



**MINUTES - SHOREWOOD BOARD OF TRUSTEES**  
**Committee of the Whole Meeting**  
**September 8, 2021**

1. Call to Order

President McKaig called the Committee of the Whole meeting of the Village Board to order at 6:03 p.m.

2. Statement of Public Notice

Village Manager Ewald stated that the meeting had been posted and noticed according to law.

3. Roll Call

Village Manager Ewald called the roll. Present via teleconference: President McKaig, Trustees Jim Arndorfer, Tammy Bockhorst, Arthur Ircink, Kathy Stokebrand and Wesley Warren.

Excused: Melissa Baldauff

Others Present: Village Manager Rebecca Ewald, Ast. Village Manager Tyler Burkart, Finance Director Mark Emanuelson, Interim Chief Thomas Liebenthal, Planning and Development Director Bart Griepentrog, Elder Services Director Elizabeth Price, Library Director Rachel Collins.

4. Overview of the 2022 Budget (6:04 p.m.)

There were several major policy items approved by the Village Board that have aided in being able to prepare this proposed budget in order to continue to maintain existing service levels, programs, and projects that are currently in place or have been otherwise approved, and to continue to support the other goals and objectives of the Village Board. They are as follows:

- Approval of a staff sharing agreement for the Court Clerk with the Village of Brown Deer.
- Approval of several staffing changes and restructuring as a result of staff retirements and turnover.
- Approval of adjustments to the wage rates and salary ranges of numerous positions which increased the village's ability to recruit and retain high quality employees.
- Approval to change the method of collection for the water utility public fire protection fees which improves comparability between communities and can allow the village to restore annual capital funding to long-term sustainable levels while still maintaining our eligibility for about \$275,000 of state aids under the Expenditure Restraint program.
- Previously approved a fiscal strategy to use excess General Fund reserves to reduce taxes and limit the growth of the village's tax levy for debt service to a maximum of 5.0% per year until those needs begin to decline in 2025.
- Support for efforts to begin to improve Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion within the organization through continued funding of EDI engagement opportunities, and the proposed development of a strategic plan for continued improvement of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion within the community.

It was noted that the Village was recently made aware there will be a zero percent increase for health insurance. It was requested to review Attorney fees in budget wrap up due to possible increase in costs for the Police Commission.

5. Update on ARPA funds (6:52 p.m.)

The Village of Shorewood was awarded \$1,375,868 under the Federal ARPA Grant Program. Funds must be expended by December 31, 2024.

As a federal grant, it is extremely important that the Village's use of these funds complies with:

- General underlying federal grant regulations
- Federal OMB 133 procurement and internal control standards
- The specific program eligibility requirements.

While staff is still reviewing the general federal grant regulations and OMB 133 procurement and internal control standards, we have generally completed our review of the specific program eligibility requirements as outlined in the 151 pages of The Department of Treasury – ARPA Interim Final Rules.

To that end, staff would like to share our summary as applicable to the Village of Shorewood, in order that we may begin the process of evaluating the potential activities or projects that the Village may wish to undertake with this grant funding. The Village Board has already agreed to fund video/audio equipment with these funds in 2021. Two administrative items referred for funding by ARPA in 2022 are document scanning and modifications to the Village Hall lobby/counter area. Further discussion on eligible activities will resume after budget completion. The Village Board's long term strategy for utilization of the funds will continue as the Board evaluates best use for remaining expenditures after budget conclusion.

The American Rescue Plan Act has four eligible use categories, seven general expenditure categories, and a total of 66 expenditure subcategories. Staff has prepared a summary of the categories that would be most applicable to the Village of Shorewood:

- A. Support public health expenditures
- B. Address negative economic impacts caused by the public health emergency
- C. Provide premium pay for essential workers
- D. Replace lost public sector revenue
- E. Invest in water, sewer, and broadband infrastructure

A further discussion on these items will be brought forward to the Village Board for consideration at a future date, including:

- Identifying only those projects eligible in Shorewood
- Advantage/disadvantage to funding the SEACSI Project
- Advising whether the footwashing station would be an eligible expenditure

If trustees have specific questions or suggestions they were requested to contact Director Emanuelson directly in advance of our October meeting.

Tr. Ircink moved, seconded by Tr. Bockhorst to adjourn at 7:20 p.m. Motion carried 6-0.



**MINUTES - SHOREWOOD BOARD OF TRUSTEES**  
**Village Board Meeting**  
**September 8, 2021**

1. Call to Order

President McKaig called the meeting of the Village Board to order at 7:35 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Village Manager Rebecca Ewald called the roll. Present via teleconference: President Ann McKaig, Trustees Jim Arndorfer, Tammy Bockhorst, Arthur Ircink, Kathy Stokebrand and Wesley Warren.

Excused: Melissa Moore Baldauff

Others Present: Village Manager Rebecca Ewald, Ast. Village Manager Tyler Burkart, Village Attorney Nathan Bayer, Planning and Development Director Bart Griepentrog and Public Works Director Leeann Butschlick.

3. Statement of Public Notice

Village Manager Ewald stated that the meeting had been posted and noticed according to law.

4. Special Order of Business – None

5. Consent Agenda Items (7:36 p.m.)

- a. Accept Presentation of Accounts – September 8, 2021
- b. Consider regular Village Board Minutes – August 2, 2021
- c. Consider special Village Board Minutes – August 16, 2021
- d. Consider authorization to hire village clerk
- e. Consider service agreement for facility conditions assessment
- f. Consider Request for Proposals for consulting services related to a Form-based Code Update of the Village's Commercial and Mixed-Use Zoning Districts
- g. Consider Hubbard Park parking lot reconstruction MMSD Green Infrastructure Funding Agreement.

Tr. Warren moved, seconded by Tr. Ircink to approve the consent agenda. Tr. Stokebrand requested to remove item f. Motion carried 6 – 0 with item f removed.

6. Items Removed from the Consent Agenda (7:37 p.m.)

Director Griepentrog noted he would clarify the proposal to include hybrid form based code. He further noted that any firm who would provide a proposal on this RFP would be able to provide form base code and use regulations.

Tr. Stokebrand moved and President McKaig seconded to approve the RFP for consulting services related to a form-based code and or hybrid code of the Village's commercial and mixed-use zoning districts. Motion carried by roll call vote 6-0.

President McKaig moved, seconded by Tr. Bockhorst to move item 8 prior to item 7 on the agenda. Motion carried 6-0.

7. Citizens to be heard – This item is for matters not on the agenda. Discussion may follow comment on non-agenda items or discussion and action may come at future meetings. (7:44 p.m.) – None.

8. Public Hearing(s) (7:44 p.m.) –

- a. Ordinance 3028: An ordinance amendment related to modifications to Chapter 535 Zoning Article IX Off-Street Parking

Director Griepentrog reviewed the amendments related to off-street parking.

Sam Essak, 2401 E. Jarvis – supports the proposed ratio, noting there is adequate parking.

Vick Herman, 4071 N. Stowell – not in favor of the proposed changes; concerned about apartment buildings on Oakland and Lake Bluff; it will affect other businesses and is not family friendly; would support a 1.5 ratio; we need to protect our suburb.

Andrea Brandt, 4054 N. Stowell – inquired if there is a way we can monitor whether a developer will charge less and

make the units more affordable; more cars equates to less safety; does not understand how increasing density will help our taxes; this restricts families by not providing parking.

Cliona Clipper, 4442 N. Sheffield – in favor of the proposal; disagrees the change is less family friendly; it makes the community available to all people who desire to live here.

Gene Webb, 4401/4403 N. Oakland – would like to know how many special exceptions are located on the North Shore Bank lot; in addition to parking permits, what impact will closing the parking lot have in the direct vicinity to the building; his business model is geared toward middle age or older residents who need parking.

Dan Walsh, 4024 N. Stowell – does not agree that the previous code was zoning by Xerox; it's been evolving over time and the market won't protect the interests of the Village; doesn't believe the proposal is supported by facts or industry standards.

Jennifer Cooney Vulpas, 4331 N. Alpine – echoed Web's comments; restricting parking, restricts older residents; she objects to restricting parking.

Mark Warhus, 4071 N. Stowell – why change the parking code before form based code review; perhaps modify and seek a compromise on the ratio.

Stephanie Spicuzza, 1609 E. Beverly – have we asked current businesses and property owners their opinions; there are people with mobility challenges and inclement weather that requires parking.

## 9. New Business

- a. Consider Ordinance 3028: An ordinance amendment related to modifications to Chapter 535 Zoning Article IX Off-Street Parking (8:37 p.m.)

Tr. Ircink moved, seconded by Tr. Bockhorst to approval of Ordinance 3028: An ordinance amendment related to modifications to Chapter 535 Zoning Article IX Off-Street Parking.

Tr. Warren noted he would like a Committee of the Whole to review the changes; sees the equity argument; is curious about other North Shore community comparisons; would like to bring the ratio down, but maybe not to one.

Tr. Arndorfer agrees with Tr. Warren; would like to reduce the ratio, but one may be going too far; struggling to see broad resident support; would like to see how the 1.5 ratio works in Whitefish Bay and would also like to look at Wauwatosa.

Tr. Stokebrand noted the BID discussed the changes, but did not provide a formal vote or response, noting there was also support; agrees with Trustees Warren and Arndorfer; doesn't understand the rush, as we don't have form based code yet and would like to run the changes through the consultant.

President McKaig supports the amendment; our land use and commercial corridor is larger than Whitefish Bay; there is data to support the changes and the Plan Commission recommended these changes by a 5-2 vote.

Tr. Bockhorst supports the changes; commended Director Griepentrog for his work; noted the opportunity to amend an antiquated code; parking has been discussed annually and a lot of work has been done on this item.

Tr. Ircink withdraw his motion and voiced his desire to have a Committee of the Whole to discuss the changes after budget concludes. He noted his strong support for affordable housing and parking has a large impact on developing affordable housing in our community. Tr. Bockhorst noted she will not withdraw her second to the motion.

Trustees Warren and Arndorfer relayed they do not agree with the 1.75 ratio, but would like to review the information in greater detail prior to making a decision.

Tr. Stokebrand called the question.

President McKaig expressed the desire to work with the community to anticipate changes, because our community needs to continually change to succeed in the future; fear around change is not supported by data.

Restated Motion: Tr. Ircink moved, seconded by Tr. Bockhorst to approve Ordinance 3028: An ordinance amendment related to modifications to Chapter 535 Zoning Article IX Off-Street Parking. Motion failed by roll call vote: aye (Bockhorst/Ircink/McKaig), Warren abstained; nay (Arndorfer/Stokebrand).

Village Attorney confirmed the vote failed.

- b. Consider proposal for Lake Drive (STH 32) green infrastructure feasibility review. (9:36 p.m.)

It was noted that the design constraints will limit green infrastructure options.

Tr. Stokebrand moved, seconded by Tr. Ircink acceptance of the Kapur, Inc. proposal for professional engineering services for Lake Drive (Edgewood Avenue to Kensington Boulevard) green infrastructure feasibility study in the amount of \$5,942.00. Motion carried 6 – 0 by a roll call vote.

- c. Review RFP for police chief recruitment. (9:44 p.m.)

Village Manager Ewald reviewed the proposed process for developing an RFP for Police Chief recruitment services that included a website landing page, email contact for comments, outline of the process, Notify Me to learn of future recruitment efforts and opportunities for public comments to be received. No action will take place at this meeting.

All written comments submitted, actions from the Human Relations Commission and Police Commission, along with a summary of all verbal comments will be provided to the Village Board in advance of their September 20 Village Board meeting in which the draft RFP will be considered. Based upon the comments received staff will prepare a redlined draft of the RFP to assist the Board with possibilities for additional consideration on September 20. All comments and redlines draft will be provided in the regular September 20 Village Board meeting packet available online.

The Village Board reviewed and provided the following comments on the draft RFP and process:

Tr. Warren thanks staff for a transparent process and requested the HRC and Police Commission designate their representative for the review panel. Village Manager Ewald will request their representative on his behalf and report back at a future date.

The Board heard the following public comments at the meeting:

Liz Egan - voiced support for the transparent process and references diversity, equity and inclusion; inquired whether the Weiss organizational study would be referenced in the RFP; while not referenced in the RFP staff noted that it would be noted in our pre-meetings with interested firms; had additional suggestions for distribution of the RFP to ensure it reaches a diverse array of firms with the opportunity to submit a proposal. It was further clarified that citizens at large and community groups are stakeholders within the process.

- d. Consider next steps for Atwater Beach lifeguard RFP. (9:56 p.m.)

Following the August 16, 2021 Village Board meeting, Village staff worked with Bayside IT to estimate costs for the telephone plan and WiFi hotspot. Bayside IT estimates a one-time cost of \$500 for these improvements as well as an annual cost of \$750. Staff has yet to be informed by the vendor if they performed a site visit as requested by the Village Board during the August 16 meeting. In addition, the Village received word of another municipality who was terminating the vendor's services this year due to poor performance as well as recruiting and employing lifeguards who didn't have the proper certifications.

If the Village wants to still pursue the current contract with USA Management, they are willing to do a service agreement as a one-year agreement with an option to renew for two more years. This would allow the Village to try their services for one year before considering extending it for two more years. The set amount for all three years would be up to \$32,480. There would be no discount for the third year under this proposal. Attached is the updated agreement.

There are two possible options provided: 1) authorize staff to re-issue the RFP for Atwater Beach Lifeguard services, or 2) authorize staff to enter into an agreement with USA Management.

Tr. Ircink noted he does not support the vendor and supports redistributing the RFP. Tr. Stokebrand agreed that she does not support the vendor either while noting that staff has spent a considerable amount of time on this matter.

Tr. Ircink moved to re-issue an RFP for Atwater Beach lifeguarding services, seconded by Tr. Warren.

It was suggested that our Park and Open Spaces or Community and Business Relations Committee be involved to see how we could communicate this action and how they could help the presence at the beach if lifeguards are not available.

Trustees Ircink and Warren withdrew their motion.

Tr. Ircink moved, seconded by President McKaig to initiate conversations with our committees on alternate solutions at Atwater Beach that do not include lifeguards and not re-issue an RFP. Motion carried with 5 ayes and 1 abstention (Bockhorst).

#### 10. Reports of Village Officials

- a. Village President – noted Resignation of Police Commission Member
  - ii. Update on Police Commission Appointments
  - iii. Report of Communication with Community Members and Shorewood Police Officers.
- b. Village Trustees – Tr. Ircink reminded everyone of the Shorewood Feast this Saturday, September 11.
- c. Village Manager - President McKaig conducted the swearing in of Village Manager Ewald as Interim Village Clerk.

#### 11. Items for future consideration (10:17 p.m.)

Tr. Warren moved, seconded by Tr. Ircink to place Ordinance 3028 on the Committee of the Whole agenda immediately after the budget process and for consideration on the regular Village Board following the Committee of the Whole meeting. Motion carried 5 ayes and 1 nay (Bockhorst).

Tr. Ircink requested a staff update on lights at Atwater.

12. Closed session – the Village Board upon motion duly made, may convene into closed session to confer with legal counsel for the governmental body pursuant to Wis. Stat. 19.85(1)(e) to confer with legal counsel for bargaining reasons regarding the police union agreement. (10:22 p.m.)

Tr. Ircink moved, seconded by Tr. Bockhorst, to adjourn into closed session to confer with legal counsel for the governmental body pursuant to Wis. Stat. 19.85(1)(e) to confer with legal counsel for bargaining reasons regarding the police union agreement at p.m. Motion carried 6 – 0 by a roll call vote.  
The Board discussed the union’s proposal.

13. Reconvene into open session (10:33 p.m.)

Tr. Stokebrand moved, seconded by Tr. Ircink to reconvene into open session at 10:33 p.m. Motion carried 6-0.

14. Adjournment.

Tr. Warren moved and Tr. Stokebrand seconded to adjourn at 10:35 p.m. Motion carried 6 - 0.

Respectfully submitted,

Rebecca Ewald  
Village Manager

**From:** [Barbara Kiely Miller](#)  
**To:** [President McKaig](#); [Trustee Ircink](#); [Trustee Bockhorst](#); [Trustee Arndorfer](#); [Trustee Baldauff](#); [Trustee Stokebrand](#); [Trustee Warren](#)  
**Cc:** [Bart Griepentrog](#); [Rebecca Ewald](#)  
**Subject:** Modifications to Zoning for Off-Street Parking  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 8, 2021 5:01:21 PM

---

Dear Village Board members,

This evening you will be considering a recommendation from the Plan Commission to change the zoning code for off-street parking. I wanted to make sure you knew that this was NOT a unanimous recommendation from the group. The two members with the highest seniority and most experience on the Plan Commission voted against recommending these changes to the Board. I cannot speak for Commissioner Couto, but as the commissioner with the highest seniority, I wanted to tell you why I think why I voted “No.”

Our current zoning requires 1.75 parking spaces per apartment in multi-family buildings, and these spaces must be within an approved garage. The proposed change is to drop the requirement to 1.0 parking spaces per apartment. I think this is too low. Although Shorewood may be considered a “walkable” community, it is and always will be a “bedroom community.” Most working adults commute to jobs outside the village, some outside the county, and many to jobs that are not reachable by our limited bus system. Regardless of a resident’s income level, the need to reach employment, as well as other shopping and service needs, will always be critical. Whether a homeowner or renter, the vast majority of adults depend on automobiles to get around. Cars which cannot be accommodated within a building will take up parking spaces on village streets. We have numerous older multi-family apartment buildings that were constructed in the 1920s, ‘30s, and ‘40s (see the chart on pages 118-119 of your packet), when individual auto ownership was low due to economic issues, the Great Depression, and gasoline rationing during World War II. Residents in those buildings already compete for valued street parking without being forced to park further from their homes because of increased demand generated by new development with lower parking requirements. In addition, our small businesses on Capitol and Oakland depend on street parking for their customers, who are drawn from other Northshore communities and



Milwaukee as well as in the village. Using up street parking for apartment dwellers when unnecessary will harm our small businesses that already face numerous challenges.

It has been suggested that we should emulate Milwaukee's 1.0 parking ratio. But Shorewood is not Milwaukee, and if we wanted it to be like the City we would all probably have chosen to live there rather than in our village. If you feel a change to the zoning for off-street parking is required, I suggest a compromise of 1.5 spaces per apartment. This is the code in Whitefish Bay, which is a more relative community to model ourselves after than Milwaukee. In addition, I would require all spaces to be located inside an approved garage. The three multi-family buildings at Oakland and Kensington—the Cornerstone, Metropolitan, and Ravenna—all were able to accommodate parking at the rate of 1.75. There is no reason that future development should not meet a requirement of 1.5 spaces per unit. Our parking code is one of the only controls and checks on developers that the village has. Let's not do away with our control over thoughtful development. Yes, we are looking forward to a form-based zoning code, but we don't know what that will look like, yet.

In addition, please reconsider the suggestion that all neighborhoods be treated the same in Shorewood. As you know, the southeast quadrant of the village and the 4000 blocks of Downer and Prospect are in congested areas with parking restrictions due to overflow parking from the university. The parking needs in those neighborhoods are quite different than in others.

Lastly, in section H (5) of the redlined copy of the code, please consider retaining the requirement for screening of parking slabs from adjacent yards. If ever the phrase "good fences make good neighbors" applied, it's in this situation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Barbara Kiely Miller

4051 N. Downer Avenue

bkm@wi.rr.com



**From:** [President McKaig](#)  
**To:** [Rosalie Bredeck](#); [Trustees](#); [Rebecca Ewald](#); [Bart Griepentrog](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Parking thoughts  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 8, 2021 4:20:27 PM

---

Hi Rosalie,

Thanks for your email. I am sharing it with trustees and staff to make sure that everyone is aware of your position.

Sincerely,

Ann

Ann McCullough McKaig  
Village President  
414-758-0148  
(pronouns: she or they)

***"You don't have to see the whole staircase- just take the first step." - Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.***

---

**From:** Rosalie Bredeck <[robredeck@gmail.com](mailto:robredeck@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 8, 2021 12:13:47 PM  
**To:** President McKaig  
**Subject:** Parking thoughts

Hi Ann,

Thank you for accepting resident's comments about changes to parking regulations in the village. Here are a few thoughts:

- When residents are concerned that construction related parking changes will negatively affect their quality of life, the contractor/village reps should spend time with affected residents to understand and verify the concerns. Then work with residents to potentially modify design plans to mitigate negative impacts in those neighborhoods. Studies are useful, as is time spent in the affected area with affected residents.
- Self-driving technology has the potential to impact traffic and parking patterns/needs in the future. I think new development should be designed with the flexibility to address today's parking needs and be easily modified as those needs change in the future.
- There are only a couple of areas in the village where I find it consistently difficult to find on-street parking; northern blocks of Oakland Ave. and eastern blocks of Capital Dr. It's annoying, but doesn't prevent me from spending time in those areas. It might feel quite different if I lived in one of those areas.
- I'm concerned that changing the parking requirement to 1.0 might create an unpleasant environment, especially for larger buildings with greater than 40 units. I'd rather start with a 1.5 requirement and then grant exceptions as warranted, allowing for more

controlled development. I know, that would be messy!

Thank you for considering my comments.

Rosie Bredeck  
4248 N Ardmore Ave.

**From:** [President McKaig](#)  
**To:** [Mark Warhus](#); [Rebecca Ewald](#); [Bart Griepentrog](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Vote no on one parking space per housing unit.  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 7, 2021 12:28:15 PM

---

Dear Mark,

Thank you for your email. I am copying Mgr. Ewald to ensure that your position is shared with the entire Village Board.

Best,

Ann

Ann McCullough McKaig  
Village President  
414-758-0148  
(pronouns: she or they)

***"You don't have to see the whole staircase- just take the first step." - Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.***

---

**From:** Mark Warhus <mwarhus@att.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 6, 2021 2:53:05 PM  
**To:** President McKaig  
**Subject:** Vote no on one parking space per housing unit.

I am writing to ask you not to approve the amendment related to modifications to chapter 535 zoning article IX off-street parking as it is written.

I believe the change from the current 1.75 parking spaces per multifamily unit to 1 per unit is a drastic change in zoning that will result in overcrowded, overpacked streets that will change the environment of the neighborhoods the resident of Shorewood have chosen to live in. I also question the need to make this change while the Village is about to begin the process of developing zone based building codes.

At the same time I believe it will help everyone to have the issue of multi-family unit parking settled. I suggest you modify the amendment to require 1.5 spaces per unit (this is what is done in whitefish Bay where there has been a successful increase on multi-unit housing). I believe this compromise will produce the type of development the Village is looking for while not negatively changing the environments of the surrounding neighborhoods. With luck it will also solve the problems that have been occurring with recent request for exemptions from the current zoning code.

Such a compromise would demonstrate the Board's willingness to listen to the citizens who have expressed their concerns about this issue and enable the Village to move forward without the current rancor and divisiveness that has resulted from the Planning Commission's recent decisions.

Please feel free to get back to me with any questions.

Thank you,  
Mark Warhus  
mwarhus@att.net  
4071 N. Stowell Ave.

**Mark Warhus**

**From:** [President McKaig](#)  
**To:** [Sangeeta Patel](#); [Trustee Arndorfer](#); [Trustee Baldauff](#); [Trustee Ircink](#); [Trustee Stokebrand](#); [Trustee Warren](#); [Trustee Bockhorst](#)  
**Cc:** [Rebecca Ewald](#); [Bart Griepentrog](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Zoning Change for Parking  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 7, 2021 12:29:23 PM

---

Sangeeta,

Thanks for your email, adding Tr. Bockhorst to ensure the entire Village Board is aware of your position.

Best,

Ann

Ann McCullough McKaig  
Village President  
414-758-0148  
(pronouns: she or they)

***"You don't have to see the whole staircase- just take the first step." - Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.***

---

**From:** Sangeeta Patel <emailsangeeta@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 6, 2021 2:30:57 PM  
**To:** President McKaig; Trustee Arndorfer; Trustee Baldauff; Trustee Ircink; Trustee Stokebrand; Trustee Warren  
**Cc:** Rebecca Ewald; Bart Griepentrog  
**Subject:** Zoning Change for Parking

Hello Trustees,

To the extent that you are surveying Village residents regarding the new zoning change in parking multi-family residential units from 1.75 to 1.00 parking stalls per unit, I am personally not in favor of the change. I feel that increased street parking and traffic, particularly in the business district will make the area less safe for pedestrians.

Outside of my personal opinions, I am surprised by the proposed zoning change because when I was on the Plan Commission, the developer of the new Stowell Apartment Building had stated that the industry standard was 1.5 parking stalls per unit, which had been confirmed by the Planning Director. Before making a change in parking to below industry standards, I would like to see the Village Trustees have a robust discussion of what that would practically mean for Shorewood. For example, I would like to see what nearby communities have as their parking zoning code for multi-family developments. I have heard that the Whitefish Bay Code follows the industry standard of 1.5. My understanding for the City of Milwaukee is that the zoning code fluctuates between 1 to 1.5 per unit based on the nature of the community. It would be very important to understand why certain communities have chosen 1.00, 1.50 or greater parking stalls per unit. There has been a lot of speculation in the community as to what the impact

would be if the change in zoning is made, however, I would like to see the Trustees engage in a more thoughtful discussion based on hard data of impact and comparison as to the nature of other communities that have the 1.00 parking stalls versus other zoning code options that are currently in place.

Sincerely,

Sangeeta Patel  
4232 North Lake Dr.