th and it was noted that two one-hour sessions were hoped to be arranged. Mr. Griepentrog noted that Code Users who have worked on projects in the village over the last ten years would be invited to these sessions and asked the Working Group to provide the names of any representatives that the group would like to specifically include or not include by the end of the week. Ms. Kiely Miller suggested that the architects who renovated the Fire Station be included. Ms. Oberholtzer clarified that these listening sessions would not be open to the public, but that summaries of what was learned would be shared. She noted that opportunities for public input would be clarified later in the meeting.

Ms. Oberholtzer discussed the details for the proposed individual listening sessions, which would be about 20 minutes each and be offered to members of the Village Board, Plan Commission, Design Review Board, Community Development Authority and the Working Group. These sessions would also take place the week of March 14th. She noted that a consolidated summary of what was generally learned would also be created.

Ms. Oberholtzer pointed out that a findings memo related to the components of the first task would be presented to the Plan Commission at their March 22nd meeting, but that it would not include the insights from the small group and individual listening sessions. She noted that the Working Group would be able to review that memo at their next meeting.

7. Confirm date for first virtual public workshop – March 31 or April 7 from 6:00 pm – 7:00 pm

Ms. Oberholtzer stated that the first public meeting could possibly be held either March 31st or April 7th and requested insight on which the group preferred. Mr. Griepentrog noted that he was hopeful for March 31st to remain closer to the project's initial timeline. Ms. Kiely Miller asked that the School District's Spring Break be avoided, and it was confirmed that was the week of March 21st. Mr. Hagner noted that the Conservation Committee was scheduled to meet on April 7th. March 31st from 6:00 pm – 7:00 pm was confirmed to be the proposed date.

Mr. Griepentrog noted that he would place the meeting onto the Village's calendar and start promotion immediately. Tr. Stokebrand questioned if a mailing should be considered. Mr. Griepentrog noted that a post card was used to promote the Comprehensive Plan, which was both costly and time consuming and did not prove to be very successful. He suggested sticking to digital promotions and informed the Group that an article on the project would be featured in the next print edition of the Shorewood Today. He noted that he would see if the article could be revised to include the selected date. Tr. Stokebrand reiterated that she would like a mailing to be considered. Mr. Krouse did not think a post card was necessary. Tr. Ircink stated that in addition to social media, email distribution lists were also valuable and did not think that the cost of sending a post card would see the desired returns. Ms. Kiely Miller noted that the success of communication related to its presentation or wording. Ms. Loest questioned who was in charge of the project's communication plan. Ms. Oberholtzer stated that she would be happy to help with any communications, but clarified that the Village would be in charge of distributing any invitations to participate.

Looking ahead, Ms. Oberholtzer questioned if April 28th or May 5th would work to host the second public workshop. Mr. Griepentrog noted that a Design Review Board meeting was scheduled for April 28th and suggested that Wednesdays typically work well for avoiding conflict with Village meetings. Ms. Oberholtzer noted that April 20th or April 27th could be considered, but would be confirmed at the next meeting.

8. Future discussion items

No future discussion items were noted.

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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

Bart Griepentrog, AICP
Planning & Development Director