

MINUTES OF THE
OAK CREEK PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 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, Alderman Bukiewicz, Mayor Scaffidi, Alderman Michalski, Commissioner Correll, Commissioner Siepert and Commissioner Chandler. Also present were Doug Seymour Director of Community Development and Assistant Fire Chief Mike Kressuk.

Commissioner Dickmann moved to approve the minutes of the May 28, 2013 regular Plan Commission meeting. Commissioner Correll seconds. Roll call, all voted aye, with the exception of Alderman Bukiewicz who abstained. The minutes were approved as submitted.

Significant Common Council Actions

There were no comments or concerns from the Commission.

**Sign Plan Review – Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC) Banners
6665 S. Howell Avenue
Tax Key No.: 718-9961-002**

Mr. Seymour explained to the Commission the applicant was requesting approval for the display of sixty-four MATC banners throughout the campus. Currently, the campus is using the thirty-two locations to display one banner and would like to replace the one banner with two 28"x49" banners. According to Municipal Codes Section 17.0708, the Plan Commission must approve any public institutional name signs.

Commissioner Chandler questioned what the regulations were for Institutional zoning. Mr. Seymour explained there were not separate sign regulations by zoning district; it is all regulated under municipal code. Because it is Institutional the Plan Commission does have the ability to identify and approve the signage. Typically banners are a public function similar to the banners the City has on Howell Avenue. Where it expands into the private parking lots then it becomes a signage issue. Commissioner Chandler questioned if there were stipulations on quantity. Mr. Seymour explained there was no specific formula for that.

Commissioner Correll clarified the normal guidelines would not allow this in a commercial parking lot but because this was institutional they were being asked to look at it potentially differently. Mr. Seymour explained they would not allow a business to have these types of banners as part of their business because it is considered signage. Commissioner Correll question if there were other examples of private schools displaying these in their parking lots within the city. Mr. Seymour stated the High School has some similar banners in their parking lot.

Commissioner Johnston stated the requested banners were similar in size to what the city uses on the street lights. He questioned the height of the light poles in the MATC parking lot because the proposed banners were significantly larger than what was currently there. Mr. Trevor Kubatzke MATC, stated they were very tall light poles at approximately thirty feet and the current signs were very small comparatively.

Alderman Bukiewicz looks at MATC as a college campus and a source of pride for the City. They are proposing sixty-four signs on 110 acres. They are contained within the property and he supports this proposal.

Commissioner Chandler questioned the need for sixty-four signs. Mr. Kubatzke explained the number of poles with banners would stay the same and they would reuse the banners that were made originally for the downtown campus that were updated for use at this campus. The current banners are really small and ripped. The new banners would make more of a statement and the artwork on the banners was designed to have to banners next to each other on a pole.

Commissioner Carrillo stated she works for MATC and the department that created the signs and would be abstaining from the vote.

Alderman Michalski moved that the Plan Commission approve the sign plan for MATC located at 6665 S. Howell Avenue.

Commissioner Correll seconds. Roll call, all vote aye (Commissioner Carrillo abstained). The motion to approve carries.

Plan Review – NDT Specialists
7365 S. Howell Avenue
Tax Key No.: 765-9017

Mr. Seymour explained to the Commission the applicant was requesting approval for the construction of a 1,800 square-foot accessory building located on the southwest side of the property located at 7365 S. Howell Avenue. The building will be a natural grey color constructed out of decorative split face concrete block with two bay doors and a service door on the east elevation. The roof of the building will be a medium blue colored standing seam steel roof. There are no windows proposed for this building since the purpose of the building is for the storage of vehicles and maintenance equipment. The building meets all of the height, setback, and lot coverage requirements of the M-1, Manufacturing Zoning District.

Mayor Scaffidi questioned if there were any concerns from the Fire Department. Assistant Fire Chief Mike Kressuk explained based on the current plan and the stated use of the facility 1800 square feet does not necessitate a fire sprinkler. They do not have any concerns with the building as described. If it was connected to the addition it would change things.

Mr. Larry Schneider Jr NDT, showed the Commission the color sample for the medium blue and an example of the proposed block.

Mr. Seymour questioned the accent color on the existing building. Mr. Schneider stated it was currently all gray with a black accent on the overhangs. Mr. Seymour questioned he reason for the blue. Mr. Schneider explained it was chosen because a lot of the buildings in the area have the blue accents and they figured it would match the area.

Commissioner Chandler questioned if they would be changing any parking. Mr. Schneider stated they would not be changing any parking at this time.

Commissioner Johnston questioned if the drain in the garage from the original proposal has been removed. Mr. Schneider stated there was no drain.

Alderman Bukiewicz questioned if the proposed gutters on the building would need to connect to the storm sewer laterals. Commissioner Johnston stated they would not need to connect. Alderman Bukiewicz questioned if they would be infringing on anyone going towards First Street with the drainage. Commissioner Johnston stated it would drain off to an existing wetland that was back there that the detention pond would drain to.

Commissioner Chandler questioned if the building would require any HVAC. Mr. Schneider stated the building would not be heated or air conditioned.

Commissioner Correll moved that the Plan Commission approve the site and building plans for the property at 7365 S. Howell Avenue, subject to all building and fire codes being met.

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

**Plan Review – Aldi Inc.
9342, 9440 & 9210 S. 13th Street
Tax Key Nos.: 876-9995, 876-9996 & 876-9997-002**

Mr. Seymour explained to the Commission at the May 14, 2013 meeting, the commission approved the site, building, and landscaping plans for Aldi Inc. for three additions to the existing facility located at 9342 S. 13th Street. Since that time, the applicant has made modifications to the site plan. At this time the applicant is adding a 70-stall parking lot located near the office area with a small stormwater pond instead of a rain garden.

Commissioner Chandler questioned the change from the rain garden to the stormwater pond. Ms. Carrie Ann Hewitt Jahnke & Jahnke for Aldi, explained the rain garden was proposed when they were just looking at the office addition and now with the additional square footage of the parking lot the pond would address more of the runoff and will help with the sediment for stormwater quantity and stormwater quality.

Commissioner Chandler questioned the addition of 70 parking spaces. Mr. Hal Weiss with Graycor Construction explained it was a request by Aldi Corporate for the additional parking. They have a standard amount of stall they want to see on all of their new buildings.

Commissioner Siefert questioned if there was a road going in connecting on the north side connecting 13th Street. Mr. Seymour explained there was a proposed construction road to service construction and there was some speculation it might turn into a permanent road, although it was not agreed upon. Mr. Graycor stated it was not going to be a permanent road but purely for use during construction.

Commissioner Michalski moved that the Plan Commission approve the site plan for the Aldi addition at 9342 S. 13th Street.

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

**Rezone – City of Oak Creek and One West Drexel LLC
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 Commission was presented with the initial draft of the general development and regulating plan for the Drexel

Town Square Mixed Use Planned Development District. Having an opportunity to review that, the Commission was also give the opportunity to ask questions and further review it at their meeting of May 28. Staff did receive some comments and questions which were addressed. At this time they will give the opportunity for Commissioners to ask some questions if they did not get the answers that they needed or go over specific sections of the plan page by page to address the changes that were made since the initial document.

Mayor Scaffidi suggested going through the document page by page and addressing questions as they come arise.

Mr. Seymour began by explaining one of the things the Commissioners would see throughout the document was at the time of the initial draft there was some question as to the nomenclature that was being used for the zoning request and were as in some of the earlier drafts it was treated as a PUD overlay district. On the advice of legal counsel it was determined it was a separate based zoning district the Drexel Town Square Mixed Use Planned Development District. The text in the regulating plan reflects that and they will see a lot of the acronym DTSMUPDD as Drexel Town Square Mixed Use Planned Development District.

As you go through the document you will notice each of the figures has two different alternatives, figure 1a shows what is the alternate a access point onto Howell Avenue which is north of Susan Drive and there is an alternate figure that shows the access point at Susan Drive. That is really reflective of the recommendations that are currently being made by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation in their review and approval of the traffic impact analysis for this development. Rather than waiting for that decision which is going to be handed down in late June it was decided that to represent the first generation development proposal and really all of the exhibits as part of the PUD in terms of two different development schemes with the only difference being the location and representation of the intersection at Howell Avenue.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned “with the written consent of the property owner” on page 2, the second paragraph. He understands if they talk about making changes and they agree with them they haven’t given the Commission written consent yet do they get something after the fact? Mr. Seymour explained it was put in the document recognizing that there may be situations where there might be leases on the properties that for the site plans and the building elevations to change they don’t want the lessee being the one making the submittals they want the property owner to be the one making the submittals.

Commissioner Dickmann if there would be commercial buildings underneath the apartments. Mr. Seymour explained it was always anticipated that some of the buildings along 6th Street may have some ground level or free standing retail that really catered towards the residential portion of the development such as a coffee shop or small restaurant. There will be nothing to the scale of the mixed use development or the perimeter commercial that is further to the east. Commissioner Dickmann expressed concern with the parking for the apartments because they do talk about the retail establishment on the first floor would have outside parking in the back. If they are talking about underground parking just for the building that might be pretty expensive. Mr. Seymour stated they are talking about developing underground parking to serve the apartment units. There would be some surface parking as well to supplement and for visitor parking but each of those buildings as it is proposed right now in the first generation development proposal will have underground parking.

Mr. Seymour pointed out on page 3 where they provide a definition for Large Format Retail building. The other addition speaks to the internal access system and that they are proposing and encouraging interior access roads and cross access easements so that they don't force people out to the arterial streets if they are traveling between properties within Drexel Town Square.

Page 6 is driven by some of the demand they are seeing from the marketing end. Throughout this they have been especially sensitive to the automotive oriented uses and in particular drive-throughs and how they impact Drexel Town Square. In fact there were some statements about whether or not they would even allow drive-through uses in Drexel Town Square. What is being presented is in response to what they are seeing in the market that some of the main street businesses such as a coffee shop for example want some type of drive up access for their customers. It would not be a drive-through in the traditional sense where you see the big ordering banner and the microphone and the speakers but an opportunity to capture some of the drive up traffic through a window, similar to what you see at a typical coffee shop. While they are not entirely certain that is going to work out with the site plan while they have said they will make allowances for that as part of this regulating document. They have had their architect develop a series of recommendations and guidelines for how in effect that would be treated if they did get a proposal. Recognizing right now there is no proposal or a site plan that shows a drive up window as part of the main street commercial they wanted to achieve maximum flexibility that they could allow those through their marketing provided that the drive up window would conform to the guidelines that were being established for drive up windows in the main street mixed use district.

Commissioner Johnston questioned on page 5 the approximate parking supply and demand for users and employees. He questioned how it was going to work if someone comes forward with a building are they going to look at the number of parking stalls. Mr. Seymour explained that a parking demand analysis would need to be provided at the time of site plan approval. He further reiterated that the Plan Commission is not abrogating its ability to review site and building plans as has been suggested in some earlier correspondence. Plan Commission is and will be responsible for approving every site and building plan for everything that takes place within this development. As part of that the applicant for each development proposal has to generate and provide a parking demand study to demonstrate that the combination of off street parking and on street parking is capable of addressing those needs. This is more of an urban form and is not a suburban development, so we don't have the parking minimums and encouraging the big parking lots that you will see in a typical suburban development. That is a very important distinguishing characteristic between this development and a lot of the other things that have been seen in Oak Creek. The parking will be substantially less in many cases than what the code requires for similar sized commercial developments. Recognizing the unique form of this development, the interactive nature of this development in terms of the shared parking areas and the mix of uses and the presence of the residential, they are approaching it in a slightly different manner in that they are asking the applicant in each proposal to demonstrate to the Commission that the parking that is being provided is adequate to provide for the needs of that business. Commissioner Johnston stated according to the table you would need 310-430 parking spaces the document says are the approximate parking supply and demand needs for the proposed city hall/library building. Mr. Seymour explained when you look at the detailed site and building plans for the city hall and library they will provide and analysis of what they feel will be the appropriate parking for that civic building and will be included as part of that site plan submittal.

Commissioner Johnston questioned if the table made sense as it was shown if they are only showing 130 parking stalls. Mr. Seymour explained they are not reviewing the site plan for the building at this time. Some of the earlier iterations have shown some limited parking but there is room on the site to develop the appropriate amount of parking, whatever that may be. Commissioner Johnston just used the city hall example because that was the one they were familiar with and they don't know what the other uses are going to be, they are all going to come in with their own uses and parking requirements. The table is a pie in the sky of what they would like to see out there but it is not going to match what they are coming through in here for the ultimate development.

Alderman Michalski questioned the difference between a drive through and a drive up. Mr. Seymour explained there was a drive up window approved on a Dunkin Donuts on the Qdoba building. There was a drive up approve for the Tazino's building and there are the capabilities of doing that as opposed to a drive through which is your typical McDonald's with a double ordering station menu boards, dedicated lanes which are much more impactful in terms of the visual impact as well as the traffic impacts. Mr. Seymour explained on the Qdoba building there was actually a little road that winds along the Howell Avenue side that was put in for that purpose.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned how an ATM with a bank would be classified. Mr. Seymour explained in those situations you would potentially have larger drive throughs with those types of facilities and would be more properly located not on Main Street but perhaps in some of the perimeter areas.

Commissioner Johnston expressed concern with the orientation of the drive up lanes are going to work when you can't access off of Drexel or Main Street. There are two sides of the building to use and without seeing what the building layouts are going to be, how do they propose to get a drive through in there that doesn't impact the adjacent businesses? Mr. Seymour stated the responsibility is on the applicant to demonstrate to the Plan Commission when they review the site and building plans for the development it is their obligation to demonstrate that what they are proposing meets those requirements. There is no proposal at this time for a drive up or drive through for those buildings. It is to allow flexibility in the marketing such that if there was a user that needed that type of facility and could demonstrate that it meets those requirements they would be permitted.

Commissioner Correll agreed he did not see how it would in this development. He does not know what the value is to opening up to that.

Alderman Bukiewicz commented they should keep in mind they are putting these rules in and nobody is exactly sure what is going there. This is a fluid plan and can change. This is adding flexibility to the plan and they are not being so rigid as to deter development.

Commissioner Chandler questioned if there was a way to add something to the parking to identify minimum and maximum parking. Mr. Seymour explained they could but the way it is structured they would look at the relationship between all of the different multiple uses in the development and how that affects the parking demand for any particular development gives you the ability to right-size the parking. You would not have that ability if you add minimums and maximums. They do not want to over park the development but it will fall into place when the Commission reviews the site and building plans.

Mayor Scaffidi clarified as the site gets developed and they review buildings the Plan Commission has the ability to right-size the parking lots and minimums and maximums for each of the developments. Mr. Seymour confirmed that was the case.

Commissioner Chandler commented it would leave them open to having too much parking. Mr. Seymour stated that if the Plan Commission wants to include language setting minimums and maximums he would be happy to put those in the document. Commissioner Correll commented it sounded as if they wanted to keep it as general as they can to open up the marketing concerns. He thinks there have been public concerns voiced that it has been general and changed already. He expressed concern for it not being marketed and then they throw four drive throughs on every corner and that is not going to be what the vision was also. So, he understands keeping it general from a marketing stand point they don't know what is going to be there but if they don't eliminate some of the basic things that kept the vision what it was and still is he thinks they are missing the boat.

Mayor Scaffidi moved on to page 7 Landscape, Streetscape, Community Places, Signage and Lighting. Mr. Seymour noted this section, appendix A shows a series of best management practices for sustainability for the Drexel Town Square Development. This document which was prepared on behalf of the City as part of the grant effort that is being participated in by the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District really provides a palette of different options for the City and the developers within Drexel Town Square to meet some of those sustainability objectives with respect to stormwater and other environmental standards. It is not a binding document which says that you must do on this site. For instance there are bio swales in there and they will go through those when we get to that point but it provides a series of options for the developers and for the City to consider to achieve those sustainability goals, such as the 80% removal of suspended solids. There are a number of ways you can go about doing that but that is the ultimate goal of the development through bio swales, permeable pavers and a number of other things. They have a goal and there are a number of ways in which they can reach that. Rather than being prescriptive as far as what you must do on any given site to meet that goal they give them a palette to work with.

Moving on to pages 8 and 9.

Alderman Bukiewicz back to page 7 referred to the LED or Metal Halide lights. It was great giving everyone a choice but it would not be very uniform if they were using two types of lights. It would be nice to see all the same style type on at least the outside lights being the same style type heads. He would encourage the LED even though it is the most expensive option.

Commissioner Dickmann page 9 Building Facades. He commented they reduced some of the figures on Commercial from 50% to 40% and so on. He questioned why the figures were changed. Mr. Seymour explained after consulting with some of their marketing people they felt some of the glazing requirements were pretty restrictive. Recognizing that some of the glazing requirements were likely more than they would have gotten under the existing code which they really don't have any glazing requirement there. They still will have that 75% of the visible perimeter of the buildings must be comprised of glass, brick or decorative masonry. This just takes it a step further and says of that 40% of the building has to meet that glazing requirement. It varies depending where on the site the building is located. They will talk about the special condition buildings that are on the site at entrances to the development that will have some more restrictive standards. Commissioner Dickmann commented they have never had anything about the glazing before. Mr. Seymour commented other than to say glass was a recognized acceptable material, they have never had a minimum glazing requirement.

Commissioner Chandler questioned the exceptions in the Building Facades section for building materials and why it was added for large format retail. Mr. Seymour explained one of the things in looking specifically at the first generation proposals for the large format retail is that it would be difficult to provide a formula that would work given the scale of the building. Rather it was felt that if we saw the building elevations which we felt were appropriate that they would be adhering to those rather than trying to come up with a building façade that may or may not work for that large format retailer. Commissioner Chandler questioned if they weren't just identifying a guideline until they come forward. She expressed concern for the exception considering they don't know yet what it looks like. Mr. Seymour explained the presumption was being a first generation development proposal, the façade was reflective of the type of architecture they were looking to have for the large format retailer. If it is not they would like to hear those comments. Commissioner Chandler questioned if the proposal would not meet the requirements or were they making the assumption that it may not meet the requirement. Mr. Seymour explained it wouldn't have met the requirement but it is being proposed that the large format retailer not be held to the same standards that you would be holding the perimeter outlot commercial buildings. Commissioner Chandler questioned why. At the last meeting the question came up would the standards be the same regardless of the large buildings or not and the answer was yes, everyone would be under the same standard but it seems to have changed. Mr. Seymour commented he doesn't know that it has ever changed. If you would apply those glazing standards to the frontages of the large format retailer given scale and the size of the building it may not look or provide the same aesthetics and the scale that you would get if you were looking at what you have here. Our position in looking at this is to find a building that you like for a large format retailer recognizing that it is different than building a 3,000 square foot building. There are standards out there it would be very difficult to migrate those standards from a smaller building to a large building. Being the first generation development proposal this is something that is being proposed and has been vetted through the Common Council and the Plan Commission through earlier review process. Certainly nothing that has been approved. It has been run through the other first generation plans and at this point the way it is written they would make the presumption that this first generation development proposal would be acceptable to the Plan Commission. Commissioner Chandler expressed concern for assuming that one this is acceptable to everyone and we are putting it as the standard. It seems that we are moving further ahead with the large box versus the others and she just wants to make sure that they are sending the message to everyone that they are being consistent regardless of the business coming in. Mr. Seymour commented consistency is not there when you look at the architectural standards for a 190,000 square foot building versus a 3,000 square foot building. That is why they are calling it out and if the Plan Commission and owner feel this is an appropriate architectural style for a large format retailer at Drexel Town Square it presumed to be acceptable. Commissioner Chandler recommended removing the exception for the large format retailer as well as the exception in the Materials section so they are not once again bound to specification when they don't know what the final look is going to be. The pictures they see are just examples and is not what everything will look like.

Commissioner Carrillo agrees and feels they have been told the plan pertains to everyone and no one will be singled out and now in red it gives exceptions to the large format retailer. She would like to take the exceptions out and when they come forward with the plans these will be the rules they would try to adhere to and then they can accept the changes. She does not want to give an exception right off the bat. Mr. Seymour explained they can certainly defer to the Plan Commission and ultimately the Common Council on that issue. There is a difference between and 180,000 square foot building and a 3,000 square foot building in terms of when

you hold 40% of the 190,000 square foot building is going to be a lot of glazing. He is not sure that is a look that they would be satisfied with for the large format retailer.

Alderman Michalski commented he understood the problems with the exception being granted without even knowing what is going to be there. He questioned the size of the city hall/library complex. Mr. Seymour stated it was approximately 85,000 square feet. Alderman Michalski commented that was a very large building and they were allowing 40% glazing on that building. He would think that would be the bar they are going to have for everything in there. He is not sure he would want others to have 20% or 10% and would like to see it all closer to the 40%.

Commissioner Correll commented they are doing compromising before they are even seeing something and he wished they maintained the standards a little bit longer before they start making exceptions.

Alderman Bukiewicz suggested taking into account any large format retailer in the area. He suggested picturing Woodman's with two sides of the building being glass. Commissioner Chandler commented the location is different so you can't compare. Alderman Bukiewicz was not discussing location but the building itself and how it would look with two sides of glazing. He suggested thinking about the flexibility they could have. Some of the merchants are just not setup to have so much glass. Ultimately the Plan Commission is going to review it so they will get another kick at the cat either way.

Alderman Michalski commented if they set the bar at 40% and a developer comes in and says they want to build a facility here the onus is then on the building owner as to why it shouldn't be 40% and give the Plan Commission and the Council the ability to make a change at that time as opposed to allowing a lesser standard right now. If the developer comes in and explains why he can only have one window and why it works that way and it looks good he doesn't see a problem.

Mr. Seymour commented the function of the building in many cases does not lend itself to street level glazing. Many different stores of this size some of the operations held immediately along those front walls may not be suitable for glazing.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned Signage. Pole signs, billboard style, wall mount, and roof mounted signs are not allowed without the special permission from the City and the OWD. He questioned who the City was in that sentence. Mr. Seymour explained the City was the Plan Commission.

Mr. Seymour noted on the table on page 12 the earlier version just showed under the large format retail that essentially large format retailers were permitted uses. It has been changed in the sense that they wanted it to be more reflective of the types of activities that take place within the large format retailer. You will see things that are permitted such as appliances, bakeries, book or stationary, etc. It is more descriptive of the types of activities that are actually taking place in there rather than just lumping them in and saying large format retail stores. As part of this there may be some changes that take place between this public hearing draft and the public hearing. One of those would be changing the use table for the large format retail to include the following uses: building supply stores, currency exchanges, hardware stores, printing services and video sales and rentals as permitted use in the large format district reflective of the things that typically happen in a large format retail store.

Commissioner Johnston questioned Land Use Regulations. He questioned if the use for massages should be added as a permitted use in the case of a spa or similar operations. Mr. Seymour stated it was something they would want to include in there in his opinion.

Commissioner Dickmann commented times are constantly changing and there are new businesses and activities all the time and everything else is prohibited except what is listed. Somehow this list is going to have to be updated periodically, whose function is that? Mr. Seymour stated it would be the function of the City and the Plan Commission would have a role in that process.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned if the area on the drawings marked fuel center was a proposed gas station. Mr. Seymour explained some of the earlier renderings did show a fuel center on one of the Meijer outlots which varies according to which access point is selected. After considerable discussion with Meijer there was no agreement at this point on the orientation and/or architecture of that building. So, rather than include that on the first generation development proposal which would have basically said it was acceptable they placed it with just the nomenclature of fuel center and that fuel center would have to meet the architectural standards of the perimeter outlot commercial buildings. They did not feel that the initial proposal for the fueling center met those standards and that is why they had the site plan removed from the first generation development proposal. That is something that will have to come back before the Plan Commission for detailed site and building plan approval. As it is written right now will be required to meet the standards of the perimeter outlot commercial buildings.

Alderman Bukiewicz questioned if there were going to be any charging stations being put in for electric cars. Mr. Seymour stated the initial site plan and the initial first generation development proposal does not but certainly it is a function that they feel would fit in with Drexel Town Square there is just not an advanced enough proposal to include at this point and time. Alderman Bukiewicz questioned if the plan was flexible enough to include that if a green business came in and would like to provide that for their customers. Mr. Seymour stated certainly electrical charging would be fine and could be incorporated pretty easily into any of the site plans.

Commissioner Chandler questioned what was meant by the building didn't fit the location when referring to the fuel center. Mr. Seymour explained it had to do with the orientation of the gas pumps and canopies.

Mayor Scaffidi highlighted the fact the northern edge of the development will continue the Oak Leaf Trail. Mr. Seymour also pointed out there would be bike lane accommodations on 6th Street and part of the BMPs would be the provision of permanent bike racks.

Commissioner Siepert commented the fire protection beyond six stories would run into some challenges for the fire department. Assistant Fire Chief Mike Kressuk explained the height of a structure can create some challenges. In the City of Oak Creek if you look at WE Energies it is essentially a twenty-six story building. A completely different make up of what you are looking at in this particular case but it is not unheard of to have that size structure within the community. It is less his role to dictate to the Commission what size structure you should allow but rather just let them know the size structure they do allow he needs to provide fire protection for and would find a way to do that.

Commissioner Siepert pointed out the ladder truck only goes one hundred feet, but if you put it on an angle you don't get that full one hundred feet. A.C. Kressuk stated that was correct. It all depends on access points around the structure and the location of the structure on a particular

site. Without any concrete plans it is almost impossible at this point to tell you what the access to those structures would be and how they would accomplish that. Mr. Seymour pointed out the first generation proposal does include a paved access around the entire portion of the multi-family residential development which would be the most likely candidate for the increased density and height. Mayor Scaffidi explained whether it is six stories or eight stories a new modern six or eight story building is going to have better fire protection than most of the homes in Oak Creek that are thirty and forty years old. Because they are up to date and to the newest standards and they are water protected. We are not going to have three story building for the rest of their lives. Mr. Seymour pointed out the first generation proposal does not go that high.

Commissioner Chandler questioned what the accessory building height was exactly. Mr. Seymour explained it was for service buildings or it may be for maintenance vehicles for fleet vehicles, something that was not part of the main building.

Commissioner Chandler questioned why the layout of building "J" changed on the site plans. Mr. Seymour explained the layout of "J" would change depending on where it was in relation to the access drive.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned why there was only shared parking in the one corner of the site. Mr. Seymour explained it was merely indicative of a location where it could happen. It does not have the same level of enforcement as the general development is concerned.

Commissioner Chandler questioned if there was going to be a bus route throughout the whole development. Mr. Seymour explained this type of urban development allows for and in many cases encourages transit options, and not having those options right now in Oak Creek one of the things for the future as they consider how they as a community relate to rest of the metropolitan area would certainly encourage the right kind of transit to serve not only the businesses and residents in Oak Creek such as Drexel Town Square, Caterpillar, some of the major employers. The other things that have been talked about as finding what are the appropriate types of mass transit options are for our community. It is just not doing things that would not preclude those things from happening in the future. Commissioner Chandler clarified that throughout the town square they could have a bus route? Mr. Seymour confirmed the roadways within the development are sized appropriately in many cases for busses and or larger. Commissioner Chandler expressed concern for the bus route being on the major streets in the town square. She believes having a bus route is a good idea but expressed concern for busses going through the actual town square.

Commissioner Chandler questioned if the shared vehicle use was for a park and ride. Mr. Seymour explained this was more of an option that was out there for much more dense urban centers was a car share program and was not designed as a park and ride and would not be consistent with what they are trying to promote there.

Commissioner Chandler questioned what section they are considering the open space area as green space. Mr. Seymour explained the main portion would be the park and environmental preserve in the southeast corner as well as the town square and there are private areas that have substantial areas of green space including the corridor around the ring road which would be devoted towards some type of best management practice for stormwater and should have substantial greenspace as well.

Commissioner Dickmann expressed concern for allowing the easel signs as temporary signs.

Commissioner Chandler questioned if neon was a normal allowable type of signage for other districts. Mr. Seymour explained as it was written right now neon would not be permitted as a primary component of the sign but would be permitted as an accent material.

Commissioner Chandler challenged allowing flags because they do not allow them anywhere else within the City at this time.

Commissioner Correll questioned if they didn't just get rid of flags. Mr. Seymour explained this would become their primary signage. The flag sign does not necessarily need to be fabric, it could be metallic or some sort of rigid material. Commissioner Carrillo would love to leave it in and see what businesses propose. She feels it is a great way to use signage up high so it can be seen from a distance. They are using a ton of different materials which are gorgeous. It states flags but it is not necessarily the feather flags in the ground. This can be a great way to sign a building.

Commissioner Chandler questioned the quantity and scale of the signs. Per the stipulation it identifies that any business can have up to five signs. She recommends adding something based on square footage because it may be too much for a smaller building or not enough for a larger building. Mr. Seymour explained so much of how they currently regulate signs is based on this rigid standard of "x" square feet and he feels the goal here is to regulate it based on the building scale of the business and how it looks. Commissioner Chandler agrees and clarified she did not mean the square footage of the sign but rather of the building. They do not want a smaller building having possibly four signs. Mr. Seymour explained it does restrict it based on the number of entry facades and based on the linear feet of the entry façade.

Commissioner Carrillo commented unlike the rest of the City they will look at every sign and every sign proposal.

Commissioner Chandler requested more information on what it means to have a balance of parallel and perpendicular signage. Mr. Seymour explained when you are looking at some of the inline businesses on Main Street they will have that visual interest so that it is just not one style of signage. The guidelines came through the project architect to provide visual interest at that street at different levels.

Commissioner Chandler questioned materials why they were limited to six. Mr. Seymour explained those were more recommendations with the exception of painted signs, box signs and some of the neon that they talked about. The idea is high quality signage materials.

Commissioner Chandler questioned how they would identify colors that they did not want to see. Mr. Seymour stated colors are very tricky and they have a visual impact on the entire street and development. It is a tricky thing to try and regulate colors. Quite frankly a lot of that will be on the property owners as the management people in charge of approving on their end what is going to be built in Drexel Town Square that is where they are going to rely on One West Drexel to a certain degree.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned if they could apply the current sign standards for temporary signs. Mr. Seymour stated that was the case.

Commissioner Chandler questioned if for special signage if they were going to have anything identified for activities that may occur in the recreational space. Mr. Seymour explained video and LED signs were not allowed within the development with the exception of the three

development monument signs which would be at the main entrances to the development which may involve some video component for advertising what is happening at the town square or library and city hall.

Mr. Seymour discussed the special conditions as it relates to the fuel center signage. Each business in the perimeter commercial outlots will have the opportunity to have one ground monument along the main street whether that is Drexel or Howell Avenue. They will also have the ability to have a ground monument sign along the interior ring road which is also public street. Having said that, those standards for signage when applied to a fueling center are probably a little bit low. As far as that is concerned in working with the developer working on signage that is appropriate for the fueling center location and conveying the information that they need to convey at the same time kind of meeting what they are trying to accomplish with respect a relatively uniform standards for signage for the commercial outlots. Meijer had proposed a much taller sign which is thirteen feet in height with a 104 square feet of sign area. To put that into perspective the current standard for ground signs is 100 square feet per side and a maximum of ten feet high. The other monument signs in Drexel Town Square are going to be a maximum of eight feet high. They wanted to maintain the uniformity throughout the commercial outlots. In working with Meijer's they have come up with a proposed standard for the fuel station with a maximum of 104 square feet per side but retaining the eight feet height limit. That would mean you would have the gas prices next to in a horizontal fashion the fuel station logo. It would not be abnormally tall, it would be bigger than some of the other ground monument signage but it is linear and that is something they can live with as far as staff is concerned.

Commissioner Johnston expressed concern with the development monument signs and the large size of them. It is just another monument sign that has the retailers name on it. He would rather see something distinctive for Drexel Town Square as a smaller monument sign and not putting all of the retailers out there again. Meijer as an example will probably have two signs on their building and signs on the gas station and the message board sign with their gas prices. It seems extreme to have two more signs out there that are going to have their name on it also. Everybody wants to have signs, he understands but it adds clutter to the development and he thinks it should be more distinct for Drexel Town Square. The gateway sign is a great example and is something unique that will drive people to the site rather than just a bunch of names. Mr. Seymour explained there is a really tricky balance providing the level of way finding and the ability for retailers to advertise their presence. They felt as a development team that having unique and architecturally designed monument signs for the development monuments was preferable to having larger monument signs for each of the individual businesses. This was a way of providing potential retailers the exposure that they need for the traffic that is coming in off of Howell Avenue and/or Drexel Avenue. Without really increasing the number of signs so that each one had their own separate larger sign. Recognizing that each one of them would have that smaller ground sign which is about fifty square feet per side. It is a tricky balance, but the philosophy was by providing consolidation onto an architecturally designed sign was preferable to having a multitude of smaller signs. Commissioner Johnston questioned how many signs off of the building did Woodman's have? Mr. Seymour stated one for the gas station. Commissioner Johnston pointed out people could still find Woodman's without the additional signs. Mr. Seymour pointed out the example of Southridge and the type of architectural monument signs that they have put in place at the entrances. It is a different example but it gives exposure without being garish and without increasing the number of signs. It is a similar situation in respect to the perimeter commercial and the types of buildings that you have. He can't argue that it is not a big sign and that it is not providing a means of advertising but it is striking that balance that is going to be important.

Commissioner Correll agreed it was somewhat complicated depending on all the tenants you would get a lot of different answers but he agrees with Commissioner Johnston that he doesn't know with this type of development the sign would be drawing anyone there. Meijer's with the size alone would be fine and the smaller buildings, would you find it off of that sign. It looks like a lot of clutter. A nice entrance may esthetically fit what they are trying to accomplish and eliminate that along with the fact you are going to be relatively flexible with the interior signage. Mr. Seymour felt it would come into play along Drexel where you have businesses on the interior that you want to be able to let people know that this is a place where you want to be turning into and accessing the development, Howell Avenue from that perspective as well. Recognizing that there are going to be businesses that are going to be quite interior of the development which won't have that exposure to the street. Commissioner Correll pointed out he is hoping that the development is unique and interesting enough to get people into it.

Alderman Michalski commented if he goes out for dinner in the Third Ward he does not drive past a monument sign. There is a branding element for the Third Ward that some of the businesses who are going to be down there are even going to be at Drexel Town Square. We spend time trying to get branding throughout the City and this is one place where Drexel Town Square should be a brand of its own.

Commissioner Carrillo commented she like the larger monument sign. To know that all of these larger businesses are located within the Drexel Town Square would draw people into the development. She likes the idea of a large monument sign versus many little ones along the edge. It looks classic and would tie into the design. Commissioner Correll pointed out they are giving businesses the smaller monument signs as well.

Alderman Bukiewicz commented for the Greendale downtown they put up the arched sign and it draws you into the downtown to find out what businesses are located within the downtown. He agrees there needs to be some signage located at Drexel Avenue to indicate where to turn in whether it is at Sixth Street or Main Street. He also likes the idea of putting them in the boulevards but not quite as high to direct people towards the businesses. Mr. Seymour explained one of the things they need to consider as well is businesses need to be supplied and they need to direct people making deliveries. They want it to be pretty obvious for the first time user pulling into Drexel Town Square where you need to enter for a specific business or delivery.

Commissioner Dickmann commented he would like to see the signs be classy saying this is the Drexel Town Square and count on directional signs within the development and the smaller monument signs.

Commissioner Correll gave the example of Bay Shore. They park and wander around looking at the different stores. He doesn't see a monument sign at all.

Commissioner Chandler recommended removing Section F because it was specific for the large business. Mr. Seymour appreciated the comment, but explained even with the current sign code they have seen where that has caused and could cause some potential problems on buildings of scale. Specifically what happened on some of the Pick n Save buildings and the Petco and TJMaxx. The standards which are pretty large really did not take into account the scale of the building or the type or architecture or the scale of the architecture. Mayor Scaffidi commented removing "F" removes their flexibility because you are saying there can't be any special conditions. Commissioner Chandler understood the differences due to size but they

have sections in the document about placement and orientation, about materials and color which should be the standard for all businesses. Maybe several of these items do apply due to the scale of the building but they want to make sure they are setting a standard for all of the businesses and not an exception for just one or the large format business that will be coming.

Mayor Scaffidi commented they should always have the ability to be flexible and the difference is significant between the large format and some of the smaller buildings. You want to have the ability to make that decision separately on that single building. To take away "F" takes away any consideration of that. Commissioner Chandler did agree with some of that, but with materials and color why would they need an exception for materials and color. Mayor Scaffidi questioned if a developer came before the Commission and wowed them with their design and it was something unique that maybe hadn't been done before, but because the standards state you don't except that material you would be throwing that out. Commissioner Chandler explained if it was an exception they could just prove why it was a good thing and they will go with it. Mayor Scaffidi commented that was what "F" was trying to do. There are special conditions and in this case it specifically talks about a large retailer but there are other examples. Mr. Seymour explained specifically to the point of materials and color it does say in terms of materials and colors it should be durable, three dimensional and easy to read. The color should complement the surrounding materials. Those are pretty consistent with the signage standards for the rest of the development. Commissioner Chandler questioned for the things that should be the same why were they putting in exceptions. They want to set a standard not put in exceptions for one business. Mr. Seymour pointed out in F4 Material and Color it states the standard of quality for materials and color remains the same for large-scale retailers as it is for all other retailers.

Mayor Scaffidi questioned if F4 made the point that a unique sign on a large format building could be something that they would except because it makes a statement, looks unique and is eye catching. Mr. Seymour explained "F" specifically goes to the look of the building in relation to its scale and its surroundings.

Commissioner Carrillo questioned if the statements just made would not apply to any sign in any part of the complex. Why would they pull large-format out when it could be covered with everything else. Mayor Scaffidi commented he thought they were pulling it out because of the size and scale of it. They were probably not going to look at every two foot sign in the development. If a large scale sign makes a statement with the building that would be the uniqueness of what this development will be. They will have buildings and signage that make statements that do things that they have never done before. He feels it is perfectly acceptable to accept some of the large-format stores to some of these arbitrary standards. They have made exceptions on every kind of sign in the City. Standards are great but they need to have some room for flexibility especially when you are talking about an anchor to one of the largest developments in southeastern Wisconsin.

Commissioner Chandler felt they were saying the same things just differently. Pending the business they may have certain requirements, corporate requirements, pending the size they may need more signs, larger signs etcetera. Her concern is that they are showing exceptions to the standard when her recommendation is if there some possibilities of differences they should include that in the standards such that the exception is not the large-format store but maybe the square footage of the store or size of the store. If they put that one statement at the beginning with everything then they wouldn't even need the exceptions because is all pending the standards set by the store, the size of the store, the details that may be specific to that store. They want to make sure they are setting a precedent not for everything at one store but a

standard for the area. Even though there will be exceptions to the rule pending the size. Maybe if they even put in each section pending the size of the store or pending the square footage of the store. Then that would give them the flexibility to do all of these things. Mr. Seymour reminded the Commissioner that it was in there where they made the definition of what a large-format retail store is in appendix B where they call it out that they treat signs a little bit differently for large format retail stores. Commissioner Chandler feels that covers everything that they are doing instead of showing a difference at the beginning of this. Going back to the prior meetings they discussed if there were going to be different standards for different stores and the answer was no. This is showing something different and she wants to make sure that they are consistent with their message for any business that comes in. Mr. Seymour felt the more appropriate reply would have been that the standards which were in each one of those districts would be consistent, not necessarily across districts.

Alderman Bukiewicz pointed out they keep saying lets be fair and lets loop it and get it all in one neat little basket. What they have done is actually done us a favor by carving this out. They have carved out the small commercial, the large commercial and there is consistency throughout. There are differences in these buildings and the businesses have different needs and different wants. Instead of saying let's put it all in one basket and sort it out case by case. They are doing us a huge favor, there is going to be large retailers in this development, which is what the demographics demanded. They outlying buildings are under 50,000 square foot retailers and they have sorted it out for us. The signage is going to be different based on the needs of the businesses. He thinks they did the Commissioner a huge favor by sorting it out like this for the Commission.

Alderman Michalski pointed out when he reads F4 it tells him that the standard of quality for the materials and the color remains the same for large-scale retailers as it does for other retailers. When he looks at F1 Types and Variations, he sees a large box anchor with at least three different types of signage on it that probably wouldn't fit on anything under 50,000 square feet and he thinks there is a lot of sense here. He agrees with Alderman Bukiewicz as to why they would want a larger building to have a little more ability to have different types of signage as opposed to some of the smaller ones that don't even have room for it. As long as the quality of the materials and the color and all the things are the same for everybody it works for him. He is going to honor that a larger building is going to need multiple types of signage as opposed to one or two.

Commissioner Dickmann agreed. The existing sign ordinance tried to cover everything in one ordinance and every meeting now we have a sign change coming in. This is a good way to handle things.

Commissioner Dickmann questioned appendix C- D Screening: All mechanical units must be at least partially screened from view. He questioned what partially meant and who would determine what is partial and what is not. Mr. Seymour stated the Plan Commission would determine what partially meant. Commissioner Dickmann requested it state they should be screened from view. Mr. Seymour stated he would give that to him.

Mayor Scaffidi questioned how they should deal with the minor points of contention that came up during the review. Mr. Seymour stated they would factor those in with the exception of some of the glazing requirements and the size of the development monument sign. Those are the two that he felt were did not have a consensus from the Commission and should be revisited. The other nomenclature they can make the changes without specifically calling them out in the motion. They will see a copy of that before the public hearing. Commissioner Dickmann

questioned the date of the public hearing. Mr. Seymour stated it would be Tuesday, June 18, 2013.

Commissioner Chandler questioned if they could go over the changes. Mr. Seymour stated there were not that many changes. He also pointed out they did not go over it necessarily but there is some terminology, and they need to recognize that there was a lot of input from different parties on this, in some places they refer to it as large-format retail, sometimes we refer to it as anchor retail. We will be making changes throughout the document to make that consistent.

Mr. Seymour stated on page 5 at the top it states the large parking area required for the DTS large format retail should be traversed with three major pedestrian walking systems...In this sentence we would just take out the number three. We recognize the BMPs offer a palette of different options which giving some of those sustainability measure they just didn't want to be specific to the exact number of those.

Page 10 he has Pole signs, billboard style wall-mounted and roof mounted signs are not allowed without special permission from the City and OWD. Change the City to "Plan Commission and One West Drexel".

Table 1. Land Use Regulations we will be adding massage and spa as a permitted use in the perimeter commercial and mixed use and large format retail sections.

Appendix B Quantity and Scale, under Primary, secondary, and tertiary signs are present. Signage has a consistent design. Temporary sign is for announcing opening date only. Mr. Seymour suggested: per current City Code and site the Code section.

Appendix C, D Screening, All mechanical units must be at least partially screened from view. Mr. Seymour suggested changing it to read: All mechanical units must be screened from view.

Mr. Seymour stated the two issues that warranted some revisiting would be the glazing exceptions for large format retail and the size of the development monument sign. He questioned if that was consistent with the Commissioner's understanding. Commissioners Dickmann and Correll didn't believe it was the size so much as what goes on the sign. Commissioner Correll questioned if they should vote on something like that. Alderman Bukiewicz did not feel comfortable voting on something that was not in front of him that he could not see. Mayor Scaffidi stated they were not going to vote.

Mr. Jerry Franke, One West Drexel, stated it was a lot easier to vote upon a concept or plan that was presented than it was to discuss an idea. They have heard them loud and clear as to what it seems like the majority of the Commission members want. He will tell them it seems consistent with he has envisioned for the development and what he will recommend to the One West Drexel. They don't envision a large list of store names on the monument signs. They do want it to reflect a classy development that draws people in. To sit here and try to describe an idea in two dimensions...it is going to be a lot easier for them to react to. Trust him the development team has heard their concerns loud and clear on the monument sign.

Alderman Michalski stated all he was looking for under the building facades was whether it would be fifty or forty...all he was looking to do was cross out the except for the large format retail district building. That is all he was looking to do in that section to keep everything consistent.

Commissioner Carrillo questioned if he would also like to cross out the exception in red on the Materials section. Mr. Seymour suggested that those were two different items. Quite honestly it was referring to the side of the building that was facing Woodman's loading docks. Alderman Michalski stated he was looking at on page nine the Building Facades. Commissioner Chandler stated she was suggesting the Facades and Materials to remove it from both. Commissioner Carrillo commented they could then review it when the plans came before the Commission.

Mayor Scaffidi clarified that they wanted to strike except for the large format retail district buildings. Commissioner Dickmann stated the alternatives they can handle also.

Mr. Seymour stated under this document the Commission retains their ability to approve modifications to architectural standards via $\frac{3}{4}$ majority, if that makes their decision any easier. Alderman Michalski stated it does make it easier and he is trying to make the process move along and if the other Commissioners disagree that "except for the large format retail buildings" should be struck he is willing to go along with whatever the majority wants. Mr. Seymour cautioned them strongly about removing the language about the backside or south elevation of the building. Commissioner Carrillo questioned why. Mr. Seymour explained that is the area that is not part of the visible perimeter of the building which backs up to the Woodman's loading dock. It would be loading dock against dock. Commissioner Carrillo questioned what it would mean if it were not in there. Mr. Seymour explained it would mean they would have to incorporate what they term as four sided architecture. The glazing standards would apply to that and some of the things in terms of the building entrances and materials. Alderman Bukiewicz commented with the function of that side of the building it would be unnecessary and just an added cost and questioned why they would put glass on a loading dock. Commissioner Carrillo explained they talked about when you are looking at the back of the library. Mayor Scaffidi commented when you are looking at the library it is completely visible from all sides. This would be a loading area facing Woodman's. Commissioner Carrillo stated there could be a building to the south of that and then that would see the back of that building. Mayor Scaffidi stated there could be not building to the south because Woodman's was south of that. Commissioner Chandler stated they have greenspace right there and that would see the back of the building. Mayor Scaffidi stated that would be west of the building. Mayor Scaffidi stated he did not see any point to dressing up the loading area on the back side of the building. Commissioner Chandler stated she was not saying it needed to be glass. Mayor Scaffidi explained if they remove the exception they would be saying it needed to be glass. Commissioner Chandler stated they would be putting an exception in there. Mayor Scaffidi stated it has been his opinion they should allow a large retailer some flexibility in how they design their building, how it looks and we still have some standards in these numbers. We would be giving them a little more flexibility to decide what their building looks like and he completely disagrees with dressing up the back side of a building that faces a loading dock. He will not buy the argument that you can see it from south of the town center. You might be able to see a sliver of it but the size and scale of Woodman's compared to the Meijer's building is not even close.

Alderman Bukiewicz commented even if they manage to get a building in the southwest portion the building would face west and they would not be looking back at Woodman's or Meijers. That would most likely be their loading dock or dumpsters. He personally would leave it the way it sits and bring it before the Commission case by case and deal with it then.

Mr. Seymour suggested getting some consensus and just talk about what appears to be the easier of the two which is the south façade of the large format retailer. Commissioner Correll

commented he thought there was some consensus that the façades should stay the same without the exception. So, he would propose that they talk about that.

Commissioner Correll suggested they vote on the façade. Mayor Scaffidi stated this was a vote to rezone the property and they were not having separate votes on all of these pieces. Commissioner Correll stated it was a recommendation with a change. Mayor Scaffidi stated he wanted it as written. Mayor Scaffidi asked for a consensus on the Building Facades: Windows and Glazing and the consensus of the Commissioners was to remove the exception for the large format retail district building.

Mayor Scaffidi also requested a consensus on the Materials for the large format building and four-sided architecture and the consensus was to leave in the exception for the south facing façade of the large format retail district building.

Mr. Seymour questioned how they would like to handle the monument sign. He suggested saying that the Plan Commission will be reviewing and approving the development monument sign and the Commission agreed that was acceptable.

Commissioner Michalski moved that the Plan Commission recommend to the Common Council that the properties at 7929 S. Howell Avenue and 300 W. Drexel be rezoned from M-1, Manufacturing to Drexel Town Square Mixed Use Planned Development (DTSMUPD) after a public hearing ad subject to the referenced regulating plan and the recommend changes.

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

Commissioner Carrillo moved to adjourn. Commissioner Chandler seconds. Roll call, all voted aye. The meeting adjourned at 8:19 p.m.