

MINUTES OF THE  
OAK CREEK PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
TUESDAY, MAY 28, 2013

Mayor Scaffidi called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The following Commissioners were present at roll call: Commissioner Dickmann, Commissioner Johnston, Commissioner Carrillo, Mayor Scaffidi, Alderman Michalski, Commissioner Correll, Commissioner Siepert and Commissioner Chandler. Aldermen Bukiewicz was excused. Also present were Doug Seymour Director of Community Development, Peter Wagner Zoning Administrator and Assistant Fire Chief Mike Kressuk.

Commissioner Dickmann moved to approve the minutes of the May 14, 2013 regular Plan Commission meeting. Commissioner Siepert seconds. Roll call, all voted aye, with the exception of Commissioner Correll who abstained. The minutes were approved as submitted.

**Significant Common Council Actions**

There were no comments or concerns from the Commission.

**Conditions and Restriction – Wimmer Brothers Development – Southfield Apartments  
6881, 6881R & 6939 S. 13 Street  
Tax Key No.: 736-8999-002, 736-8999-003, 736-8990-001**

Mr. Wagner explained to the Commission at their last meeting the Plan Commission recommended that the Common Council rezone the properties at 6871, 6955, 6881, 6881R, 6933, & 6933 S. 13<sup>th</sup> Street be rezoned to Rm-1 PUD, Multi-Family Residential Planned Unit Development. Staff prepared the conditions and restrictions for this Planned Unit Development for the Commission's review.

Mr. Arden Degner, 8540 S. Pennsylvania Avenue expressed concern for the amount of visitor parking being provided with the development. Mr. Mark Wimmer explained all of the streets within the development are private and because of that they work with the Fire Department in terms of on street parking. They have certain areas that are posted and they keep parking off of the corners. There is a minimum parking standard in the Code that requires for every one bedroom there be one and a half spaces per unit and for a two bedroom two spaces. They exceed that entire total. Typically for every unit they have a minimum of two parking stalls.

Commissioner Chandler questioned how many stories the buildings would be. Mr. Wimmer stated all of the buildings would be two-story and all of the units proposed would be eight units with direct access. They will be expanding the same architectural style that they had with their most recent expansion.

Commissioner Chandler requested clarification on the five year sunset being proposed. Mr. Wagner explained there is one parcel that is single family on 13th Street and Mr. Wimmer would like after five years the fifty foot setback requirement that is in the conditions and restrictions disappear and then allow ten foot setbacks with a six foot privacy fence and landscaping. Staff is proposing to keep the fifty foot buffer for the one remaining house.

Mr. Wimmer explained their offer was after seven years the requirement to maintain a fifty foot setback to either side north and south of the Rybacki property would be able to be reduced to 10 feet. They have been in negotiations with Mr. Rybacki off and on and he knows they are interested in purchasing his property for about seven years. It could be another seven; it is his choice and his

home. There is no pressure and they have had a standing offer of 20% over municipal assessed value to acquire the property. They feel seven years would be a reasonable time period for them to be able to hold off and maintain the fifty feet. Obviously it would drop their total unit count by well over 30% because they could not build the two buildings immediately adjoining the property. That is why they are requesting the seven years to maintain the fifty foot setback after which they could go to ten and build a privacy fence and in lieu of that that they could at least go out ten years to maintain the approvals. It would be a little tough to build the project without the property and the two buildings adjoining it. They feel the seven year sunset on the side yard being increased to ten years would be one in which they would be able to come to some terms with Mr. Rybacki.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned what the exact terms of the sunset were that were being proposed. Mr. Wimmer stated seven years is what he has told Mr. Rybacki.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned the time of compliance in Section 11. The section allows seven years from the date of adoption of the ordinance and Mr. Wimmer is requesting ten and he doesn't recall any other time they have even gone to seven years. He feels the appropriate amount is seven years and he would prefer to see them come back in seven years if they need to. There are a lot of changes that can occur in that time and he would hope by that time they might have acquired the property. Mr. Wimmer pointed out the Arbors expansion was a ten year sunset.

Alderman Michalski commented there was a reason for the fifty foot setback and questioned what the reason for that setback. Mr. Wagner explained typically multi-family developments are larger buildings and they like to maintain buffer between the single family homes. Alderman Michalski stated when buildings come that close to single family homes people do feel encroached upon when a building of this type comes as close as ten feet. He also feels the Planning Commission is being drawn into the negotiations between Mr. Wimmer and the homeowners with the clock starting to tick if they agree to this sunset.

In regards to the 25% of the visible perimeter of the building materials, there may have been a time when that lower amount was okay. This particular development has 35% as opposed to 25% and why wouldn't they want to make the new addition look a little more attractive and go back to the standards that they have had for the rest of the City. Mr. Wimmer clarified the last addition the masonry requirement on all four sides was 60 or 65%, basically the whole first floor and the entry arch. His request was that they could mimic that in the addition. The intent is to have the masonry match what is existing. Mr. Seymour stated it was clearly the intent to match the architecture of the second phase. Alderman Michalski questioned why they wouldn't want to go back to the required 75% with the new addition that would look better. Mr. Seymour explained architecture is somewhat subjective in nature he liked to approach it more in terms of whether the architecture makes sense. Certainly having certain percentages of brick and decorative masonry accomplishes that goal. If the buildings look good at 65% and it would not necessarily be their intent to force the extra 10% on there if it made it look out of character with the rest of the development.

Commissioner Correll expressed concern with taking the position to somewhat leverage the economics of the deal with the applicant to the homeowner. If fifty feet is right for a two-story then its right and if ten feet is right then that is the answer. By putting the sunset they are leveraging the deal with the homeowner or vice versa. The applicant has stated that the project is worth X to add the additional buildings he is uncomfortable with putting a time frame on it for that reason solely.

Commissioner Dickmann moved that the Plan Commission recommends that the Common Council adopt the conditions and restrictions as part of the planned unit development for Southfield

Apartments located at 6871, 6955, 6881, 6881R, 6933 & 6939 S. 13 Street after a public hearing with the following changes:

1. Section 5 change: \*All buildings must be setback a minimum of 50 feet from any abutting single-family residential district boundary *to expire in ten years.*
2. In Section 5: add *the setbacks pertain to the entire development and not individual parcels.*
3. Section 6B: change the percentage from 25 to 35 of the visible perimeter of the building.
4. Section 11: change the time of compliance from seven years to ten years after the date of adoption of the ordinance.

Commissioner Johnston seconds. Roll call, all voted aye. The motion to approve carries.

**Rezone – One West Drexel, LLC and the City of Oak Creek  
7929 S. Howell Avenue and 300 W. Drexel Avenue  
Tax Key No.: 813-9023 and 813-9024**

Mr. Seymour explained to the Commission at the May 14, 2013 meeting, the Plan Commission held this item so the Plan Commission members had additional time to review the Drexel Town Square general development plan and regulating plan. The schedule has again been revised, so action by the Plan Commission will not be required at this time and in fact the public hearing is not scheduled until June 18 which would give the Commission time once again to work through any issues that might be identified and take action at the June 11, 2013 meeting.

Commissioner Siefert questioned the OWD Board of Directors and who they were and what responsibility and authority they would have. Mayor Scaffidi stated the two representatives from the City were himself and the City Administrator Jerry Peterson. They have votes just like the other three members. Mr. Jerry Franke stated the other three members were himself, Erica Nicole Harris of the WisPark staff and Dan McCarthy of Zilber Property Group. Many of the key decisions require a four out of five person affirmative vote. To get to four is going to require compromise and working together between the two parties.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned how the Plan Commission fit into the plan. Mr. Seymour explained there is the concept of the first generation development proposal which was developed through a series of strategic meetings, public meetings and the architects' workshops which is shown in exhibit two. That is the culmination of the development teams proposals for the main street, a mixed used and the library/city hall, the large format retail, some of the concepts for the perimeter commercial, as well as the multi-family portion of the development. Given that those were developed by the project architects and land planners in conjunction with the City and in conjunction with One West Drexel LLC and the Board of Directors. There is a presumption in there that the first generation proposals are consistent with the intent of PDE and therefore are approved. If there are variations from that and they would never take that out of the hands of the Plan Commission to consider variations from that the Commission would still have the authority to if there are certain standards in there that the Commission would have  $\frac{3}{4}$  majority power. Ultimately if there was something that was substantial they would require an amendment to the PUD if there was something that was outside of the intent of the first generation development proposal. The intent is to develop according to the first plan recognizing 100% of the site is not going to be developed on day one by the original project developers. We are making allowances for future development by these developers and/or subsequent developers but if that is the case they have to adhere to the requirements. We are going to be asking the Plan Commission as the gate keepers of the development at Drexel Town Square to

be much more selective in terms of the requirements and how any future development proposals are presented that they be consistent with those development guidelines.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned some things are recommended and some are preferred and then it says these are not allowed. Those two things do not really work together because if these are not allowed there are a lot of different things that change over in the preferred. How much leeway does the Plan Commission have in making sure that it fits the document that is provided? Mr. Seymour explained the document when adopted will be the zoning code for that zoning district. If there is a direct prohibition on the type of material then the Commission would not be able to approve without a  $\frac{3}{4}$  majority as an acceptable development material. They should view the document as the zoning code for the property.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned if the signage for the northeast corner of the development would be allowed small monument signs or would they not be allowed at all within the project. Mr. Seymour explained with respect to signage the language is being revised at this time. Mr. Franke explained some of the national retailers that are looking at some of those locations would expect the lower level free standing monument signs that you see throughout suburban areas. Commissioner Dickmann commented he did not see any language in the document addressing the monument signs. Mr. Franke stated there are more changes coming and it should be addressed in the next copy.

Commissioner Siefert questioned if the maximum height of the buildings can be eight stories will the fire department be able to provide protection. Mr. Seymour explained this was a dense urban development and to achieve the density there is going to be some building height. Assistant Fire Chief Kressuk stated an eight story structure would pose some challenges to the Fire Department. He pointed out the length of aerial devices and fire apparatus does not make the case for the size of a structure in the City. The WE Energies site has a twenty-six story building, well out of the reach of our ladder at this time, but they are still able to provide fire protection for the facility. That is not to say that an eight story building doesn't pose certain challenges but those challenges are addressed through fire protection through the construction process and then internal strategies and tactics that the department would undergo to access the risk of that structure. Certainly a structure that large would pose challenges from the aerial device usage point of view but it doesn't restrict that type of structure. Mr. Franke explained there might be one building that might get to that level and that would be the proposed lodging facility. He does not think they will get to eight floors and believes at this point it is proposed at six floors.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned if they would be under airport restrictions. Mr. Seymour stated he believe they were but it was closer to 150 feet at that point.

Commissioner Chandler questioned under the paved streets and walkability the last line in the paragraph refers to several alternate entry points and questioned if there has been a decision from the Department of Transportation. Mr. Franke stated it remains under consideration by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation. The consultant has evaluated both options and there was a slight advantage to their preferred one but that was not based upon anything but his analysis of the numbers. They should know before June 11. Mr. Seymour stated one of the revisions for the June 11 draft of the PUD will anticipate an either or situation, one with the preferred access point and one with the alternate access point so that in any event the document will be such that the Plan Commission could approve it based on what the TIA reflects and what the State accepts at that location.

Commissioner Chandler requested a little more information on the build to zones and the different zones. Mr. Witzling explained most high activity urban developments that are emerging in suburban

areas typically have a strict build to zone in order to create active street edges for pedestrians. This is a very difficult thing to achieve, so it has to be managed very cautiously so you get it right. What they have done in the diagram is indicated with the heavy red line where they want to see the building edges come up to the street edge. In many places when you don't have a building up to the street edge it makes it a little bit less attractive for pedestrians, so they have created something which they call a landscape zone or a mixed building and landscape zone. This is not typically done in other communities, but they did it here because of market conditions. There may not be enough buildings to build up against all of the street edges all over, so they created the idea of a landscape zone which is a little bit more than just a few shrub planters to create the active street edge. The last thing indicated are the community features that are different kinds of green space.

Commissioner Chandler questioned who the proposed parking structure was for. Mr. Seymour explained what was shown on the northwest corner of the site was a parking structure in anticipation of a use that they hope to eventually have at Drexel Town Square which would require more parking than they could accommodate on a surface basis. There have been some thoughts that it might be a large medical office building and there might be some recreation type use in that area. They wanted to show that a parking structure could be developed in that area that could meet the parking demands of a large user that may be at the site. It is not something that they are putting in there on day one; it is almost entirely user dependent and is just put there to indicate what could happen there. Commissioner Chandler questioned if it would be for use of the apartments or condos. Mr. Seymour stated that was not the case.

Commissioner Chandler questioned the street parking and the bicycle route along the main street and expressed concern for congestion in that area. Mr. Seymour explained parking along the main street would serve a couple of functions. The design concept here is one of an urban form more than a suburban form and on street parking is typical of an urban setting. It is important to the retailers and it is important to the public in the sense that they know there are parking spaces available on the street as well as in the parking lots. It is all part of an integrated parking plan and given the nature of these developments and the mix of uses each one of those second generation development proposals needs to come up with a parking design that addresses the fact that they acknowledge that there might be shared parking and that there is a different parking arrangement. Mr. Franke commented there was an additional meeting where the conclusion was not to do a bike lane on the main street for the very concerns expressed by the Commission. It should be more apparent as they get the profiles from Graef. The main bike path for the development will be along 6 Street. They do want to accommodate a bike lane at that location. If you are going over into the town square area they would hope that people would walk their bike. There will be bike racks and things like that so that if they want to get coffee or something. Mr. Seymour also commented the Oak Leaf Trail does run along the north adjacent to this site on Drexel Avenue. Mayor Scaffidi questioned if that would have a wider bike area. Mr. Seymour stated typically the mixed use trails have a ten foot width and he thought they would be looking at enhancements as part of the entire streetscape of Drexel Avenue to integrate the bike trail into the development so it fits into what they are trying to accomplish at Drexel Town Square.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned if there should be something in the plan stating where the snow was going to be put for example where would they go with the snow on the main street? Mr. Franke stated specifically regarding main street that snow would have to be trucked away. It could not be stored along main street and effectively maintain the integrity of that as a place of activity. They know even though we have cold snowy days here people still like to be out. Commissioner Dickmann questioned if they were going to allow snow to be taken to the pond areas. Commissioner Johnston stated that is one of the areas they have looked at for snow removal.

Commissioner Chandler questioned what the auto-centric component was in relationship to? Mr. Witzling explained it was referring to the buildings in the northeast corner and that district has a separate name. It really is the mixed use allowed and they need to revise the terms so it is the same throughout the document.

Commissioner Carrillo commented on the sign language on page seven and would like to see more specific standards added to the document. Mr. Seymour explained it was in there to acknowledge the scale on the building is going to vary considerably and a 100 square foot sign is going to look very different on a perimeter commercial building than it will on a mixed use main street building which is going to look different than a 100 square foot sign on a large format retail building. They want to recognize that they want to treat signs as a point of architecture in the overall structure rather than an absolute square footage number. Mr. Witzling commented no matter what dimensional constraints are added to the document people are still going to have ugly signs. The real problem is they don't want them to be ugly and that will add some subjective judgment. They are trying to get away from the argument of how signs are measured. Commissioner Carrillo would like to see it be less subjective and more specific. They may need to be defined by what is on the main street or what fronts Howell Avenue and those types of things. Mr. Franke pointed out there is a two-step approval process. All signs will have to be approved by the One West Drexel Board of Directors before even being able to come to the Plan Commission for approval.

Commissioner Siepert questioned who was responsible for snow removal on the main streets and who would pay for those costs. Mr. Franke explained the streets that were designated as public would be snow plowed by the City and the private streets will be maintained by the developer and the businesses in the benefiting area will pay for the removal of the snow. All of the public streets will be plowable where the snow can be plowed off to the side.

Commissioner Chandler recommended that more specifics be around the sign guidelines for the total amount of signage allowed. Three signs may be too much for some of the smaller stores in the area.

Commissioner Carrillo questioned if there were any incentives for green initiatives. Mr. Franke explained the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District does give incentives whether they are cost effective enough to encourage someone to do that is doubtful. Mr. Seymour explained there are a number of best management practices and they don't want to be descriptive in exactly what you need to do to your property to achieve those goals on the overall site. There are other green initiatives such as lighting or porous pavers.

Commissioner Chandler questioned if the requirements that are identified and will be modified in the future apply to all businesses within the area including the large format business as well as the smaller mixed use. Mr. Seymour confirmed that was the case.

Commissioner Carrillo questioned with the recent tornados if there were shelters available for the public if they were in the area during a tornado. Mr. Franke explained in Wisconsin the codes do not require any development of that nature. Mayor Scaffidi commented there has been some discussion about safe areas.

Commissioner Chandler questioned with the three types of signs if there was a standard height for the primary sign. Mr. Seymour stated he would check with the architects and see what the intent of the language was on this item. Mr. Franke explained it would be different between the perimeter building versus the multiple store front buildings on main street. Commissioner Chandler questioned what would be different. Mr. Franke explained the signage will be much smaller on the main street section

and would probably consist of both a sign that goes perpendicular and a sign to see if you are in front of the building. Commissioner Chandler requested it be noted in the document.

Commissioner Carrillo questioned the landscaping of the community places and environmental features. Mr. Franke explained the town square park will be the business improvement districts responsibility and the bio swales will be the businesses responsibility and the wetland areas will be the City's responsibility.

Commissioner Chandler questioned if it has come up to take into consideration using heated sidewalks for snow removal. Mr. Franke commented that was a very expensive proposition and did not feel they could charge the rents to cover that type of feature. Mr. Seymour also commented the permeable pavers allow for greater melt and allow the moisture to permeate and therefore less accumulation of snow during the minor snow events.

Mayor Scaffidi directed the item held until the next meeting.

**Plan Commission Consultation – City Hall/Library Concept Plan  
300 W. Drexel Avenue  
Tax Key No.: 813-9024**

Mr. Seymour explained to the Commission the architects for the city hall/library building would be giving a brief presentation of the site and building plans for the exterior of the building.

Mr. Mike Hacker and Ms. Denise Benecke with Bray Architects presented the concepts at this point for this building. The building finish floor will be four feet higher than the grade at the streets at the west, the south and the east. It will be five feet higher to the street to the north. It will allow them to be integrated completely into the stormwater collection process for the greater project and gives them an appropriate civic presence within a much grander site.

Mr. Hacker explained the features of the site with tiered plazas and angle parking. There are proposed areas for the children's library programs outside and a one way book drop. There is a large water feature on the south entrance. To the east of the south plaza there will be a small grove of trees for a shade garden that will create a buffer for the employees of the public moving by and as a usable space for staff and patrons.

The majority of the building is two stories high with a key tower element on the main street. Primary materials are a lot of stone, and secondary materials are copper and a lot of glass to allow for natural light.

Alderman Michalski questioned the parking on the north side of the building and why the bump outs along the walkway that would limit the parking on that elevation. Mr. Seymour explained during discussion and how this integrates with the town square to the north one of the elements of discussion was the safety of having a public street between the public square and the civic building. As discussion of that grew there was some intent behind those to actually narrow the distance of the actual vehicle lanes to make no mistake that this was a pedestrian area.

Alderman Michalski questioned the ramp going to the health department and the serpentine design. He questioned if there was any other way to get the ramp in without the serpentine design. Mr. Hacker explained with the four foot change they have to have over forty-eight feet of ramp. That is a very long run to accommodate that full ramp. In order to do that within a small area, to get them from the main sidewalk directly straight above them they needed to look to a switchback with the ramp.

Alderman Michalski felt it was counterintuitive for someone going into the health department. Ms. Benecke explained they would be walking the same distance as the straight ramp going into the building on the west end of the elevation.

Commissioner Chandler questioned on the north side there is a five foot lift but the ADA ramp on the other side does not switchback. Mr. Hacker explained the ADA ramp on the north side is essentially two segments of ramp, one thirty feet and then a landing and then a second thirty foot ramp. On the south plaza they have that with the same condition to the west and but in order to do that in a shorter more south dimension they need look at a switchback in that condition.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned if there would be one break room for the entire building or would there be two areas, one each for city hall and the library. Additionally he questioned if the areas would lead outside for the employees. Mr. Hacker explained one of their primary guiding principles to the overall design is how they want this to be an environment that all of the employees want to work in. There are both spaces for dialogues with co-workers and friends and other areas dedicated for lunch periods. On the city hall side they have one primary break room that would be open and available to everyone on both sides. Noting that the library staff breaks are a lot shorter they have a shorter term break room to support the library staff as well. Commissioner Dickmann questioned if they would lead outside. Mr. Hacker explained there was a terraced area on the second floor for the staff use.

Commissioner Carrillo questioned what she would be looking at if she was standing at the water feature on the south side looking south. Mr. Hacker explained they would be looking at the parking field and then across the street would be a bio-swale and after that it would be available green space or developable space at a future date. Commissioner Carrillo questioned if it backed up to the Woodman's store. Mr. Seymour stated the Woodman's store was located further to the east but there was land owned by Woodman's that has some redevelopment potential along that extension.

Commissioner Johnston questioned if the book drop-off for the library was below the finished floor. Mr. Hacker stated it would be lower than a traditional drop-off. It was not below the finished floor but closer to the actual floor. Commissioner Johnston expressed concern with the grading coming up the street to the drop-off. He also questioned if there were any elevations of the east side of the building. Mr. Hacker explained the building masses have been conceptualized as a series of stone masses with a series punched openings in them. On the east side they basically expose a lot of glass.

Commissioner Johnston questioned the green roof possibility and if it was still in the plans and if so he would like it to be shown on the plans in the future.

Commissioner Siefert questioned the HVAC units and where they would be located. Mr. Hacker explained the building would be geothermal heated and cooled so there would not be large chiller units that would traditionally be seen on the roof. Within the building there would be smaller heat pumps located throughout the building. There will be some equipment at grade, mainly electrical and will be located along the east face. There will be one primary mechanical room in the building where all of the larger HVAC equipment will be located. It will be technically a story and a half above the finish floor above the multipurpose room.

No action was taken on this item at this time.

**Plan Commissioner Consultation – Fire Station #1**  
**255 E. Centennial Drive**  
**Tax Key No.: 860-9037**

Mr. Hacker with Bray Architects presented the concepts for the building architecture and site layout for the relocation of Fire Station #1. The general aesthetic of the building has held true. The building will reflect the traditional quality of what they believe represents architecture in terms of fire departments. The site is very challenging and is highly wooded. The first effort was to minimize the site improvement as much as possible. They have a lot of grade change, a lot of vegetation and a wetland that is part of the project. They want to minimize the frontage along Centennial as well. They want to minimize the east to west site improvement because that is where the majority of the grade change happens.

On the east edge they're approximating a four foot retaining wall to the north. The east wall of the apparatus bay becomes a retaining wall to the south. From the south, to the west may have a retaining wall to support the drive and the parking above that and depending how they can manage the grade it would minimize the impact on the trees. The main public drive is in-line with the entrance to the Post Office to the north.. The west is a car drive to go south to the rear and will be staff parking. To the north they will have two or three visitors parking as well and access the walkway to the main entrance.

The front of the building will reflect the traditional quality of fire departments in the Midwest with a lot of stone based, brick field. Two center bay door apparatus will go all the way up to a peak with a gable roof that would extend from the north to the south with clear story glass above. Along the wall will be glass for bringing in natural lighting. Apparatus doors in the front are arched and are proposed as bi-fold doors to open horizontally and be all glass. In the evenings they can use LED lights to light up the front of the trucks and showcase the kind of access to the community and what the fire department has within the apparatus bays.

To the west is a two-story with office space, a training room that would seat about 20 people, and a fitness room on the first floor. The second the floor is series of bunk rooms and a subtle curtain wall that connects the two sides. Primary materials are stone and brick with glass windows.

Backside is a lower garage mass containing two stall garages to house a pair of trailers. They built a three story training tower within the building. The training tower will extend from basement (grade level) to the intermediate level, which is the roof terrace of the garage, and onto the 3<sup>rd</sup> level, the actual roof which will allow training on site. The terrace element is accessible to provide outdoor space for the staff. One thing not shown in the training tower are windows which will be worked out with the staff to figure out what types and size windows for training purposes. The east is a series of windows to bring in as much natural light as possible.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned about the fire department using the MATC training tower to do the training. Assistant Fire Chief Kressuk answered that they currently use the MATC training tower when it is available. Having this fire station in a centralized location in the city will make the movement of personnel easier to accommodate coverage around the city during the training period. It is to our advantage that we have the training tower located here.

Commissioner Johnston mentioned that the retention pond should be shown on the construction drawing.

No action was taken on this item at this time.

**Rezone-City of Oak Creek Fire Station No. 1  
255 E. Centennial Drive  
Tax Key No: 813-9024**

Mr. Wagner explained that the property is currently a B-4 PUD, Highway Business Planned Unit Development and will need to be changed to I-1, Institutional District before the construction of the project.

Norm Osgood of 9080 S. Howell Avenue disagrees with having the fire department in this area. It affects the animals, the environment, and it's not a centralized area. Mr. Osgood questioned how it was decided that this was an area for the fire department and was it open to the public to give their decision, and an oak tree is left hanging there. Mayor Scaffidi stated that he'll have to talk to the Forester about the oak tree. There were 11 acres of trees and only 1.5 acres of trees were taken out and quite a bit were left by your property line to give some buffer from the fire station. Those trees were left because it a nature area we want preserve and allow our residents to be able to access it at some point. Mayor Scaffidi also stated there were studies and input from everyone. It was agreed by the fire department staff that it's a good area to put the fire station. It has good access points and it is a good location to get around the city quicker. Alderman Michalski mentioned he was on the Adhock committee and it was discussed about the studies based on the location of the fire station. It was decided that this was a place that was safe for the building. It also met all the criteria for the emergency vehicles to come in and out and it is the center of the city where most of the calls actually come from. I didn't agree with the tear down of the many trees but sometimes there had to be a balance and it came in here. The studies were discussed on numerous occasions at the common council, public hearing and the residents were aware of what was going on. I think we are trying to balance the monstrosity with an attractive looking building that represents the residents of Oak Creek and puts in the right area in the city. Mr. Osgood feels this is the most southwestern part of the city. Alderman Michalski stated that there have been studies about having a fourth fire station or do we stay with three. We decided as the council that we stay with three fire stations and move it about an eighth of a mile. Assistant Fire Kressuk added that based on population density, response time, and our current call volume and call location, it's in a right spot. Obviously we were constrained by available properties and where the station could go; we appreciate the efforts that went into moving the station.

Alderman Michalski motioned that the Plan Commission recommend to the Common Council that the property at 255 E. Centennial Drive be rezoned from B-4 PUD, Highway Business Planned Unit Development to I-1, Institutional District after a public hearing.

Commissioner Chandler seconds, Roll call-all aye. The motion to approve carries.

**Comprehensive Plan Amendment(s) - multiple**

Doug Seymour explained the Comprehensive Plan continued to retain references to the City Center District located (City Hall and Library site) at Howell Avenue and Puetz Road. The amendment is presented to include the Drexel Town Square properties and modify the language to the text and figures in the Comprehensive Plan. There are a number of references how we handle retail uses with in the city center district. The way the Drexel Town Square Mixed Used Planned Development Zoning was created and is really descriptive how we integrate the style, substance of the building, and the architecture of the site. The Drexel Interchange is added in there to make things consistent. It is undergoing a more comprehensive rewrite amendment and not all the amendments are propose to you at this time. We feel that it is important to reflect the process of the Civic Center and match the

future land use map that we voted on earlier this year in order to have consistency for the Comprehensive Plan that we will propose within the next year.

Commissioner Chandler added that several other places that were not listed in the amendment, page 9, 3e-Puetz and Howell, also Page 30-second paragraph, the first bullet, and page 79, 91, and 92. Mr. Seymour stated that he will look into that.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned about page 92, would the amendment be adding the new location of the new fire station. Mr. Seymour stated the fire department is part of the city center district. The Delphi site is shown as planned industrial and the amendment is a change in language to a match the change what we decided earlier this year.

### **Plan Commission Consultant – Mock Plan Commission exercise for Planner Candidates**

Three candidates for the position of Planner presented mock plan commission items.

No action was taken on this item.

Commissioner Carrillo moved to adjourn. Commissioner Siepert seconds. Roll call, all voted aye. The meeting adjourned at 8:43 p.m.