

REPORT OF CITY PLAN COMMISSION

October 2, 2017 – 6:00 PM

Lincoln Center, Multi-Purpose Room – 1519 Water Street, Stevens Point, WI 54481

PRESENT: Mayor Wiza, Alderperson Kneebone, Commissioner Brush, Commissioner Haines, Commissioner Hoppe, Commissioner Curless, and Commissioner Cooper.

ALSO PRESENT: Director Ostrowski, Associate Planner Kearns, City Attorney Beveridge, Comptroller / Treasurer Ladick, Alderperson Jennings, Alderperson Shorr, Alderperson Nebel, Alderperson Oberstadt, Alderperson Johnson, Alderperson McComb, Alderperson Phillips, Alderperson Morrow, Brandi Makuski, Dave Schwobe, Al Mallek, Cassie Lennex, Jami Gebert, Rusty Mitch, Mary Ann Laszewski, Jerry Walters, Ed Swedowski, and Camille Swedowski.

INDEX:

1. Roll call.

Discussion and possible action on the following:

2. Report of the September 5, 2017 meeting
 3. **Public Hearing and Action** on a request from James Shuda to rezone two unaddressed properties south of Northpoint Drive between Forest Street and Georgia Street (Parcel ID's 281240830100264 & 281240830100202) from R-2 Single Family Residence District to R-3 Single and Two-Family Residence District.
 4. **Public Hearing and Action** on a request from James Shuda to rezone three properties south of John's Drive between Georgia Street and Frederick Street (Parcel ID's 281240830100139, 281240830100138 & 281240830100137) from R-2 Single Family Residence District to R-4 Multiple Family 1 Residence District.
 5. **Public Hearing and Action** on a request from the City of Stevens Point to Amend Chapter 23, Zoning Code, of the Revised Municipal Code, specifically Section 23.02(3), Industrial Districts, to permit a setback reduction for properties bounded by two or more streets in the M-1 & M-2 districts via a conditional use permit.
 6. **Public Hearing and Action** on a request from Altmann Construction for a conditional use permit to reduce the street setback of one street frontage at 3201 Business Park Drive (Parcel ID 281230802100009).
 7. Request from the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point to purchase 101 Georgia Street (Parcel ID 281240830400103).
 8. Request from the City of Stevens Point to purchase three properties: 1466 Water Street (281240832201931), 0 Water Street (281240832201912), and 924 Arlington Place (Parcel ID 281240832201911) for the preservation of property for a future city hall.
 9. Community Development department monthly report for September 2017
 10. Director's Update
 11. Adjourn
-

1. Roll call.

Present: Wiza, Kneebone, Brush, Cooper, Curless, Haines, Hoppe

Mayor Wiza stated that agenda items 3 and 4 had been withdrawn by the applicant.

Discussion and possible action on the following:

2. Report of the September 5, 2017 meeting

Motion by Commissioner Cooper to approve the report of the September 5, 2017 Plan Commission meeting; seconded by Commissioner Haines.

Motion carried 7-0.

3. **Public Hearing and Action** on a request from James Shuda to rezone two unaddressed properties south of Northpoint Drive between Forest Street and Georgia Street (Parcel ID's 281240830100264 & 281240830100202) from R-2 Single Family Residence District to R-3 Single and Two-Family Residence District.

Agenda Item 3 was withdrawn by the applicant.

4. **Public Hearing and Action** on a request from James Shuda to rezone three properties south of John's Drive between Georgia Street and Frederick Street (Parcel ID's 281240830100139, 281240830100138 & 281240830100137) from R-2 Single Family Residence District to R-4 Multiple Family 1 Residence District.

Agenda Item 4 was withdrawn by the applicant.

5. **Public Hearing and Action** on a request from the City of Stevens Point to Amend Chapter 23, Zoning Code, of the Revised Municipal Code, specifically Section 23.02(3), Industrial Districts, to permit a setback reduction for properties bounded by two or more streets in the M-1 & M-2 districts via a conditional use permit.

Director Ostrowski briefly explained that the current M1 district allowed for a reduced street setback if the property was bounded by three or more streets, but it was not allowed in the M-2 district. This restriction made it challenging for some properties that were bounded by two or more streets when attempting to place a building on the lot in order to meet all street yard setbacks. Therefore, they were looking to modify the Zoning Code to allow the Plan Commission and Common Council to grant a reduction in street yard setbacks to no less than 20 feet per property in the M-1 and M-2 districts, as the M-1 district currently allowed a reduced setback of 30 feet, and the M-2 district called for 40 feet. Staff recommended approval and noted that the next agenda item up for consideration would be related.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing open.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing closed.

Commissioner Hoppe asked whether it would still be considered conditional use, to which it was confirmed that it would be.

Motion by Commissioner Hoppe approve the request from the City of Stevens Point to Amend Chapter 23, Zoning Code, of the Revised Municipal Code, specifically Section 23.02(3), Industrial Districts, to permit a setback reduction to 20 feet for properties bounded by two or more streets in the M-1 & M-2 districts via a conditional use permit; seconded by Commissioner Haines.

Motion carried 7-0.

6. **Public Hearing and Action** on a request from Altmann Construction for a conditional use permit to reduce the street setback of one street frontage at 3201 Business Park Drive (Parcel ID 281230802100009).

Director Ostrowski explained the request to allow a reduction to one of the street yard setbacks off Clem's Way in regards to Portesi's 4,188 square foot addition to the north side of their existing building. While the site plan provided indicated a 41-foot setback, he noted that it was taken from the middle of the street, not the property, and that the setback would be 20 feet on the north end of the property. The project would also need to meet the Portage County Business Park covenant restrictions. Staff recommended approval for the Conditional Use Permit to be granted.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing open.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing closed.

Commissioner Haines asked whether one of the handouts was related to the request, to which it was confirmed by Director Ostrowski that the landscaping plan was related to the Portesi addition, and that it would be reviewed to make sure all Zoning Code regulations were met.

Mayor Wiza commended Portesi's success and expansion.

Motion by Commissioner Cooper to approve the request from Altmann Construction for a conditional use permit to reduce the street setback of one street frontage at 3201 Business Park Drive (Parcel ID 281230802100009) with the following conditions:

1. **One street yard setback may be reduced to 20 feet.**
2. **A landscaping plan shall be submitted for review and approval by the Community Development Department.**
3. **A stormwater plan shall be submitted and reviewed/approved by the Public Works and Utilities Department.**
4. **A refuse enclosure provided shall complement the materials used on the main building and be screened with landscaping. Details shall be submitted regarding the refuse storage to be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Department.**
5. **Minor modifications to the plan may be approved by staff.**

seconded by Commissioner Curless.

Motion carried 7-0.

7. Request from the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point to purchase 101 Georgia Street (Parcel ID 281240830400103).

Director Ostrowski briefly explained that the requested property to be purchased by the Redevelopment Authority was on the southeast corner of Maria Drive and Georgia Street. The property had been subject to multiple orders by the City, with the owner since vacating the property and also showing willingness to deed the property over to the Redevelopment Authority. Minimal charges would be associated with the transfer in regards to taxes and some additional fees. If the property were to be acquired, the Redevelopment Authority would proceed with razing the buildings on the property and putting the lot up for purchase with

the intention of selling the lot for an appropriate use within that zoning district such as a single family home. This would be in line with one of the Authority's redevelopment programs to purchase dilapidated structures or properties within the city, demolishing the structures, and selling it for another permitted use. Staff recommended approval of the request.

Mayor Wiza explained that the request was before the commissioners due to State Statute requirements that the Plan Commission provide a recommendation for any property or building purchase.

Director Ostrowski noted that the estimated cost to raze the structure would be approximately \$12,000, with the land value being approximately \$13,000.

Mayor Wiza added that redevelopment was a priority for the City Council, and that they would be looking into additional related programs in the following year.

Commissioner Haines asked what could fit on the property according to its zoning, to which Director Ostrowski explained that it could be used for a single family structure, noting that it was too small to accommodate a duplex.

Commissioner Haines stated for clarification that the purpose would be to sell the lot and build a new home, to which Director Ostrowski confirmed that the ultimate goal would be redevelopment and having a new single family structure go up.

Commissioner Curless questioned whether they would end up acquiring it without purchasing it if the owner didn't pay their taxes, to which Director Ostrowski stated that while the County could take it on tax deed, the process would take approximately four years

Commissioner Curless asked why they couldn't clean up the property and turn it around rather than demoing the structures, to which Director Ostrowski stated that they could, but demolition was more appropriate for the property in question.

Mayor Wiza added that there had been some challenges to the property which resulted in it being a prime candidate for demolition.

City Attorney Beveridge stated that he had several meetings with the owners, their representatives, and representatives from Health and Human Services, as well as other organizations, and it was determined that the structure was a health hazard.

Commissioner Curless asked for clarification if the Redevelopment Authority would hold onto the lot until it was purchased, to which Director Ostrowski reiterated that once the Redevelopment Authority possessed the property, they would move forward with demolition and listing of the lot for purchase, adding that as an inner-city lot, he didn't expect it to sit for very long due to its location and lack of lots in the City.

Motion by Commissioner Brush to approve the request the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Stevens Point to purchase 101 Georgia Street (Parcel ID 281240830400103); seconded by Alderperson Kneebone.

Motion carried 7-0.

8. Request from the City of Stevens Point to purchase three properties: 1466 Water Street (281240832201931), 0 Water Street (281240832201912), and 924 Arlington Place (Parcel ID 281240832201911) for the preservation of property for a future city hall.

Director Ostrowski briefly summarized the request from the City of Stevens Point to purchase three properties for the preservation of property for a future city hall. After reviewing lot descriptions and locations, he noted that the purchase price of the properties stated was \$425,000, plus the cost of the tenant improvements, approximately \$90,000, which would be covered by increased lease payments by the tenant at 1466 Water Street as it would remain leased. The City's intent, he explained, would be to build a new two-story city hall at the corner of Water Street and Arlington Place and the location of the properties would provide an advantage in terms of being near Edgewater, a city-owned property, and proximity to other governmental agencies. A preliminary site map was summarized with earmarked parking area and access throughout the site. He further explained that several options had been presented to the City Council in regards to available locations and financial cost perspective, and the option for a new building had been preferred as the cost for renovating the current facility was exponential. He also made a point to note that levy limits had to be taken into consideration when discussing operational and capital costs.

Mayor Wiza stated that the council had evaluated the options provided by the space needs committee and had chosen to build a new city hall. He added that the numbers presented within the options were estimates based on industry information, and the only way to get more accurate numbers would be to spend money in hiring architects and experts to get more specific information. In addition, the County's architect, Venture Architect, had looked at the space required for both the City and County and updated the 2013 Bray Architect Organizational Needs Analysis and Space Assessment study. One of the options presented was to take the whole second floor of the City-County building and renovate it to accommodate City departments, but found that it didn't quite meet space needs. Even though all options presented remained on the table, they would need the Plan Commission's recommendation to proceed any further.

Commissioner Brush asked if the Plan Commission's decision affected the purchasing of the properties, and whether they needed to consider the overall costs, to which Mayor Wiza explained that the commissioners would issue a recommendation only, and that Common Council would render the decision to purchase, but he didn't see why they couldn't consider cost in their decision.

Director Ostrowski further added that there were still many items to discuss, and multiple approvals to go through as the process in itself was much longer, and even if it was approved, they would still have to come before the Plan Commission for a conditional use permit before going back to Common Council.

City Attorney Beveridge explained that the Plan Commission existed under the State Statute to provide a panel of experts in the community to give recommendations to the City Council about items that affected land, land use, and in this case, anything that involved a transaction on the part of the City, and there was nothing to preclude them from considering what they felt was relevant, including cost.

Director Ostrowski noted that they had found a file from 1992 during the time that the City had looked into doing another City Hall. They had gone through securing the funds and issued a notice of determination for potential condemnation. There had been several potential sites that were looked at, one of those potential sites being the City-owned parking lot area being discussed along Water Street.

City Attorney Beveridge added that they had gone as far as doing a creation of resolution for bonding for approximately six million dollars which would have also included the Police Department. They were not sure

why that project had fallen apart in such a late state, but they had looked at the same locations they were considering currently.

Mayor Wiza pointed out that the item was challenging as there was no clear option as every option had their pros and cons. He noted that the Space and Needs committee had tried narrowing down the options over the last year in order to provide recommendations to the Council. In August, the Council had chosen the option to build new downtown. Between building new and remodeling the existing building, there was less than 3 million dollars in difference over the next 50 years.

Commissioner Haines appreciated having the City Hall downtown, but asked what would happen if they purchased the properties and did not build in that location, and how its zoning would affect that.

Director Ostrowski explained that they were zoned either B-2 or B-3 which would allow for any office or standard retail type to go on the property. The City would have options to either resell or continue to hold it, as well as leasing 1466 Water Street in order to collect revenue from the existing tenant.

Commissioner Brush expressed concern about the proposed location, noting that there could be a higher value in placing high rise apartments there in order to allow people to live downtown. He added that they had reviewed the potential of properties along the riverfront during Comprehensive Plan discussions.

Director Ostrowski confirmed that when looking at the potential sites, they had analyzed the marketability and readiness of development to make sure that they were not taking away prime property by building along the riverfront or on Main Street. Since they were not tearing down any buildings and remaining close to the proposed new County building, and current County building, it was an advantage.

Mayor Wiza reiterated the importance of being close to the County, as well as having it close to the Downtown area.

Commissioner Curless asked when the study was performed of the other potential locations, to which Director Ostrowski stated over the past year and a half.

Commissioner Curless asked whether the Sentry building downtown was an option for relocation, to which Mayor Wiza stated it was not for sale.

Commissioner Curless noted that several million over the course of 50 years was not a lot of money. He asked whether they could look into purchasing the Verso parking lot in order to place the City Hall right along the river, to which City Attorney Beveridge stated that shoreline zoning setbacks would into play and make it unlikely.

Commissioner Curless stated that they could purchase the parking lot in order to have that area, to which Mayor Wiza stated that they were not discussing that purchase.

Commissioner Hoppe noted that the Green Circle Trail went right between the Verso-owned parking lot and the proposed new city hall building parking lot. That would give them the ability to generate traffic in a new way while welcoming pedestrians into city hall, he stated.

Jami Gebert (Portage County) appreciated Commissioner Hoppe's comments regarding the Green Circle Trail, but expressed concern with the proposed ingress and egress for the proposed parking lot as it could become hazardous for pedestrians, as well as taking away overflow parking from the Lincoln Center. She

also asked why the PowerPoint presentation from Venture Architects had not been included in the commissioner's packets.

Mayor Wiza explained that they had not provided it due to Plan Commission considering a recommendation to purchase the properties, and not considering the repurpose of the current City-County building. The PowerPoint by Venture Architects would be provided to the Common Council.

Aldersperson Jennings (First District) stated that while the Mayor had used the Chair's seat to state his opinion about the process, she disagreed with how it had taken place. She was very concerned about the request, noting that the reason she voted for it at Council was due to a set of decisions during a closed session that could not be discussed. In addition, the property wanting to be developed was prime riverfront property that would have been able to produce revenue. Lastly, she was concerned about not being presented with the renovation information by Venture Architects City-County building when the costs were comparable to building new.

Mayor Wiza clarified that he was not advocating for the purchase of the properties. He also noted the presentation for renovations of the City-County building from Venture Architects did not speak to office layouts. What the architect found was that they could effectively gut the building minus some support columns, and reconfigure the floorplan considering how the structure was built. Even so they could only find a little over 18,000 square feet to occupy.

Aldersperson McComb (Ninth District) expressed similar concerns with Aldersperson Jennings in regards to how the process was proceeding. She recalled that the Council had discussed a location for City Hall downtown, not specifically the Water Street property. She also noted that had the PowerPoint from Venture Architects been presented, she may have had a different decision based on that information. She encouraged the commissioners to not recommend the purchase to Council.

Mary Ann Laszewski (1209 Wisconsin St) stated that from visiting the City Hall on several occasions, she did not witness overcrowding of staff. She suggested several other buildings for relocation, and noted that Chase Bank was heavily criticized when they went in along the riverfront. She asked where space was needed within City Hall.

Mayor Wiza stated that the initial study performed by Bray Architects in 2013 was available online, and the only update made was to the amount of space that was needed as they were already four years into the study. He noted that they had already eliminated the break room in order to add additional office space for the Inspection Department.

Aldersperson Morrow (Eleventh District) noted that there was a lot of frustration between the City and County with addressing issues and there being a lack of communication. The City was now at a point where they had to consider their options and do something rather than remain stagnant. When he had moved to Stevens Point in 2008, the County was going to build a new criminal justice center, and similar issues had been going on since then. Relocating to Mid-state, he explained, was not a good solution as it would not set the City up for the long term.

Aldersperson Johnson (Fifth District) briefly stated that she represented District 3 on the County Board. Touching upon Aldersperson Morrow's point, she noted that there had been a number of studies performed

with no action taken. It was clear that the City has grown, and with that came staffing and space needs for them, not just for the City, but with the County. While there had been a consensus that the City Hall would be in the Downtown area, there were still other moving parts that had been discussed within closed session that she hoped would still come together. She hoped that there would be more discussion regarding the location at hand versus others presented.

Jerry Walters (Portage County), County Supervisor, representative for District 17, and member of the Space and Properties Committee, expressed concern for the request. He noted that the amount needed for the City was a couple hundred feet off from what was available of the 18,000 square feet in the current City-County building if it was remodeled, adding that the beam and column construction of the building allowed for a clean slate for both the County and the City. This would allow for residents to have access to both bodies in the same location. He continued that they had extended another contract to Venture Architects in the amount of \$25,000 to include information for the City in regards to their needs, and as a County member, he stated, he was offended that the City was proceeding with purchasing property without first receiving the rest of the information prior to the County Board meeting. He asked that they rethink about purchasing property along the riverfront.

Aldersperson Shorr (Second District) noted that there seemed to be a disconnect between feeling rushed with the decision when they had been discussing and considering it for quite some time, and that they have had the information for the major options for at least a year. The two major options now being discussed were either building in a new location or remodeling the existing building, and when discussing wanting a solution for the next 50 years, he stated, it meant having adequate space and having the flexibility and design for that space. The old Mid-State building and the current County-City building already had limitations and constraints, he reached the conclusion that building new would be the best option while remaining affordable when taking into account that it would last the next 50 years. Lastly, he added that it would be nice to know some alternatives to the Water Street site.

Mayor Wiza, for clarification, stated that while he could not make the August meeting due to visiting the sister city in Russia, he had an understanding that the majority of the City Council members at that meeting had chosen to build new downtown. In addition, after hearing some alders speak, it seemed like they were speaking on a downtown location, not building new.

Aldersperson Johnson (Fifth District) noted that it had been a long closed session with multiple moving parts, but the motion in open session was to select a location downtown, but they would have to go back and review. A special council meeting prior to Plan Commission would have been helpful she noted.

Mayor Wiza explained that there would always be moving options and pieces as new items were coming on and off the table constantly, and that the County had taken a long time to see movement on this item because there were no ideal options. He went on to read the motion from the Common Council meeting that was made after coming out of closed session to approve a new building downtown. Lastly, he explained that the City currently owned several properties so they did have options, and those options were always available, adding that they did not want to wait until everything else had been eliminated prior to making a decision as things were constantly changing. While there were other options, it was for Council to decide as Plan Commission's responsibility was to make a recommendation on the item on hand.

Aldersperson McComb (Ninth District) appreciated the reminder that they had chosen to build new downtown, however she noted that the new information from the County was significant enough for them to be informed in order to re-explore their decision.

Aldersperson Johnson (Fifth District) concurred with the assessment that they couldn't wait for the County to act, as there had been multiple studies performed with no action taken. She agreed with Alder McComb in sharing and reviewing the new information from the County as they had to evaluate every option for the City's future intensely.

Mary Ann Laszewski (1209 Wisconsin St) inquired whether there were additional options to relocate the City into the County Annex building, to which Mayor Wiza clarified that they were getting off-topic and to call his office to discuss further.

Aldersperson Phillips (Tenth District) stated that the City shouldn't be buying more buildings as they were competing with the private sector, and were poor landlords already. When looking at the financials, he didn't know how the Council could pick a downtown location when they had the option to relocate to the old Mid-State building. He asked the commissioners to not send a recommendation to Council.

Mayor Wiza noted that there had been varying thoughts and opinions on the item, but it was still the commissioner's job to make a recommendation about the purchase of the three particular properties.

Commissioner Haines asked whether their recommendation would go to the City Council rather than the CDA, to which Mayor Wiza stated that it would go straight to City Council, and that the CDA no longer existed.

Commissioner Brush noted that the item was a lot more complex than he had initially thought, and that they were being asked to take a lot more into consideration than a typical land purchase. He wanted a chance to go back and review the State Statute in regards to their review criteria.

Aldersperson Kneebone echoed similar concerns from previous alders in not being able to wait much longer to make a decision, and the point of staying in the downtown area. She wanted to see options of City-owned properties so they wouldn't have to spend the additional money, or as Alder Phillips briefly mentioned, taking property off the tax roll as they are already City owned property. In addition, they should have some discussion with the County, as well as seeing what they have to say during their board meeting.

Mayor Wiza noted that the information provided by Venture Architects had been up on the screen, adding that it was not a multiple page study, nor did it provide information about office configuration. The information presented only stated how much space was available and how much space was needed, as well as providing a confirmed that the walls, minus the beams, could be taken down and the floorplan reconfigured.

Commissioner Haines asked if the recommendation would preclude the City Council from discussing other options, to which Director Ostrowski confirmed that it did not prevent them from discussing additional options.

Mayor Wiza reiteration that the commissioner's votes did not commit City Council to consider only the option presented, and it was just a recommendation. They would still be able to discuss the Third Street

parking lot area or any other option they felt was warranted. Also, they could direct staff to provide additional information in order to make a decision.

Director Ostrowski asked for clarification on any additional information that would be requested prior to the commissioners voting on the item.

Commissioner Brush reiterated that he wanted to review the State Statute to see what they needed to consider in making the recommendation.

Mayor Wiza asked the City Attorney to present the State Statute, as it was vague in regards to what needed to be considered.

City Attorney Beveridge briefly explained that they were issuing a recommendation based on the authority provided by State Statute, but there was nothing that outlined specific criteria in issuing a certain type of recommendation. He read a provision detailing miscellaneous powers of the commission.

Commissioner Brush stated feeling overwhelmed considering the timeline given to consider the information.

Director Ostrowski noted that needing more time was not an issue, but if they needed additional information to make that decision, he asked that they inform him of what they specifically needed in order to prepare that information.

Mayor Wiza strongly encouraged the commissioners to contact City staff in regards to requesting any additional information they may need.

Commissioner Curless asked when the County was going to have their budget meeting, to which Jami Gebert confirmed that the meeting would be held on October 3, 2017 and October 9, 2017 as they had two County Board meetings in October.

Mayor Wiza noted that there would be no action about a new City building as it was their overall budget presentation, but there could be some costs associated with it included in the actual budget.

Motion by Commissioner Brush to postpone the request from the City of Stevens Point to purchase three properties: 1466 Water Street (281240832201931), 0 Water Street (281240832201912), and 924 Arlington Place (Parcel ID 281240832201911) for the preservation of property for a future city hall; seconded by Commissioner Hoppe.

Motion carried 4-3, with Commissioner Cooper, Commissioner Haines, and Mayor Wiza voting in the negative.

9. Community Development department monthly report for September 2017

Director Ostrowski stated that the monthly report for September 2017 would be issued at next month's Plan Commission meeting.

10. Director's Update.

Director Ostrowski had no further updates.

11. Adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 7:27 PM