

VILLAGE OF GRAFTON

PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 23, 2016

*Amended

The Plan Commission meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Jim Brunnuell. The Pledge of Allegiance followed.

Plan Commissioners present: Village President Jim Brunnuell, Alan Kletti, Carl Harms, Amy Plato, Randy Silasiri, Mark Paschke, and Trustee David Liss

Officials/Staff present: Village Administrator Darrell Hofland, Director of Planning and Development Jessica Wolff, and Administrative Secretary Deborah A Brown

Others present: Town of Grafton Plan Commissioner Bob Wolf, Sendik's representative Greg Devorkin, Vandewalle & Associates representatives Jackie Mich and Michael Slavney, News Graphic Reporter Melanie Boyung, and other citizens of the Community

MINUTES

Motion by Commissioner Silasiri, seconded by Commissioner Harms to approve the January 26, 2015 Plan Commission meeting minutes as presented. Motion carried.

HEAR PERSONS REQUESTING TO BE HEARD

None

Review and consideration of the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2015-2020

Director of Planning and Development Jessica Wolff gave a background on what the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) encompasses. She stated that it is intended to bring together the public and private sectors to develop a strategic plan to diversify and strengthen regional economies. A CEDS also identifies potential economic development projects, including a new business park for the Village. She also explained that it allows the region to review the key economic clusters or strong points for the next five years. Unfortunately, Ozaukee County in general does not qualify for Federal funding because the County does not have any communities that meet the unemployment rates or meet the economic distress criteria.

There were no comments or concerns by the Plan Commission.

Motion by Commissioner Harms, seconded by Trustee Liss to recommend the Village Board adopt a resolution endorsing the Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2015-2020
Motion carried.

Discussion of a Zoning Ordinance text amendment regarding outdoor display area in the C-2 Community Business District

Director Wolff then reviewed the draft of the proposed text changes related to outdoor displays that now would separate into two categories: General merchandise and Seasonal merchandise for the proposed amendment of the outdoor display area in the C-2 Community Business District. She stated that the proposed new text is drafted now with double underlined. She then reviewed the draft with the Commission members. The changes and additions were as follows:

- a. Standards:
 - i. Shall not require Plan Commission site plan review.
 - ii. Shall be located within 15 feet of the main customer entrance. *(Note: Currently 10 feet.)*
 - iii. Shall occupy no more than 60 square feet and shall not exceed six feet high. *(Note: Currently 180 cubic feet.)*
 - iv. With the exception of firewood, General Display of Merchandise and Seasonal Display of Merchandise may not occur simultaneously for a business.
Totally new text for the Seasonal Display Category for review as follows:
 2. Seasonal Display of Merchandise
 - a. Definition: Decorative point-of-purchase displays for seasonal organic (i.e., not man-made) materials having a seasonal theme or orientation such as plants, pumpkins, wreaths, and holiday decorations but excluding organic materials in bags (e.g., garden soil, salt, sand).
 - b. Standards:
 - i. Shall require Plan Commission site plan review. If approved, the conditions of approval shall include a schedule for when seasonal displays will be set up and removed.
 - ii. Shall be located within 15 feet of the main customer entrance.
 - iii. Shall occupy no more than 30 linear feet of store frontage and shall not exceed six feet high.
 - iv. Merchandise shall be attractively displayed. No pallets are allowed.
 - v. Any such display shall be neatly stacked and maintained at all times with no signage or advertisement other than a sign indicating the price and item at a size no more than two square feet. Unmaintained or unorganized areas shall be deemed in violation of this section and subject to possible penalty.
 - vi. Shall not block vehicular or pedestrian ingress and egress including entrances and/or exits to a site or building.
 - vii. All outdoor display areas are subject to the review and approval of the Director of Planning and Development based on, but not limited to, criteria such as aesthetic appeal, relationship to the architecture of the primary structure, general placement/location, traffic and safety issues, operational aspects, and maintenance.
 - viii. With the exception of firewood, General Display of Merchandise and Seasonal Display of Merchandise may not occur simultaneously for a business.
 3. Temporary Outdoor Sales Operation. Activities defined as General Display of Merchandise and Seasonal Display or Merchandise shall not be considered a Temporary Outdoor Sales Operation. See Section 19.03.0804 (A) for Temporary Outdoor Sales Operation regulations.

At this time Chair Brunnquell asked Sendik's representative Greg Devorkin to add his comments or concerns on the draft of the ordinance by the Planning staff.

Mr. Devorkin stated that Sendik's had taken over a vacant building located at 2195 Frist Avenue back in 2005. He explained that Sendik's took a risk because this location was not off the I-43 corridor. They currently have 12 locations in the Milwaukee and surrounding counties. They are considered a local grocery store and have been in direct *competition with some of the largest grocery chains in the country. In the last 11 years, Sendik's has no complaints regarding their store appearances or displays. However, in October of 2015, Sendik's received correspondence from the Village of Grafton regarding their outdoor displays. Sendik's then met with the Village and discussed their outdoor displays and how they have always worked with the other municipalities without any problems. He stated further that out of 18 municipalities, only the Village of Grafton had issue with their displays.

He noted the importance of these outdoor displays because their customers identify with a certain shopping experience that has been very successful in competing with the larger grocery stores such as Meijer, Costco, and the Pick 'n Save here in Grafton.

Commission held a discussion on the drafted text and asked Mr. Devorkin what his thoughts were on the drafted document.

Chair Brunnquell wanted to understand what Sendik's was looking for in particular and what out of the new proposed draft from the Village Planning Staff that he would have concerns or issues with. He also stated that the Village takes this matter very seriously and wants to come to a conclusion that is reasonable for all of the businesses in the C-2 Community Business District.

Mr. Devorkin replied that they have issue with the 30 linear feet of store frontage. They need at least 70 feet but were asking for 100 feet. They also have some concerns on the wording of "no pallets" being allowed in the seasonal outdoor display. Mr. Devorkin used the example of pumpkins in the fall are put in boxes and then put on pallets.

Commissioner Harms was very sympathetic with Sendik's and their location. He believes that their store's outdoor displays look good and are very inviting. Commissioner Kletti asked what other communities are doing in regards to Sendik's displays. Mr. Devorkin replied that they work on a percentage of the store frontages.

Commissioner Silasiri added that looking at the percentage of store frontages has to balance out with the enforcement by staff. Director Wolff stated further that we could look at percentage method and remembering that all seasonal outdoor storage would require them to come into the Village and submit a site plan and have the Plan Commission review and approve it. The site plan would give staff and the Commission a gauge to the monitoring of the displays.

It was then the consensus of the Commission members to have Staff look into what the percentage method would look like with some of the store frontages in the C-2 district

and come back to the Plan Commission with those results and see if there would be some consistency with that method.

Extraterritorial Review

A. Interim Amendment to the Town of Grafton Comprehensive Plan 2035

Director Wolff then reviewed with the Commission the Town of Grafton's decision to go ahead with an interim amendment to the Town of Grafton Comprehensive Plan: 2035. She further explained that the change was to change the residential area east of I-43 to the west of Lakeshore Road to the R-2 District as previously shown on the Future Land Use Map. This would reduce density from R1 to R2.

Commission accepted the extraterritorial review.

Comprehensive Plan update

Director Wolff stated that the Village has now started their kick off meeting on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. She noted that the State Statutes require that all communities prepare a Public Participation Plan at the onset of all Comprehensive Plan projects outlining the procedures to be used to foster public participation throughout the process. The Public Participation Plan will be reviewed by the Plan Commission and adopted by the Village Board.

She further noted that Vandewalle & Associates were hired to assist the Village with this project. Vandewalle staff met this afternoon with the Village staff to learn about key community issues and discuss goals for the Plan Amendment process. She stated further that Village staff led the consultant on a tour of the Port Washington Road study area and key sites related to the multi-family housing policy question. She then introduced the Vandewalle & Associates Staff. Jackie Mich and Michael Slavney from Vandewalle & Associates were present to discuss key issues and concerns, describe stakeholder involvement opportunities, and review the project purpose and timeline.

Ms. Jackie Mich stated that Vandewalle & Associates were very excited to work with the Village of Grafton on their Comprehensive Plan review process. She then reviewed with the Commission several key issues and defined the project purpose and timeline. She stated that some of the significant areas that the Village should be reviewing are the evaluation of housing mix which has more or less been fairly stable, and Port Washington Road corridor plan to name a few. She also noted that the Village will be addressing the stakeholders' involvement which includes: Public Participation Plan, Key land use issues, and also holding focus groups and community workshops. They will also be looking at trends such as population and demographics. She also mentioned that population projections would be a key as the rate has grown over a period of time from 1999 to 2014 and to present rate. Questions can be answered for the need of more housing, household size changes and age changes in the Community. She noted that the housing characteristic is high at 67.7 percent and housing affordability will be reviewed more closely. The American Community Survey statistics showed more than a third of Grafton renters spend more than 30 percent of their income toward rent.

Ms. Mich also noted the mixed use housing types that shifted since 2000. She stated that 67 percent are single family, 28 percent are multi-family and 3.69 percent are two family. The information obtained from American Community Survey shows those numbers have changed very little in the past 15 years. Also noting that the education rating was that most Village of Grafton residents have high school diplomas and many have graduate degrees. She stated that half the people in Grafton work in Ozaukee County and half the people commute to Milwaukee and surrounding suburbs. She also stated that in the Village of Grafton, there are 26 percent of residents in the field of Education and Health services, and about 19 percent of manufacturing fields.

The Commission then reviewed the results of the recent kick off questionnaire for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Mike Slavney gave some background on working with the Village of Grafton. He stated that Vandewalle has worked with the Village 15 years and is looking forward to working with the Village on some of the key issues of reviewing and moving forward with some changes in the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that one of the review items will be amending the Planned Land Use Map and its categories. He would want the new map to be changed to "Future" Land Use Map and have the Village's map tailored to Grafton's specific needs. He further noted that the County Wide Map uses limited number of colors and does not define the zoning districts as well. Grafton needs a color for mixed use without a pattern. The future land use map is too blunt an instrument to be a good guide for the future development.

He then reviewed the answers from the recent questionnaire that was sent out to Village Board members, Plan Commission members, and Department Heads. He was very happy with the great responses received back on the survey. The positive development responses were the Lumberyard project, Meijer Store and the Village Pointe Commons project. The overall support was for the Downtown development including higher density apartments with some commercial retail on first floors in the Downtown area. There was also strong support for the office development along Port Washington Road. As far as increase in Industrial/Business Park, the support was lukewarm. Commercial Development was favored along Port Washington Road with a definite hold on "Big Box" type developments. There was also positive interest in Port Washington Road, north of Arrowhead Road for multi-family. There was also high interest (about 70 percent of responses) in re-evaluating the Village's current policy on the drive through restaurant facilities along the I-43 corridor.

Mr. Salvney also had noticed the interest in multi-family development in the downtown districts, Hickory Street, and Wisconsin Avenue and Chateau areas as well. However, there was some opposition for affordable housing in the Village. The Port Washington Road corridor sparked interest in Lifestyle—retail similar to a smaller scale Bayshore Mall feel and including office, shopping, sit-down restaurants, family-oriented businesses, hotel, business parks. He further noted that there was interest in hotels near I-43 and Arrowhead Road and also Falls Road. He also explained that there was general support for further commercial development, with a lot of concerns about the types of commercial uses and trying to maintain a high quality of standards in Village's commercial development. Mr. Salvney then handed out some newer planned neighborhood concepts which offer a little more flexibility to zoning by incorporating a variety of unit types within a single zoning district. He explained further that by having

different zones, i.e. single family, multi-family or two family, it would require going through zoning amendments every time a new project comes through planning; a planned neighborhood zoning would allow for multiple unit types. This way an applicant would not have to amend the land use map every time, but would have more control over the overall mix. He further noted that these type of developments are more interesting and have a variety of people living in them.

The Commission held a brief discussion on the housing results along with current rent rates in the County as well as the Village. The Commission as a whole agreed that Saukville and Cedarburg should be added in the municipal mix of results. Chair Brunnuell expressed his interest in the planned neighborhood zoning and stated that the Village has looked at that kind of development. He stated that this type of concept offers great insight into the future of the Village. He further expressed the interest in obtaining more rent comparisons in the surrounding communities and at least a three year running survey.

Chair Brunnuell also asked if the public had any comments or questions.

A resident from Cedarburg, Tony Polston asked if the multi-family would include rentals and condos. He was looking at possible 3+ units and above multi-family development.

Mr. Slavney responded by stating that the condos could be included in the mix but it would depend on need at the time the development is presented.

In closing, the Commission reviewed the timetable and the next steps in the process. In April 2016, Ms. Mich stated that there will be a draft plan amendment for Plan Commission to review. In May there will be interviews and focus groups involvement. In June, some Community workshops will be held, and then coming back to Plan Commission sometime in June to wrap up all the information and data collected for review.

Chair Brunnuell thanked the consultants for their efforts and look forward to further review on all the data collected in the next couple months.

Review and consideration of a recommendation to the Village Board for the Public Participation Plan for the Comprehensive Plan update

Motion by Commissioner Harms, seconded by Commissioner Paschke to recommend Village Board adoption of the Public Participation Plan for the Comprehensive Plan update. Motion carried.

Old/New Business

None

ADJOURN

Motion by Commissioner Kletti, seconded by Commissioner Paschke to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m. Motion carried.