

REPORT OF CITY PLAN COMMISSION

April 1, 2019 – 6:00 PM

Police Department – 933 Michigan Avenue, Stevens Point, WI 54481

PRESENT: Mayor Wiza, Alderperson Kneebone, Commissioner Arntsen, Commissioner Cooper, Commissioner Haines, Commissioner Hoppe, and Commissioner Rice.

ALSO PRESENT: Director Ostrowski, Associate Planner Kearns, Comptroller/Treasurer Ladick, City Attorney Beveridge, Secretary Mohr, Alderperson Jennings, Alderperson Shorr, Alderperson Johnson, Alderperson Dugan, Alderperson McComb, Alderperson Phillips, Alderperson Morrow, Joe Bachman, Brian Beaulieu, Marv Iwanski, Sara Brish, Lois Freeberg-Hagen, Gary Hagen, Susan Carroll, Mary Oswald, Greg Johnson, Scott Moodie, Mike Johnson, Linda Luebstorff, Jeff Vaughter, Bryan Worzella, Gwen Morey, Nigl Morey, Eric Yonke, Bernie Coerper, Nathan Sandwick, Bill Pritchard, Bill Schierl, Andy Pech, Will Stites, Jeff Bintz, Calvin Hackbarth, Susan Kerbel, Polly Dalton, Karl Weyers, and Lynette Kvatek.

INDEX:

1. Roll call.

Discussion and possible action on the following:

2. Report of the March 4, 2019 meeting
3. Public Hearing regarding the proposed project plan, boundaries and creation of Tax Incremental District No. 10 (See the Public Hearing Notice which was published on March 15 & 22, 2019)
4. Consideration of "Resolution Designating Proposed Boundaries and Approving a Project Plan for Tax Incremental District No. 10, City of Stevens Point, Wisconsin"
5. Request from Graphic House Incorporated, representing Associated Bank, for a sign variance to construct two freestanding signs that are closer than the required separation distance, taller than the current height requirements, and larger than the current size requirements at 5597 US Highway 10 East (Parcel ID 2408-35-1400-10)
6. Conceptual project review for a residential development project on property lying between West Zinda Drive and West River Drive
7. Neighborhood Associations
8. Parklet Ordinance
9. Tourist Rooming Houses
10. Community Development Department Monthly Report for March, 2019
11. Director's Update.
12. Adjourn.

1. Roll call.

Present: Wiza, Kneebone, Arntsen, Cooper, Haines, Hoppe, Rice

Discussion and possible action on the following:

2. Report of the March 4, 2018 meeting

Motion by Commissioner Cooper to approve the report of the March 4, 2019 Plan Commission meeting; seconded by Alderperson Kneebone.

Motion carried 7-0.

3. Public Hearing regarding the proposed project plan, boundaries and creation of Tax Incremental District No. 10 (See the Public Hearing Notice which was published on March 15 & 22, 2019)

Mayor Wiza announced the dates the Public Hearing Notices were published for the proposed creation of Tax Incremental District No. 10.

Greg Johnson, Senior Municipal Advisor of Ehlers Inc., provided a brief explanation of Tax Incremental Districts, as well as reviewed key points to the creation of TID No. 10. He stated that if the Plan Commission moved to proceed, the resolution to create TID No. 10 would go before the Common Council on April 15, 2019, and then back to the Joint Review Board for a final determination.

Mayor Wiza announced that there was additional seating in the overflow room as they were near capacity.

Director Ostrowski provided a summary of TID No. 10 in terms of the benefits and reasoning for its creation, its boundaries, and the remaining length of surrounding TIF districts. He reviewed the infrastructure and site improvements within and outside the district, in addition to developer Incentives, for the proposed district. Commissioners had the following comments:

1. Inquiry as to whether a financial agreement with a development had occurred first, or if the creation of the TID would be first, to which staff explained that one of the contingencies for a development was to create the TID. If it was not created, the development would not proceed, although it could also occur with the TID being created first.
2. Inquiry to the status of TID No. 6 and the areas in which it would overlap with TID No. 10, to which staff explained that TID No. 6 was operationally doing better, but was also receiving funds from donor TIDs No. 5 and No. 7. Comptroller/Treasurer Ladick added that TID No. 6 owed the City six million dollars, however they expected the costs to be repaid back into the general fund by 2025. Director Ostrowski lastly added that any new increment in the overlapping areas would go into TID No. 10.
3. Clarification requested for donor TIDs, to which Director Ostrowski briefly explained that revenue from successful TIDs could assist with debt from TID No. 6, noting that the debt had largely been a result of the mall redevelopment project.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing open.

Tim McKnight (2101 Oak St) inquired on the status of the ShopKo site.

Nathan Sandwick (633 Portage St) expressed concerns with the proposed TID creation, noting it was a big gamble and urged the City to explore additional options. He called to see the value propositions and projections, noting that the current proposed projects made it seem like TID No. 10 would be more valuable than all other districts combined.

Andy Pech (1909 East Ave) asked what the contingency plan was if the City went into a recession. He questioned why they needed to provide additional incentives.

Bill Schierl (109 County Rd E S), co-owner of Team Schierl Companies, expressed support for the TID creation, stating it would assist in redeveloping the west side, specifically The Store. As a property owner, he looked forward to possible incentives for rental conversion. Lastly, as a resident, he was excited for increasing park areas and improvements for road conversions.

Bernard Coerper (1400 West River Dr) requested confirmation on whether his property would be included in the district.

Jeff Vaughter (418 Cedar St) asked what type of pressures property owners within the proposed district would be subjected to in order to increase the values of their properties, specifically code enforcement related issues.

Alderson McComb (District Nine) expressed concern for residential areas west of Mead Park being included within the proposed TID, noting a lot of her district was also within the proposed boundary.

Brian Beaulieu (2132 Elk St) inquired on whether the proposed TID was geared more towards residential properties or businesses.

Alderson Phillips (District Ten) questioned whether it was the City's obligation to redevelop properties that weren't used. Additionally, he asked that Sloman Park could be included within the TID boundary as it could be used for redevelopment since it was seldom used.

Alderson Jennings (District One) stated support for the TID creation, noting that the revenue would go towards infrastructure improvements.

Mayor Wiza declared the public hearing closed.

4. Consideration of "Resolution Designating Proposed Boundaries and Approving a Project Plan for Tax Incremental District No. 10, City of Stevens Point, Wisconsin"

Director Ostrowski stated the following in regards to inquiries posed during the public hearing:

1. He was unaware when the Shopko property could be redeveloped, as it needed to go through bankruptcy proceedings.
2. The value proposition for the TID seemed high, however he reiterated that the number was based over 27 years. Additionally, they had several larger properties in the Downtown area that could produce high value developments.
3. Noted that the proposed projects listed were for planning purposes only, and projects would need to come back before the appropriate body for review and approval, adding that there were not a lot of financing tools in Wisconsin.
4. In regards to a contingency plan, the risk did not come with creating the district, but rather approving a specific development or project, which they would analyze individually at that time. Mayor Wiza added that while each project was different, the City guarded itself through the development agreement. All projects would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
5. In regards to requests to add additional parcels into the district, he noted that it was up to the commission to do so. However, they needed to keep in mind that adding parks could go against the district as 50% of existing properties needed to be eligible for some rehabilitation.
6. Property owners would not face any additional pressures for property improvement outside the normal property maintenance requirements. He noted that façade improvement grants could potentially be made available for residential properties.

Commissioners had the following comments:

1. Expressed concern for residential properties in terms of increased cost for homeowners. Even if additional property maintenance was not forced, the infrastructure projects could affect the surrounding tax base, to which Director Ostrowski noted that there would be minimal impact. However, as entire areas improve, it could lead to higher property values.

2. Concern for TID revenue staying within the district, and some bodies not being able to receive taxes from those new developments, such as the school district. Inquired how they could ensure those bodies get funding, to which Director Ostrowski stated that the goal for the district was to spur development in the area. Additionally, the Joint Review Board, who would have final say on the district creation, had representatives from the City, the County, the School District, the Technical College, and the public. Ultimately, they would all have a say in whether the district would be beneficial to them.
3. Inquiry on the timeline of some proposed projects, and whether it was beneficial to have long term hypothetical plans rather than short time, more concrete projects, to which it was stated that the plan acted as more of a guide and there could be project plan amendments, if needed.

Mayor Wiza announced that the item would go before council the third Monday of the month.

Motion by Mayor Wiza to approve the consideration of “Resolution Designating Proposed Boundaries and Approving a Project Plan for Tax Incremental District No. 10, City of Stevens Point, Wisconsin”; seconded by Commissioner Arntsen.

Motion carried 7-0.

5. Request from Graphic House Incorporated, representing Associated Bank, for a sign variance to construct two freestanding signs that are closer than the required separation distance, taller than the current height requirements, and larger than the current size requirements at 5597 US Highway 10 East (Parcel ID 2408-35-1400-10)

Mayor Wiza announced seat availability in the main room for any attendees still in the overflow room.

Director Ostrowski briefly explained that Graphic House, representing Associated Bank, was requesting a sign variance to construct two freestanding signs on the property less than the required separation distance, and at an increased height and size. Two freestanding signs currently existed on the property, which also received a sign variance in 2016. Given the access restrictions on the site, similar surrounding sites, as well as variances previously granted, staff recommended approval seeing as they did not see any detriments to the surrounding properties.

Motion by Alderperson Kneebone to approve the request from Graphic House Incorporated, representing Associated Bank, for a sign variance to construct two freestanding signs that are closer than the required separation distance, taller than the current height requirements, and larger than the current size requirements at 5597 US Highway 10 East (Parcel ID 2408-35-1400-10) with the following:

1. The freestanding signs shall be set back at least five feet from the property line.
2. The signs shall conform to all other applicable requirements within the sign ordinance.
3. Applicable building permits shall be obtained.
4. Minor modifications may be approved by staff.

seconded by Commissioner Hoppe.

Motion carried 7-0.

6. Conceptual project review for a residential development project on property lying between West Zinda Drive and West River Drive

Commissioner Cooper recused himself from the item.

Director Ostrowski briefly explained that the applicant was looking for a conceptual project review to receive feedback from the Plan Commission and residents in order to better address concerns early in the process before getting into a final design, at which point they would come forward for official approvals if deciding to proceed. The proposed subdivision development would consist of single or two-family homes on the entire 20 acres. It was also noted that the area had adjacent wetlands, and wetlands intermixed on the property, thus the developer was proposing at-grade, on slab, homes. The development would be geared towards a mix of seniors and open-age groups. Were they to rezone to a Planned Development District, it would allow for a denser development, however they would still have all the necessary buffers and protections for the wetlands. The proposed project warranted a future discussion on a new conservation subdivision type zoning. He added that request had been before the Plan Commission in 2015, but had failed at council. Commissioners had the following comments:

1. Recalled 2015 challenges revolving around concerns for the wetlands and cut-through roadways, to which staff confirmed accurate.
2. Inquiry on whether a PDD zoning would affect the current subdivision plat and property lines, to which staff noted the possibility as they wanted more diversity for the project in terms of types of construction.
3. Inquiry on infrastructure costs, to which staff noted that the environment posed challenges which required further review.
4. Inquiry on whether the area had previously been a quarry, to which the applicant, Bill Pritchard, confirmed a quarry had been present north of the site across from the railroad.
5. General comment that development in the area wasn't minded so long as the wetlands weren't developed in or encroached upon, adding that the owner had the property rights to build.
6. Questioned how they could protect the wetlands from run-off as they couldn't constantly be policing the area.
7. Questioned what the developer could do on the property without Plan Commission approval, to which staff stated that they could split the lots via a certified survey map, use private drives, and develop the properties.
8. Inquiry whether a conservation district would be a part of a PDD zoning, to which staff stated that a PDD zoning would allow for more control, as well as allow for a more unique and concentrated area.

Bill Pritchard (3785 Kohler Dr, Plover), developer, stated the following in regards to comments made:

1. No desire to build on, near, or encroach onto the wetlands. He identified the wetland areas on a map, and reiterated that they would only use the uplands.
2. Intent was not to do a single-family subdivision, but rather clusters of smaller homes for retirees and young professionals.
3. Development would include pedestrian walkway to connect other residential developments and carve out a connection to the nearby school towards the west.
4. Summarized previous development projects and noted the importance of preserving natural beauty.
5. Stated that the State of Wisconsin was more restrictive with the use of fertilizers, noting again that there was no intent to build in, use, or disrupt the wetlands.
6. Confirmed that the proposed clusters would not be segregated, but rather placed together for like-minded interests. They would be open to all occupations, ages, or children.

7. There was no intention to have units rented, and the development would be done in phases as they continued to measure success.

Aldersperson Jennings (District One) stated her opposition to the project, noting that it was not infill, but rather suburban sprawl development that the City would need to maintain and that would further impoverish the City.

Aldersperson Dugan (District Eight) noted that the developer had done infill developments within her district, and they had always been well built homes. She read a brief prepared statement that indicated that the proposed development would not be sensitive to the area and surrounding residents.

Karl Weyers (933 Meadow St), who had attended for the TID No. 10 item, stated that one of the proposed projects was to restore Moses Creek, which used to be a wetland. He questioned doing something in the long view that would take away from the wetlands when they were proposing to restore it in another location under the creation of the new TID.

Aldersperson Johnson (District Five), speaking on behalf of Aldersperson Nebel who could not attend, stated Alder Nebel had concerns for the proximity of the railroad, as well as to the wetlands. For Aldersperson Johnson personally, she hoped to see an alternative plan to protect the natural parcel were it to be developed.

Brian Beaulieu (2132 Elk St) stressed that the property owner had rights to develop, in addition the newer homes were valued higher which would provide more tax base. He supported the project.

Aldersperson Dugan (District Nine) noted that she did not see the project as urban sprawl, noting it provided needed housing options. She did express concern for the wetlands and agreed with Mr. Weyers' comments. She suggested that the proposed housing clusters be mixed, rather than keeping retirees grouped away from young professionals and vice versa. Ideally, she would have liked to see a smaller subdivision for the area, and asked that there be controls for use of fertilizers and chemicals. She was undecided about the request.

Lynette Kvatek (216 W Pleasant St) surrounding area resident representing her neighbors, said that they opposed the project as a neighborhood in 2015, specifically for two-family homes as it would open the area to the rental market. Otherwise, they were fine with development in the area.

Aldersperson Jennings (District One) reiterated that the urban core of the City was subsidizing larger lot developments, such as the one being proposed, in addition to them creating indebtedness.

No action was taken.

7. Neighborhood Associations

Director Ostrowski explained that the City had been working and meeting with various groups and alderspersons to help facilitate the formation of neighborhood associations. In order to better assist the groups in forming and for the City to accomplish recommendations outlined in MSA's Housing Study, the City was proposing to allow anyone to create a neighborhood association, however, in order receive any benefits from the City, they would need to be a qualified neighborhood association. The two potential designations could include: Neighborhood Group / Neighborhood Associations, which would allow anyone to form a group, and Qualified/Certified Neighborhood Associations, which had the potential to have specific signage for the district and to qualify for certain Redevelopment Authority programs or other grant programs. The goal would be to foster groups of every size and increase community engagement.

Mayor Wiza asked for comments from the audience.

Aldersperson Johnson (District Five), again speaking on behalf of Aldersperson Nebel, stated that Alder Nebel supported the idea, however she had issues with the MSA delineated map boundaries that had been provided in the agenda packet. Aldersperson Johnson mirrored the same concerns for the MSA delineated maps, stating that they did not accurately depict neighborhood boundaries.

Aldersperson Kneebone supported the idea.

Motion by Commissioner Hoppe to approve moving forward with the program; seconded by Commissioner Arntsen.

Motion carried 7-0.

8. Parklet Ordinance

Director Ostrowski stated that parklets had previously been discussed at Plan Commission, in addition to receiving feedback from the Association of Downtown Businesses and general public, most of which had been incorporated into a draft ordinance that had been included in the agenda packet. The ordinance itself defined parklets, as well as their general requirements. A parklet handbook would detail design criteria, use, and other details regarding licensing and insurance requirements. The handbook was in the process of being drafted, with expected completion by the end of April. Staff supported the adoption of the ordinance as proposed.

Commissioner Arntsen asked what may be entailed for insurance requirements, to which Director Ostrowski stated that it shouldn't be too difficult, as often time they would extend their insurance for the addition of the parklet, but ultimately it depended on the type of parklet.

Motion by Mayor Wiza to approve an ordinance amendment to adopt Parklets under Chapter 16.08; seconded by Commissioner Cooper.

Motion carried 7-0.

9. Tourist Rooming Houses

Director Ostrowski explained that the City had previously approved tourist rooming houses in 2017 as a conditional use within the R-4 and above zoning districts. While the City had since approved two legal tourist rooming houses, several others illegally operated within the R-2 and R-3 districts. As such, staff was looking to expand on the types of districts that they could be allowed in, as well as making sure they met the State's licensing requirements and that they paid room tax. Staff provided three options in how to move forward, with their recommended option two being to permit tourist rooming houses for owner-occupied dwelling units in the R-3 Single and Two Family Zoning District and above districts, but as a conditional use for solely rental units with no owner living onsite.

Sara Brish (340 Division St N), Executive Director of the Stevens Point Area Convention & Visitors Bureau, summarized the growing trend and success of tourist rentals all over the world. She commended the City for taking steps to further address tourist rooming houses, adding that the City needed more lodging. She was in support of expanding the use however the City saw fit.

Susan Kerbel (1925 Church St) stated that she had approached the City several years ago in running a tourist rooming house, however her property had been zoned R-3. She supported the expansion of districts, noting that she still wished to pursue operating one. She had interviewed her surrounding neighbors, of which none had any issues with her doing so.

Polly Dalton (1577 Church St) supported staff recommendation three, which would allow tourist rooming houses in the R-3 Single and Two Family Zoning Districts and above districts as a permitted use. She noted that the rentals often provided individuals with a home away from home, as well as a human connection.

Additionally, the rental sites often had strict rules of their own, in addition to some providing financial assistance.

Aldersperson McComb (District Nine) stated her support for staff recommendation two, noting that the City needed the additional room tax, and was a user and supporter of AirBnB.

Aldersperson Dugan (District Eight) noted support for the tourist rooming houses to be a conditional use, however she requested there be additional regulations: licensing through the State or City, ensure building codes were being met, ensure parking availability, restrict number of tourists at one time and days they can be rented, incur annual costs, and place a cap on earnings.

Aldersperson Jennings (District One) supported the request as it could act as a mechanism to convert rentals into a revenue stream, and potentially saving or restoring historic homes. She suggested that there be a radius around the university where these could not occur as they could be exploited by landlords.

Aldersperson Johnson (District Five), speaking on behalf of Aldersperson Nebel, stated that Alder Nebel had concerns with the item as it could increase rentals in District three overall. Aldersperson Johnson personally supported moving forward with staff recommendation two.

Commissioner Hoppe stated support for staff recommendation two, as recommendation one would cause the Plan Commission to be bogged down with requests, and recommendation one seemed too wide open.

Motion by Mayor Wiza to approve drafting an ordinance to allow Tourist Rooming Houses to be a permitted use for owner-occupied dwelling units in the R-3 Single and Two Family Zoning District and above districts, but as a conditional use for solely rental units with no owner living onsite; seconded by Commissioner Hoppe.

Motion carried 7-0.

10. Community Development Department Monthly Report for March, 2019

Director Ostrowski briefly explained that while values remained lower than previous years, there were many projects lining up for the building season. Overall permit counts were up for the month of March.

11. Director's update.

Director Ostrowski provided updates on the following:

1. Lot Sizes: Staff was exploring the possibility of reducing lot size requirements in certain zoning districts. The request would be forthcoming.
2. Comprehensive Plan: Staff had received the final draft, it was being reviewed and would be brought forward shortly.

12. Adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at 8:36 PM.

Community Development Report - March 2019

Construction Report

New Construction	# of Permits	Location	Declared Valuation	Fees
Single Family	1	542 West River Dr	\$206,530.00	\$1,165.00
Two Family	-	-	-	-
Multi-Family	-	-	-	-
Commercial/Industrial	-	-	-	-
Additions or Alterations	# of Permits	Declared Valuation	Fees	
Residential	48	\$168,766.47	\$2,945.23	
Commercial	28	\$1,336,475.20	\$11,762.80	
Monthly Permits	Monthly Valuation	Monthly Fees	YTD Permits	YTD Valuation
77	\$1,711,771.67	\$15,871.03	201	\$38,061.24

2018	2017	2016
233	166	125
\$15,090,787.79	\$5,664,643.63	\$3,701,439.55
\$124,774.16	\$47,727.16	\$35,480.32

Violation Report

Exterior Structure Complaints	
Multiple Exterior Property Violations	0
Exterior Property Violations	2
Accumulation of Rubbish or Garbage	0
Grass or Weeds	0
Improper Parking of Vehicles	8
Improper Storage of Refuse or Refuse Carts	0
Refuse or Refuse Carts on Curb	0
Snow and Ice	91
Storage of Household Items Outside	12
Unlicensed or Inoperable Vehicles	0
Unsanitary Conditions	0
Exterior Building or Structure Violations	0
Defective Sidewalks, Driveways	0
Defective Protective Treatment	0
Defective Exterior Walls, Roofs, Windows, Doors	0
Interior Structure Complaints	0
Multiple Interior Structure Violations	0
Interior Structure Violations	1
Multiple Violations	15
General Case	
Other Violations	15
Rodent or Pest Violations	0
Fire Prevention Violations	0
No Heat Violation	0
Electrical Violations	0
Nuisance Violations	0
Mechanical Violations	0
Signage Violations	0
Plumbing Violations	0
Improper Occupancy: Multi-Family Dwelling	0
Improper Occupancy: Residential Dwelling	0
Visibility/Obstruction Violations	0
Unlawful Animal	0
Land Use Violations	1
Loss of Pre-existing Use Status	0
Work w/o Historic Preservation Review	0
Work Without Permit	2
Total Violations / Total Service Fees Billed	132 \$1,000
9/132 Tagged or Verbal, 7/9 Compiled = 77% Compliance	