



**Plan Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
May 19, 2020**

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

**1. Call to order.**

The meeting was called to order at 6:46 p.m.

President Allison Rozek	No
Trustee Kathy Stokebrand (Acting Chair)	Aye
Leah Blankenship	No
Eric Couto	Aye
Tim Hansmann	No
Therese Klein	Aye
Barbara Kiely Miller	Aye
Sangeeta Patel	Aye
Daniel Wycklendt (arrived after item 3)	Aye

**2. Approval of February 25, 2020 meeting minutes.**

Mr. Couto moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Ms. Kiely Miller. Vote 4-0 to approve; Trustee Stokebrand abstained as she was not a part of the meeting in February.

**3. Discussion and recommendation of consultant selection for Comprehensive Plan Update**

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

The RFP was published and responses were received in March/April. Interviews and reviews were delayed about a month due to COVID restrictions and happened on May 14<sup>th</sup>. The interview panel participants were Mr. Griepentrog, Trustee Stokebrand, President Rozek and Village Manager Ewald. Village Manager Ewald and President Rozek were unable to attend as other commitments arose due to the Supreme Court decision regarding the statewide stay at home order occurring that day.

Mr. Griepentrog and Trustee Stokebrand conducted the interviews and completed score sheets based on criteria within the RFP and an added category for the interview quality. Both independently scored the interviews and came up with the same results.

Ms. Kiely Miller wanted to hear their results first before discussion.

Mr. Griepentrog said the proposals were received from JSD Professional Services, Inc. and Vandewalle & Associates, Inc. Each were scored on the following: quality and content of the proposal, experience and technical competence, familiarity of the consultant with the types of issues encountered on a project like this, an understanding of their approach to our project, the interview, the project timeline and cost. With that JSD Professional Services scored an 86 (out of 100) and Vandewalle & Associates scored a 92.75 with Vandewalle being the selection based on the score sheet.

Mr. Griepentrog said Vandewalle scored higher because of their experience in this area (geographically they have done comprehensive planning work in the North Shore) and a wide base of Wisconsin comprehensive planning experience, they clearly specified the

project tasks and person responsible for them and they have a small team that would do most of the work with us. Mr. Griepentrog reminded the Commissioners that village staff would do two-thirds of the chapters and the consultant would do the last third. Vandewalle has done plans like this in the past which included working with staff.

JSD had not provided similar experience and Vandewalle also understood the concept of a second generation comp plan knowing that many communities in Wisconsin did this ten years ago and that there was more of a desire to reconfirm and reestablish some things. Vandewalle also discussed an ability to acknowledge controversial projects and its impact on the community.

Mr. Griepentrog said there was nothing wrong with JSD in particular but added they had lost their project leader (left for a new job) between the time of submitting their proposal and the interview. They did not have a lot of Wisconsin comprehensive planning experience but had more master planning experience. They had two landscape architects on their team which the village could've found a way to use them but their expertise is more with physical planning activity than comprehensive planning activity.

Mr. Griepentrog and Trustee Stokebrand scored both the interviews and both came back with the recommendation of selecting Vandewalle & Associates, Inc.

Mr. Wycklendt joined the meeting at this time.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked if the person who left JSD was Amanda Arnold, their Senior Planner. Mr. Griepentrog stated yes. Ms. Kiely Miller noted she had only been with the company since the beginning of this year and that that had been a concern of hers. She said one thing she did like about JSD was that a member of their team had experience with historical planning. One thing she did not like with the Vandewalle proposal was that it started off discussing redevelopment opportunities, infill and working with real estate people versus what the residents want. With the Village being so small this could be different that working with a larger municipality. Mr. Griepentrog said that during the interview Vandewalle discussed a controversial project in Lake Geneva and how they had a meeting to discuss it and get the feelings regarding the project. He felt this first meeting which tackled the topic head on so they could understand it. When the land use chapter gets worked on this could be valuable experience for them going forward. Ms. Kiely Miller said that it had been ten years since the current plan was done and there have been a lot of redevelopment plans completed since then. Lessons and unintended consequences from those projects will need to be reviewed, some of which we learned about when the traffic and parking study was done last year. Mr. Griepentrog said that redevelopment opportunities were not asked for but that it is a typical standard thing most municipalities ask for. She liked that the proposals addressed how to do online participation. Both teams did virtual interviews and both were up to speed on facilitating online meetings.

Ms. Kiely Miller said that Vandewalle has somebody on staff involved with GIS mapping and wondered if the Village would use that person or would he just advise. She asked if this would increase the cost above the \$30,000 the Village Board approved. Mr. Griepentrog said that the Village already has a GIS consultant on contract but if for some reason there is a request for extensive maps beyond what is typical then cost could increase. This would be a special request not the typical.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked what the Plan Commission's role will be with the consultant. Mr. Griepentrog said monthly meetings at their regular time being the first level or review prior to any formal presentation. The Plan Commission will be involved in all the reviews

before it is presented. The materials may not come from the consultant each time but from staff presenting it at meetings.

Trustee Stokebrand said she reached out to some references the Vandewalle gave and when reaching out to a reference from City of Greenfield she said they were very happy with the work Vandewalle did and that they exceeded their expectations. Another reference from the City of Brookfield spoke highly of them. She asked him specifically about land use, the intergovernmental component and the issues and opportunities and he reiterated that they worked very well especially with the intergovernmental component. He said the coordination with governmental groups helped move their update along smoothly.

Mr. Couto said he was ok making the recommendation and asked if it was needed to make a motion. Mr. Griepentrog said he would prefer a motion but it was not placed on the agenda as a consideration.

Ms. Klein asked if the costs were similar. Mr. Griepentrog said JSD's cost was \$27,500 and it was itemized based on staff and projects. Vandewalle's was \$30,000 not to exceed cost. Ms. Kiely Miller noted JSD's cost did not include presentation to the Board or committees so that could increase their costs.

Mr. Couto moved to recommend to the Village Board Vandewalle & Associates for the Shorewood Comprehensive Plan Update, seconded by Mr. Wycklendt. A roll call vote was taken: Mr. Couto – Aye, Ms. Patel – Aye, Ms. Klein – Aye, Ms. Kiely Miller – Aye, Trustee Stokebrand – Aye, and Mr. Wycklendt - Aye. Vote 6-0.

#### **4. Review of 2019 Plan Commission Annual Report and Future Initiatives**

Planning Director Bart Griepentrog introduced the item per the memo that was provided to the Plan Commission. This is an annual report and initiative submission and it will be reviewed by the Village Board in June. What is important is the confirmation of initiatives. The three initiatives identified are to revise the off-street parking requirements, review the zoning map and update the special privilege policy and ordinance.

Ms. Kiely Miller reviewed the list the committee had previously and asked about historic properties and districts and moving forward with that. Mr. Griepentrog said that was designated as one of the Village Manager's initiatives and she will include the Plan Commission when necessary. She said revising the sign code was another. Mr. Griepentrog said it is already in his work plan and he is prioritizing it when he has time to work on it. He meets quarterly with the village manager to go over his work plan. She said another initiative had been to research and revise conditional permitted and prohibited uses. Mr. Griepentrog said he'd be happy to add that initiative if the Commission feels it should be. The initiative to research/revise zoning code relative to site design standards didn't go anywhere last discussion either. She didn't know if this would come up during the comprehensive plan. Mr. Griepentrog said this would be a pretty big discussion and was held off until after the comprehensive plan was completed.

Trustee Stokebrand asked if the review of the sign code refers to commercial. Mr. Griepentrog said yes. She said there is nothing wrong with adding the items to the list and having that list even if they are not acted on. Mr. Griepentrog said he understands that perspective but when this process began in 2018 many committees submitted a lot of items and it made the board's discussion of them quite difficult and nothing was selected. Last year's submission was shorter (up to three as opposed to nine) as a way to help the process.

Ms. Patel asked if it is clear that the topic of off-street parking requirements included businesses and when businesses are before them for conditional uses if they are accounting for parking properly. Mr. Griepentrog asked if the question was whether the parking requirement initiative was specific to commercial occupancies. Ms. Patel said yes. She wanted to be clear this was an aspect of off-street parking and not just residential parking. Ms. Patel said each time a special exception is given for parking it is not clear if they are over budgeting when granting them (multiple parking exceptions for one specific area). Trustee Stokebrand said that in general the goal of the Village Board will be to simplify and streamline the code and include both residential and commercial. Mr. Griepentrog said this has been discussed a number of times and during the traffic study and it is written in an open format so anything residential and commercial can be included. He feels the code is too strict which is why special exceptions are required. Mr. Couto asked what the traffic and parking study came back with in regards to parking for commercial. The consultant didn't provide a recommendation on this and mentioned it is a local policy decision. It would be up to the commission and planner to review the code and parking requirements. Mr. Couto asked what you fall back on without any recommendations or guidelines when you have ran out of viable parking options in an area. Mr. Griepentrog said that the village would have to come up with their own recommendations and the problem with the current regulations is that they are based on commercial occupancy and the renovation of a space. Trustee Stokebrand asked if regulations take into account public parking structures. Mr. Griepentrog said the regulations do not. His biggest issue with the parking regulations is what triggers the review; renovation of a space. If someone doesn't renovate a space there is no discussion about parking but if you renovate into a different use that triggers a parking review. Mr. Couto said he agrees the half and half review makes no sense. Mr. Griepentrog said the only rewording he would suggest would be to change it to "revise commercial off-street parking requirements".

Ms. Klein asked if there was anything new to add possibly regarding in-home businesses and if the zoning needs to change to accommodate that. Ms. Kiely Miller asked if she was referring to one person who works out of their home (i.e. graphic designer) or one who runs a business where clients are coming into the home. Ms. Klein said all of those scenarios she is asking about. Mr. Griepentrog said there is a section of the code that references home-based businesses with limitations which could be reviewed and expanded if need be. He has no problem adding it to the list but would like to prioritize items.

Similarly, accessory dwelling units was a topic that came up during the housing study as a way to expand housing options. He said the CDA is the village's housing authority but the topic of accessory dwelling units is under the zoning code. It could be a shared initiative between the CDA and Plan Commission. Mr. Couto asked how it would be a shared effort. Mr. Griepentrog said that the CDA is responsible for the policies and priorities regarding housing as they are the Village's housing authority and if they wanted the Village to expand housing opportunities one way to do that would be through accessory dwelling units and that would be a change to the zoning code which is the Plan Commission that oversees those changes.

Mr. Griepentrog summarized that he would be adding the review of the conditional, permitted and prohibited uses, to research the zoning code for setback and form based requirements, review home-based business regulations and to expand housing opportunities within the zoning code. Ms. Kiely Miller said this all depends on staff workloads and said they can add items but some may not get addressed. Mr. Griepentrog said they can add additional initiatives but to prioritize them. He said he

would recommend keeping the top three items on the list in the order they are presented and would add the other suggestions after that. Trustee Stokebrand said that home-based businesses would be a timely initiative but that the economy may need to shake out before to see if in six months if people are still not working in offices. Mr. Griepentrog said his suggested order for the remaining topics would be home-based businesses, accessory dwelling units/housing opportunities, conditional uses and zoning code review. Mr. Couto asked Mr. Griepentrog's opinion of the zoning code as it is written and how long it can keep being pushed off before it becomes an issue. Mr. Griepentrog said the chapter is woefully outdated but as a built out community it isn't utilized as much as one would think it is. He said it does need to get worked on though. Ms. Klein asked if it could be reviewed in sections. Mr. Griepentrog said he would separate it out between residential and commercial and felt the residential could be reviewed fairly quickly. The commercial section would take more time and he suggested a form-based code which would dictate the type of construction, storefront visibility and how buildings interact with the public realm. He feels this would be a huge benefit but would require a consultant with expertise to review that section. He suggested that this could be a proposal in the land use chapter of the comprehensive plan as a goal of the community to revise the zoning code because there would be more standing with documenting it in the comprehensive plan and then acting on it. Trustee Stokebrand asked if form-based code for commercial development/zoning be controversial. Mr. Griepentrog said the intent of form-based code is to remove the controversy and make things more specific. He said the City of Milwaukee has it in several commercial districts and it is a very useful tool that makes it clear what the community expects and wants. Ms. Patel said they have discussed in the past wanting more uniformity in the commercial district and form-based code could help with that.

Ms. Kiely Miller said reviewing the zoning map is her number one initiative and that Attorney Bayer has explained to them that with recent legislative changes if a project meets the code requirements it has to be approved even if as a commission they don't like it. If projects meet code they only have so much to stand on to say no and reviewing the zoning map would help. Mr. Griepentrog stated this discussion should take place during the update of the land use chapter in the comprehensive plan but is leaving it on the Plan Commission's initiatives in case the specificity of the discussion is not satisfactory during the update.

Mr. Couto wants the commission to be more proactive than reactive and to start digging into other items/topics.

Ms. Kiely Miller suggested adding the request for a planning intern to help with the work load. Mr. Griepentrog said this was an intention but with the current COVID situation (cost and concerns) it is not likely. He is having the discussion with the Village Manager.

Mr. Couto moved to accept the seven committee initiatives as discussed (*Revise Off-Street Parking Requirements, Review Zoning Map, Update Special Privilege Policy and Ordinance, Review of the Conditional, Permitted and Prohibited Uses, Research the Zoning Code for Setback and Form-Based Requirements, Review Home-Based Business Regulations and Expand Housing Opportunities within the Zoning Code*), seconded by Ms. Kiely Miller. A roll call vote was taken: Mr. Couto – Aye, Ms. Klein – Aye, Ms. Kiely Miller – Aye, Trustee Stokebrand – Aye, and Mr. Wycklendt – Aye. Vote 5-0.

## **5. Update on 2020 Census**

Planning Director Bart Griepentrog introduced the item per the memo that was provided to the Plan Commission. The Census Bureau has expanded the collection period that

was to expire July 31<sup>st</sup>. The collection period now expires October 31<sup>st</sup> and is in part due to not being able to go door to door for follow up and get responses. The role of the Complete Count Committee has been therefore extended two months. There has been a weekly teleconference with Milwaukee County suburban communities to discuss response rates and those numbers were included in the meeting materials. With Shorewood's higher number of rental properties than many other communities the Village's response rate is good.

A first attempt to reach out to hard to count population (renters, seniors, young families) is to contact multi-family property owners asking them to post within common spaces a poster about the census encouraging their response. Having healthy numbers benefits the community in the long run so anything the committee can think of to encourage response is welcomed.

Trustee Stokebrand said we have no way to know who is responding or which demographic is not responding and asked if there was any feedback on that. Mr. Griepentrog said that in the materials response rates per Census Tracts. Tract 803 is the east side of the village mainly single family homeowners with the highest response. Tract 804 is the southwest quadrant that includes a large number of renters and has the lowest response rate. It is easy to identify that the missing responses are from multi-family buildings. The best way to get responses is to have the census workers go door to door but that will not occur to August. Trustee Stokebrand added that a lot could be UWM students and with that Mr. Griepentrog said when responding to the census you are supposed to use your primary residence as of April 1<sup>st</sup>. If an individual is a student and hasn't responded yet they could've moved recently to a different location and determining who lived at addresses as of April 1<sup>st</sup> could be difficult.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked if the poster that will be posted is the one in the materials with all the different phone numbers. Mr. Griepentrog said yes. She felt this would be useful because there is a large number of Russian speaking residents in the village. She did state that she posted this flyer to multiple social media accounts to promote it.

Ms. Patel said that when she responded to the census there was a specific code required to do so. She asked if there are any instructions for finding your unique code if you no longer have it at the time you want to respond. Mr. Griepentrog said he was not sure how it all worked but that on the flyer/poster under 1. Respond Online it says "*if you do not have an invitation to respond, simply indicate that you do not have a Census ID and then enter the address for which you are responding*".

Mr. Griepentrog stated he has been working with the Senior Resource Center on this as well and that Elizabeth Price has posted the flyer/poster in multiple locations as well.

Mr. Couto asked if there will be any community wide mailings about this in the coming months. Mr. Griepentrog stated there is an article that will be in the upcoming Shorewood Today publication in June/July. It has been in Manager's Memos and social media posts also.

**6. Future agenda items.**

Mr. Griepentrog stated the comprehensive plan updates will be coming back monthly. There are no other applications on hand at the moment.

**7. Adjournment.**

Mr. Couto moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:04 p.m., seconded by Ms. Klein. Vote to adjourn 6-0.

Recorded by,

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

Crystal Kopydlowski  
Planning Department Administrative Clerk