



**Plan Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
September 28, 2021**

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

**1. Call to order.**

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

Present via teleconference: President Ann McKaig – Chair, Trustee Tammy Bockhorst, Eric Couto, Therese Klein, Barbara Kiely Miller, Josh Pollack and Daniel Wycklendt.

Others present were Planning Director Bart Griepentrog, Village Attorney Nathan Bayer and Planning Administrative Clerk Crystal Kopydlowski.

**2. Approval of August 24 2021 meeting minutes.**

Ms. Kiely Miller moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Wycklendt. Vote to approve 7-0.

**3. Consideration of a Parking Special Exception for a proposed multi-family redevelopment at 4414 N. Oakland Ave., submitted by Acquisition Entity V, LLC (Wimmer Communities).**

**a. Overview**

Mr. Couto called a point of order regarding the composition of the Plan Commission, in particular the trustee position, and whether the trustee position had been confirmed by the Village Board.

President McKaig stated that in the future if there is a topic not on the agenda it should be submitted in writing so there can be preparation. She said meeting would proceed per the agenda as there was a quorum. Mr. Couto appealed President McKaig's ruling to move forward with the agenda.

Attorney Bayer stated there is no point of order but that if Mr. Couto would like to raise the issue of trustee appointments to the Plan Commission, he could per 155 of the Village Code and Robert's Rules. He said that if it was the belief that there was something wrong with proceeding with the meeting a motion to adjourn would be in order. Attorney Bayer said they would not address an appointment as a rule of order at the beginning of the meeting as the issue of committee appointments is far beyond a point of order. He stated a point of order addresses things like how to take votes on an item, should there be a voice vote, should there be a poll or have votes recorded in a different way etc. Attorney Bayer said his advice to the Commission was to move on with the agenda or for Mr. Couto to motion to adjourn and if a second would occur there could be discussion and a vote. President McKaig stated the meeting would move forward per the agenda.

Mr. Griepentrog introduced the item per the memo that was provided and a slide presentation.

Applicants Nick Wimmer, Mark Wimmer, John Wimmer and Dave Wimmer with Wimmer Properties were present. Nick Wimmer gave an introduction to their company

and their project. Tammi Czewski with Traffic Analysis & Design, Inc. was available also to respond to any questions.

**b. Public Hearing**

President McKaig opened public comment at 6:58 p.m.

Jennifer Essak, 2401 E. Jarvis Street, supports the project by Wimmer Properties. She feels the village is an urban community and is described as an urban community and should act like one by embracing developments that encourage less parking and use of public transportation. With less parking rents will be lower and there will be less cars.

Gene Webb, business owner at 4401 N. Oakland Avenue, said he looks forward to serving Wimmer's tenants. His customers are of the older population that need parking and his concern is the lack of parking in the area. He said that something has to be done so that this will not negatively impact the businesses. He said what is being requested is essentially a 1:1 ratio whereas past exceptions have been higher than this and said this is too much and it will cause difficulty.

Elizabeth Beeghly, 2413 E. Shorewood Blvd., said when parking is reduced it should be kept in mind what this will do to the commercial buildings and what this does down the road when so many exceptions have already been given. She suggested having public comments after the commissioner's debate not before.

Daniel Walsh, 4024 Stowell Avenue, said this is not a small exception but an exception that is 40% less than what the zoning allows. He said the zoning is what has led to what Shorewood is today. He said the proposed project is much denser and externalizes many more costs onto the immediate neighborhood. He said the Plan Commission should vote no and allow the Village Board to make the decision with greater input from the community.

Jon Krouse, 1711 E. Lake Bluff Blvd., is in favor of the development. He is in favor of the reduced parking requirements. He does not believe Shorewood can be compared to larger cities such as Portland. He said there is a move towards this direction and he is in favor of it.

Lisa Castagnozzi, business owner at 4451 N. Oakland Avenue, said any decrease in parking will affect the whole neighborhood. She said it is difficult to park already. She said she looks forward to new developments and new apartments but said one parking space per resident will affect the neighborhood, the businesses and visitors to the area.

Mark Mazzie, 1816 E. Lake Bluff Blvd., said he lives across the alley from the development. He said there is a tremendous amount of student traffic on Lake Bluff and adding parking to the north side of Lake Bluff Blvd. would narrow the street and increase the risk of accidents. President McKaig asked if the parking being referred to in the proposal is being added to a no parking area. Mr. Griepentrog said he believes Mr. Mazzie is referring to his staff comments with respect to existing on street parking in which he states that this part of Lake Bluff Blvd. is not congruent with the rest of the street. He said neither the developer or staff proposed any changes to existing parking. He said any changes to existing parking would be taken to the Village Board.

Andrea Brandt, 4054 N. Stowell Avenue, said that a deeper dive needs to be take when considering these developments and try to make some compromises between those who like the developments and those who don't. She said there is middle ground to be had. With less parking there will be more services (Amazon and take out delivery) and parking for this needs to be accounted for. She said the development is a little large for the area and perhaps it could be smaller allowing for more parking.

Bruce Hoover, 4411 N. Cramer Street, said he is thankful for this proposal and appreciates new construction and new property in Shorewood. He said there has been an uptick in traffic since Fiddleheads opened and that if there are any proposes to parking changes on Cramer he would voice his opposition. He is in support of the proposal but there should be more compromise and more parking.

Karen Desing, 3952 N. Stowell Avenue, would like the Plan Commission to be thoughtful and think about how this would affect the current tax base and the existing businesses. She said the development should not be allowed at the detriment of existing businesses and surrounding residents. She said to keep in mind that parking has an impact on the future tax base as well as the existing tax base.

Trustee Jim Arndorfer, 2524 E. Shorewood Blvd., stated that he understands wanting to keep meetings efficient but feels limiting public comment to two minutes is overly restrictive and should consider expanding that to three minutes.

Luke Delaney, 2422 E. Newton Avenue, said he supports the development in general and he has enjoyed seeing the progress in the downtown area including the increase in housing units.

Mr. Griepentrog read into the record comments received via email after the 3 p.m. Monday deadline.

Elizabeth Muslin-Wagner, 4349 N. Alpine Avenue, is against the parking special exception that does not follow the existing zoning regulation of 1.75 cars per unit. Developers should be obligated to provide sufficient parking so that residents are not further burdened with parking issues.

Desty Lorino, 4353 N. Alpine Avenue, feels the developer should be required to have two spaces per unit and anything less would create a burden on the residents. He feels it will cause traffic congestion and safety hazards. This is a major crosswalk and pedestrian safety is a concern. He said the building is a compromise and doesn't fit the master plan for new housing in the village. He said open spaces are very valuable and this is not the highest and best use.

Davida Amenta, 4400 N. Wildwood Avenue, opposes granting the parking exception for the proposed development at Lake Bluff and Oakland. She stated the first strategic direction of the Comprehensive Plan is to "ensure redevelopment on Capitol and Oakland meets community goals" and said this project does not meet community goals. She said this project does not further affordable housing goals, housing for disabled adults or housing for seniors. She said to listen to the Comprehensive Plan and initiate a broad public process to develop form-based zoning before approving yet another luxury housing project.

Emily Gallagher, no address given in email, is against the parking exception and that it should not move forward without following the zoning regulation in place of 1.75 cars per unit. She would like a development that provides adequate parking and aligns with needs and regulations.

Calli Spheeris, 4041 N. Downer Avenue, is against the parking exception that does not follow the existing zoning regulation of 1.75 cars per unit. Developers should be obligated to provide sufficient parking so residents are not further burdened with parking issues.

Elizabeth Sutherland, 4225 N. Prospect Avenue, is concerned about the cost of the apartments and that it does not meet Shorewood's goal to provide affordable housing. She said the additional street parking needed puts additional stress on the parking

situation and will adversely affect the businesses on Oakland. She supports the goals of the Housing Study and Comprehensive Plan and does not support this project.

Sam Essak, 2401 E. Jarvis Street, supports a lower parking ratio for the proposed development. He believes an exception from the current excessively high ratios is justified. High parking ratio requirements translate into higher costs for developers which translates into higher rents for tenants. High parking ratios make it harder to have affordable housing. A vote requiring more parking is a vote against affordable housing. He added that parking is bad for the environment and encourages more auto use, creates less surface area for water infiltration which contributes to flooding. It contributes to global warming with more fossil fuel burning and more concrete surfaces. He said to not dictate or regulate requirements that result in higher rents and are bad for the environment.

President McKaig closed the public comments at 7:37 p.m.

**c. Plan Commission deliberation**

Questions were asked of the applicant prior to deliberation.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked how parking will be allocated. Mr. Nick Wimmer stated each unit is allocated a space and if a tenant does not need the space it could be rented to another tenant that may need it. The optional rental of the extra space would be terminated if a future tenant would like the parking stall upon signing a lease and moving in. Ms. Kiely Miller asked if the spaces were assigned to specific tenants. Mr. Nick Wimmer stated typically yes. Ms. Kiely Miller asked where management, staff and services will park when on location. Mr. Nick Wimmer stated that after the building is leased there will be no full-time staff on site and maintenance will be likely a part-time situation. When a tenant would arrange for a service as needed, they may arrange for parking in their space if they are at work during the time. Ms. Kiely Miller asked, based on Wimmer's materials describing their previous four projects and the car ownership breakdown, how many tenants had more than one vehicle and how many had zero vehicles. Mr. Nick Wimmer stated that the majority had two vehicles but that previous developments had been in places like Menomonee Falls and Brookfield that has very low walkability. Ms. Kiely Miller asked the percentage of what units would be used for short term rentals and how many would have vehicles. Mr. Nick Wimmer said a majority of their rentals are 12-month full time rentals and he does not have a percentage for short term rentals. Ms. Kiely Miller asked how many tenants they anticipate will use public transit. Mr. Nick Wimmer stated he did not have that data. Ms. Kiely Miller asked if they will provide bike storage. Mr. Nick Wimmer stated yes and it would be underground. Ms. Kiely Miller asked for an explanation of the statement in the staff report regarding excess on-site parking during peak times and how they may be made available to residents and guests through flexible arrangements and signage for the surface level spaces. Mr. Griepentrog deferred to Wimmer Properties. Mr. Nick Wimmer said this refers to situations where tenants may be at work leaving their stalls vacant during the day allowing flexible arrangements to be made to let delivery trucks park in them at those times. Ms. Kiely Miller asked about the demographics of who would be renting the units. Mr. Nick Wimmer stated that all types of demographics of renters rent all different types of units across their portfolio. Ms. Kiely Miller mentioned the traffic study and its comparison of the number of trips to a bank versus a multi-family development. She noted that with the increase in online banking that the comparison may not be accurate. Mr. Nick Wimmer said what she was referring to was the Institute of Transportation engineer's multiplier for a drive-through bank structure based on the 17,000 square feet that occupied the existing structure with three drive-through lanes.

He said if they were going to estimate what the future project of 43 mid-rise residential units would produce in traffic, they needed to have a comparable multiplier.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked about exhibit 1 in the traffic study pertaining to the volume of traffic leaving and entering the alley and asked why the number was so low. Ms. Tammy Czewski with Traffic Analysis & Design, Inc. (TADI) explained that the exhibit is based on the Institute of Transportation engineer's national trip rates. She said they compile a lot of data in a two-hour peak period in the morning of 7 to 9 a.m. and two-hour peak period in the afternoon of 4 to 6 p.m. to see how many trips a unit would generate. She said there is a proportion for in and a proportion for out and based on the national trip rates that is the number of trips an apartment would generate. She said throughout the day that is where you get more of your ins and outs because people leave at different times. What the exhibit says is that the traffic coming in and out is very similar/even.

Mr. Pollack asked if the development seemed to pose any additional risk than any other development of similar size. Ms. Czewski said they did do a safety analysis for the intersection and the number of trips for this particular development are low in the peak hour. She said if the development were anything else such as a bank or retail then the trip generation would be higher and so that would create more impact on traffic in the area. This is a low trip generating development and did not affect traffic operations. Mr. Griepentrog said in his time with the village he has not received any complaints on traffic related to multi-family developments.

At this time the Commissioners reviewed factors one through thirteen.

Factor #1: The effect the granting of the exception will have on adjacent parking and traffic conditions.

President McKaig said this factor does apply.

Ms. Kiely Miller said residents in the area with garages and driveways still need street parking for contractors/guests. She said parking and traffic conditions are a concern expressed by small business owners.

Ms. Klein acknowledged that what the proposal has brought forward addresses the concern and they have heard from a number of residents that are fine with the development and the traffic it will bring to the area. She said looking at the bigger picture of the development, the tax base, being progressive and creating space for people to use alternative forms of transportation and that change has an impact but it does not degrade what the village has today.

Mr. Couto said any development will have an impact and they have heard from local small business owners and residents who all oppose this development because of the parking exception and the increased traffic to the area. He has not seen any commitment from the county or the state for increased transportation funding. He has seen cuts to this funding each year. He said this will have a negative impact to parking.

Ms. Klein stated the amount of traffic increase is a perception and they are to consider the parking exception.

Ms. Kiely Miller said the factor addresses the effect on adjacent parking and traffic so they must consider traffic too.

Mr. Nick Wimmer added that a residential redevelopment at this site would likely have the lowest impact on traffic versus a commercial retail/bank or medical office type of property.

Mr. Pollack said when they are considering this exception they are in terms of what is good for the community and this particular development but added he is also considering alternatives and what would be better than this. He said for factor one this would be fairly benign impact.

Trustee Bockhorst concurred with Mr. Pollack. She said to consider if the development would have to build parking to meet code that would bring even more cars on the street.

President McKaig said parking is a dynamic thing and not a static 1:1. She said there could be a zero impact because there has been no indication that tenants will have more than one car. She said it is possible all the cars will park on site. She said that Milwaukee County has confirmed that the two bus lines in Shorewood have the highest levels of service, have not been reduced and are a priority. She said there was a state cut to funding but at the ICC meeting the intergovernmental relations representative from the county reported they were able to recover nearly all those funding cuts via alternative revenues, spending and federal dollars. She said that is a good thing for this year and it shows there is a high commitment to public transportation.

Ms. Kiely Miller said it is important to acknowledge that the developers are before them tonight because the Village Board did not approve a reduction to the parking code from the current 1.75 spaces per unit for multi-family buildings. She said the parking exception for Catalyst Partners is under appeal and will not be heard until October 5<sup>th</sup>. She said there is no way to predict how these decisions will pan out. President McKaig added this body recommended the parking modifications with a vote of 5 to 2.

Trustee Bockhorst said the current existing bank site had a deficit of 27 parking spaces. Mr. Nick Wimmer said if they were proposing another bank at the site they would not be before the commission. They are before the commission because of the change in use. He said the residential use is a much lower traffic and parking impact than a bank.

Mr. Wycklendt said he has expressed frustration with all the parking exceptions before them but if this was a proposal for a restaurant there would be enough parking and perhaps a much bigger impact on the neighborhood. He said the site has been a blight and it is exciting having something in front of them to solve that problem. He asked does the good outweigh the bad with this proposal.

Factor #2: The effect the granting of the exception will have on the appearance and character of the applicant's property, adjacent property and neighboring property.

Mr. Wycklendt said this will improve the appearance.

Ms. Kiely Miller said she likes the townhouse appearance. She said if all setbacks are met there may only be 11 to 12 feet from the south facing apartment at the north and the new building and this could take away sunlight. She said at the rear there could be balconies looking into windows. She said the building will be large and a dramatic

change for that neighborhood. She liked the materials and felt it was well done. Mr. Nick Wimmer stated the building height and setbacks comply with all current zoning requirements.

Mr. Pollack said the proposed building looks nice and will have a positive impact on the character of the applicant's property and the surrounding properties.

Mr. Couto said it is a great looking building and a nice-looking property.

Trustee Bockhorst said this is an enhancement and a drastic improvement.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked if there was an opportunity for solar panels or permeable surfaces in the parking lot. Mr. Nick Wimmer said at this stage those items have not been explored

Factor #3: The effect the granting of the exception will have on the property values of the applicant's property, adjacent property and neighboring property.

Mr. Couto said the new building will look better but asked if there was any way to get some expertise on the ramifications to the area regarding real estate values. President McKaig said those details were included in the application.

Mr. Wycklendt said the applicant's property will be worth significantly more and this could potentially help out surrounding properties also. Mr. Nick Wimmer said the Moegenburg Research study included with the application addressed this question. They used the Mosaic property as a similar property with a similar parking scenario and found that surrounding properties increased in values after the building was completed.

Mr. Griepentrog reached out to the village contracted assessor with this question and whether the exception and more cars would affect values. They stated no it would not but would have to confirm that by reviewing sales data.

Ms. Kiely Miller thought the question had more to do with if the multi-family building would affect the values of single-family homes. President McKaig clarified that it has to do with granting the parking exception not the development. Ms. Kiely Miller said it was difficult to compare a six-story building with a parking structure to this four-story building and is not sure how helpful the findings are. President McKaig asked if she was rejecting the data in the application. Ms. Kiely Miller said yes.

Attorney Bayer stated all the factors relate to the parking only and not the underlying development as a whole.

President McKaig stated she did not feel the parking exception would affect property values.

Factor #4: Whether the granting of the exception will serve a public or desirable or useful purpose.

Ms. Kiely Miller said expansion of luxury housing is not a village goal. The development will not provide more families to our school district based on the applicant's calculations and this does not meet the goal of family friendly housing. This development does not meet the goal of affordable housing. She said they cannot predict what a post pandemic

village will look like and what this will look like for the customer base and traffic and parking for those who need or want to work at home. She said tenants in multi-family buildings have struggled to find parking and why would we ok a building to add to that. She said that how people live now has to be respected. She struggled to find the public benefit.

President McKaig said the public benefit is an increased customer base for the market area and increased tax base.

Ms. Klein said they are deliberating on granting an exception for parking before they know anything about the building. She stated she was trying to understand the useful purpose of a parking exception and whether that brings in new development versus the impact on the people that live, own businesses and shop locally. She asked about their role and whether they are to decide if the development is right for the village or if the parking exception is right for the village. Attorney Bayer stated it was the later. Mr. Griepentrog added that all thirteen factors may not all be applicable. Attorney Bayer said to keep in mind that 535-51B and the criteria are overarching set of criteria that can apply to anyone applying for a special exception for any of the parking regulations.

Ms. Kiely Miller asked Ms. Klein if she was referring to the Stowell decision could be denied or that the Village Board may decide that the appropriate parking rate is different when she said a lot could change after making this decision. Ms. Klein said she was referring to the development as a whole could change after they make this decision. Ms. Kiely Miller said Attorney Bayer was saying that granting this parking exception which allows higher density creates the potential for excessive traffic and parking problems whereas if they could meet the current code or some compromised level that maybe they wouldn't have to worry about some of these things and it wouldn't be an issue. Attorney Bayer clarified that that is not what he is saying. He said his point was that if all the parking could be on site it otherwise meets the existing zoning. He said if they had 75 spaces and filled all 75 spaces the issues with traffic would exist either way. He said the gap between what they have on site and what potentially could be parking on the street is the impact to be discussed. Ms. Kiely Miller said this was the main concern of the small business owners.

Mr. Wycklendt said it is important to discuss what is going there and what alternatives could be in the space. He said that granting this exception could have less of an impact on the community than some other use that could go there.

Trustee Bockhorst said this has a desired public benefit which is partly why they voted to recommend a decrease to the code requirement.

Factor #5: Whether the spirit and intent of the requirements of this article are being carried out.

Attorney Bayer says the article being referred to is Article Nine Off-Street Parking which begins at 535-45 and runs through 535-51. He said this encompasses the overarching regulation of parking as found between 535-41 and 535-51 of Article Nine Off-Street Parking of Chapter 535. Mr. Griepentrog said spirit and intent is a personal interpretation of the code and is left to the discretion of the commissioners. He said they are requesting an exception to the ratio and the enclosed parking.

Ms. Kiely Miller said she has no problem with the applicant not meeting the enclosed factor because the 14 spaces that are not enclosed will be on the private property.

Factor #6: Recommendations of any boards or committees to which the Plan Commission refers the application for advice.

President McKaig stated this factor refers to the application that is before the Commission and was not applicable.

Factor #7: Intensity of use, deviation from typical use classifications, access to transit, and physical constraints to meeting parking requirements.

Attorney Bayer said this would be more applicable if the applicant was seeking a special exception relating to a parking regulation that could not be met because of a non-conforming property. He said this was not applicable with the exception before them. Mr. Griepentrog said the applicant is not requesting an exception based on a physical constraint. He said the other three things (intensity of use, deviation from use classification, and access to transit) are straight forward.

Ms. Kiely Miller said based on other multi-family developments this development will have an increase in density and intensity of use.

Factor #8: If senior housing is proposed, the number of employees on site, the type of senior housing, the parking needs of the residents, if any, and the ratios from the Institute of Transportation Engineers parking generation report ratios for senior housing should be reviewed.

President McKaig stated this is not applicable.

Factor #9: Historical conditions and whether additional parking requirements for new or expanded use may be satisfied with incremental increase commensurate with new or expanded use.

Attorney Bayer said that with this being a tear down and rebuild they are not looking at a property with a new or expanded use and the property is not being converted. He said they could discuss that the space used to be a bank and that it will be torn down and new construction. He said the construction as is meets all other zoning.

Factor #10: Evidence that actual parking demands may be less than code requirements.

Ms. Kiely Miller stated she was not convinced that actual parking demands are less than the 1.75 requirement. She said Shorewood is a bedroom community and that most people work outside of the village and need vehicles. She hasn't been convinced with the climate and the infrastructure we have for mass transit that the parking demand will be less.

President McKaig said that with a functional .34 parking ratio in the Village and all the vintage buildings that were built without parking that is good evidence as it has been in play for a while. She also added that one of the good things about Shorewood is that it allows for families that live in two homes to live closely together. She said cars that had been parked at one residence now could be split between two locations.

Factor #11: Availability of shared parking, including satisfactory documentation of shared parking to satisfy the parking demand.

Mr. Griepentrog stated the applicant has shared no agreement so this is not applicable. Attorney Bayer agrees.

Ms. Kiely Miller said several past exceptions for multi-family developments have benefited from parking structures and that is not available here. She said there is little opportunity for shared parking and with the property not having a structure they can take advantage of that is a negative. President McKaig said The Oaks has a parking exception and they have no shared options and are making it work and not exceeding demand.

Factor #12: Alternative transportation that has been reasonably shown to reduce the need for parking.

Attorney Bayer said this is straight forward and is asking if there is any evidence of public transportation that will alleviate parking.

Trustee Bockhorst said there is a bus stop right out front. These routes have the highest levels of usage. She said there are options in the area and hard to say they do not exist.

Ms. Kiely Miller said this works great if one works downtown but a lot of people do not work downtown. Some work in areas without bus lines and it is difficult to decide based on assumptions. She said that the village has a bus line and that is it and it may not work for everyone.

Mr. Couto said that the comments from business owners suggest this is going to be an issue and parking will be a continued issue. He said for him this is an issue.

Trustee Bockhorst said there are plenty of professionals that take public transportation. She said there are many routes and ride share options also. She said if someone needs a parking space and they will be paying for a luxury apartment and the building doesn't provide that they may not rent there. They cannot assume one size fits all and that all the tenants will need parking. She said they are tasked with determining if there are alternative transportation options and it has been determined that there are.

President McKaig said the application included information on all the alternative options as well.

Factor #13: Such other matters as the Plan Commission deems relevant and material.

Ms. Kiely Miller stated she has concerns regarding the impact to surrounding small businesses and the safety of children walking to and from school. She said there is a great appetite to meet on common ground and have thoughtful development that increases housing but does not put undue burden on small business owners. She would like the developer to come back and adjust their proposal to make this work and be more palatable and lower the detrimental effects. President McKaig said that sounds reasonable but feels that Ms. Kiely Miller is putting out an option that is not viable for the Commission. She asked if what Ms. Kiely Miller is proposing is an option. Attorney Bayer said there is a request for a parking special exception and their options are either

to approve or deny it. He said contingencies could be placed on the granting that are relevant to the parking issue. He said it was beyond the jurisdiction of the body to tell the developer to come back with a new proposal. Mr. Griepentrog said per code 535-51D it states the *"the Plan Commission shall either approve or disapprove the application for a special exception hereunder, in accordance with the provisions of this article, shall specify the requirement or requirements that will be expected from the application and shall find that the special exception is not inconsistent with the applicable provisions herein"*.

Mr. Mark Wimmer stated their application speaks for itself. He said they have a track record of products that meets a market need. He said data provided in terms of what the demographics and parking demand typically are for this type of project are from case studies of their recent developments in suburban areas. He said they sited that only 25% of the demographic have two cars and that is in suburban areas that do not have the walkability, essential services Shorewood has. He said this is a reflection of the change in how society interacts with its environment. He said this site will likely have the lowest parking demand of all their developments. He said the regulations from 1960's does not make sense today. He said this project will have the lowest impact with the greatest benefit. He said they are not requesting TIFF money and will not be asking for TIFF money. They are coming forth with a market rate project that they are investing in.

Trustee Bockhorst said the Village's land use policy are in line with Milwaukee. She said that adding 42 units and 42 people at a minimum with disposable income will not have a detrimental impact on businesses. She said dilapidated vacant buildings increase crime and having an active street is an opportunity to increase safety. She said the parking exception relates directly to the Village's Vision 2025 Plan in that the village will be a vibrant urban community.

Ms. Kiely Miller moved to postpone the vote on the parking special exception until the Village Board decided on the code (ratio) change. Seconded by Mr. Couto.

Trustee Bockhorst argued against this. She said 5 of the 7 of them voted to recommend lowering the ratio from 1.75 to 1 in the past. She said no to deferring. She said part of serving is making difficult decisions based on facts, information, input from the public and professional staff.

Mr. Wycklendt is frustrated by this motion. Their job is to make a decision. They punted the last time to allow for more public comment but it is important to make a decision tonight.

Mr. Couto said he has the longest history of frustration with the Village Board not taking this issue up. The fact they are being asked to decide on another special exception with the Village Board having taken it up but failing is frustrating. He wishes the Village Board would figure this out so that these do not come before them anymore. He is voting for the delay because he is sick of the procedure.

Ms. Kiely Miller doesn't mind deferring this and have heard from enough residents to get an idea of what the community wants which is thoughtful development with no more cars on the street. She said if the Village Board is going to address this in the near future the item should be deferred.

Ms. Klein agrees with Mr. Wycklendt and that this proposal is in line with the number they recommended to the Village Board and would like to vote on the exception tonight.

A roll call vote was taken: Mr. Wycklendt – No, Mr. Pollack – No, Ms. Klein – No, Ms. Kiely Miller – Yes, Mr. Couto – Yes, Trustee Bockhorst – No and President McKaig – No. Motion fails 5-2.

Ms. Klein moved to approve the parking special exception for proposed multi-family redevelopment at 4414 N. Oakland Avenue, submitted by Acquisition Entity V, LLC, based on meeting the conditions stated in 535-51B. Seconded by Mr. Pollack. Mr. Griepentrog suggested an amendment to the motion to specify the requirement that will be expected from the application. The parking special exception would call for 44 parking spaces with 14 of which would not be enclosed. Attorney Bayer agrees. Ms. Klein and Mr. Pollack accepted the amendment.

Ms. Kopydlowski read the motion back as follows. Ms. Klein moved to approve the parking special exception for proposed multi-family redevelopment at 4414 N. Oakland Avenue, submitted by Acquisition Entity V, LLC, based on meeting the conditions stated in 535-51B with 44 spaces on site and 14 of those spaces not enclosed.

A roll call vote was taken: Ms. Kiely Miller – No, Ms. Klein - Yes, Mr. Couto - No, Mr. Pollack - Yes, Trustee Bockhorst – Yes, Mr. Wycklendt - Yes, President McKaig – Yes. Vote to approve 5-2.

**4. Future agenda items.**

Mr. Griepentrog stated there are currently two conditional use applications for the October meeting.

**5. Adjournment.**

Ms. Kiely Miller moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:49 p.m., seconded by Mr. Pollack.

Vote to adjourn 7-0.

Recorded by,



Crystal Kopydlowski  
Planning Department Administrative Clerk