

MINUTES OF THE
OAK CREEK PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2015

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, Alderman Guzikowski, Commissioner Correll, Commissioner Siefert and Commissioner Chandler. Also present: Doug Seymour, Director of Community Development; Kari Papelbon, Planner; and Assistant Fire Chief Mike Kressuk.

Commissioner Dickmann moved to approve the October 13, 2015 meeting minutes. Alderman Guzikowski seconded. On roll call: all voted aye. Motion carried.

Commissioner Dickmann moved to approve the October 27, 2015 meeting minutes. Alderman Guzikowski seconded. On roll call: all voted aye, except for Commissioner Siefert, who abstained. Motion carried.

Significant Common Council Actions: Ms. Papelbon advised that the Common Council approved two Resolutions for Certified Survey Maps at 9005 S. 11th Avenue and 8380, 8400, and 8432 S. 27th Street.

**Public Hearing – Comprehensive Plan Amendment
2020 Vision – A Comprehensive Plan for the City of Oak Creek
Update the Planned Use category and Map 2 in the Comprehensive Plan from “Planned Industrial” to “Institutional” for the properties at 7502 and 7512 S. Howell Ave., and from “Planned Industrial” to “Planned Business” for the property at 7518 S. Howell Avenue.
Tax Key Nos. 781-9032, 781-9031, 781-9993**

Ms. Papelbon explained that the hearing is for two requests. The first was for Kelvin Schroeder (also known as South Shore Group) for the property at 7518 S. Howell with a request for “Planned Industrial” to “Planned Business” in anticipation of purchase for a multi-tenant retail/restaurant building which would be owner occupied and would mostly cater to the bridal industry at this point.

Ms. Papelbon explained that existing zoning in the area is diverse and includes business districts, manufacturing, a combination planned unit development, residential, institutional and park. Staff feels that this mix of uses in future development of general development along Howell Avenue are appropriate for the area. A change in the land use category does not preclude specific proposals from obtaining rezoning, conditional use or other local approvals. Any property development would have to come back to this commission.

Ms. Papelbon explained that the second request is for the Sikh Temple at the request of the City and that is to reflect the existing use of the properties for institutional purposes and that there are no additional development plans at this time. This is to make sure that all of our plans reflect the current and future use of the property that is to change it from “Planned Industrial” to “Institutional”.

Ms. Papelbon explained that the State of Wisconsin Smart Growth Law requires that all local land decisions after January 1, 2010 be consistent with the objectives, goals and policies contained within the Comprehensive Plan hence why these requests are before the Plan Commission this evening.

Doug Seymour, Director of Community Development read the public hearing notice and opened the hearing. Mayor Scaffidi called for public comment.

Dimity Grabowski, 9858 S. Deerpath Drive:

"I reside in the 5th District and my question is in regards to the Comprehensive Planned Map that when the Sikh Temple purchased those lands the understanding was with the area that they are looking at to put as institutional that the Comprehensive Land Plat and Map states that that would in fact be mixed use being business. So my question to this board is; are we going to take another area of land off the tax rolls and it's going to be institutional, is that correct?"

Mr. Seymour responded that there are two separate and distinct actions that are relating to the use of property. The first is the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and that was adopted back in 2001 or 2002 and it had a future land use map attached to which guides the Council in making future decisions and that shows this entire as 'Planned Industrial'. The second component is the Zoning Map; they are similar but not the same and that is an important distinction. While the Comprehensive Plan may call for one land use it is not infrequent that the zoning may be in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan and that's what we're trying to bring together. With respect to the current "Institutional" zoned property owned by the Sikh Temple; that is not changing. They have not asked for it to be changed, the zoning will remain the same. What is changing is the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, that's changing from "Planned Industrial" to "Institutional" to reflect the actual zoning that's in place. Zoning is not changing at all.

Dimity Grabowski asked if the property in the front is listed as Residential and that it is not zoned "Institutional" at this time.

Mr. Seymour responded that it is not, and again advised that this is not a zoning action.

Dimity Grabowski asked if the zoning action would come before the commission at some point to ask for institutional.

Mr. Seymour responded no, that it is anticipated, but he did not want to speak on behalf of the applicant, but the properties that are owned by the Sikh Temple are not part of any pending rezoning petition. Mr. Seymour advised that the property out in front which is actually impetus for this land use change request at some point in time may come back and request a commercial zoning which would then be consistent with the land zone plan. Mr. Seymour reiterated that there is no plan or proposal to rezone the front portion to "Institutional" at this point in time.

Mayor Scaffidi made a second call for comment.

Rosemarie Annonson, 3920 E. Ryan Road:

"My question is where is the tax? What do we tax on, the zoning?"

Mr. Seymour responded that the tax is not on zoning, it is on value.

Rosemarie Annonson replied that Institutional property is not taxed.

Mr. Seymour responded that there is no proposal to change any zoning this evening and second of all, the property would actually be the subject of a future rezoning petition is not being

proposed to be changed to “Institutional”. It will likely be proposed to be changed to a commercial zoning.

Rosemarie Annonson: “Why are we changing the Comprehensive Map to “Institutional” and then we’re creating a disparity; why aren’t we just going for what future use is going to be?”

Mr. Seymour explained that they are not creating a disparity, they are correcting a disparity.

Rosemarie Annonson: “Well aren’t you correcting one with another?”

Ms. Seymour responded no.

Rosemarie Annonson: “I just don’t get it, why are we going towards “Institutional”?”

Mayor Scaffidi advised that Mr. Seymour can only answer the question that is presented to him.

Mayor Scaffidi made the third and final call for comment. Mayor Scaffidi closed the public hearing.

**Comprehensive Plan Amendment
2020 Vision – A Comprehensive Plan for the City of Oak Creek
Update the Planned Use category and Map 2 in the Comprehensive Plan from “Planned Industrial” to “Institutional” for the properties at 7502 and 7512 S. Howell Ave., and from “Planned Industrial” to “Planned Business” for the property at 7518 S. Howell Avenue.
Tax Key Nos. 781-9032, 781-9031, 781-9993**

Commissioner Dickmann asked for clarification on the addresses and inquired which one would they be building on.

Ms. Papelbon responded that the “7518” property is the property that the Sikh Temple surrounds. The property that is proposed to have future development on it is the property that shows as “dots” on the map. Ms. Papelbon explained that the Sikh Temple property is only changing to reflect the fact that it is already an “Institutional” use is the area that is “hashed” on the map.

Alderman Bukiewicz reiterated that zoning is not being changed, the Comprehensive Plan is being changed from “Industrial” to “Institutional” and “Planned Business” so that one parcel is getting changed in there. The one with the dots is being changed. It’s that parcel where the residential home sits. So the zoning is not changing, the Comprehensive Plan is changing. We can all look at the fact there shouldn’t be a small factory sitting there on Howell Avenue. It doesn’t fit our plan. So for future planning it could be a business, it could be part of an institution. Just to make clear it’s going from “Industrial” to “Institutional” with those uses Doug so expressed.

Mr. Seymour stated that the use, zoning, on the Sikh Temple properties is not changing. The map that is adopted as part of the Future Land Use Plan is changing to reflect the zoning that’s in place. He stated that what is changing is the house in front which is 7518 S. Howell Avenue, from “Planned Industrial” to “Planned Business” which will allow them at some point in the future to come back before the City and apply for rezoning to a Commercial Zoning District.

Alderman Bukiewicz motioned that the Plan Commission adopts resolution 2015-03, amending the Comprehensive Plan and Planned Land Use map to reflect the change in land use from

Planned Industrial to Institutional for the properties at 7502 and 7512 S. Howell Ave., and from Planned Industrial to Planned Business for the property at 7518 S. Howell Ave. following a public hearing and adoption by the Common Council.

Commissioner Correll seconded. On roll call: all voted aye. Motion carried.

**Public Hearing – Comprehensive Plan Amendment
2020 Vision – A Comprehensive Plan for the City of Oak Creek
Update the Planned Land Use category and Map 2 in the Comprehensive Plan from
“Single Family Residential” to “Mixed Residential” for the properties at 7721 S.
Pennsylvania Ave., 2100 E. Drexel Ave., 2200 E. Drexel Ave., and 2280 E. Drexel Avenue.
Tax Key Nos. 779-9991-001, 779-9006, 779-9007, 779-9008**

Ms. Papelbon read the public hearing notice and opened the hearing. Mayor Scaffidi called for public comment.

Tony DeRoso, HSI Properties 18500 W. Corporate Drive Brookfield, Wisconsin, went through the specifics of the revised conceptual plan. (Plan Modifications were presented on the screens for all to view.)

Mayor Scaffidi placed a second call for public comment.

Christine D. Smith, 7739 S. Pennsylvania Avenue:

“Hello, thank you very much for allowing me the opportunity to speak. Beautiful new building first time in here, hard to find. My concerns with this are still mostly in the area of traffic and the density. If we do decide to change the Comprehensive Plan to Multi-Use, we’re going from approximately 32 to 35 units up to what did he say, 288 units, all of that traffic. Originally on the Comprehensive Plan there were three roads in and out of this area. Back through history with the Korean Church going in and all that one of the roads got removed. It was supposed to be put back on the map after the plans in 2009 fell through. That apparently didn’t happen but I would request that that become something that we look at instead of having the two remaining roads in and out that we consider adding a third road someplace in and out of this property. The density increase I think in the number of cars that would increase along with the density I think warrants at least a look at the number of ingress and egresses out of this property. The other thing I would ask; the last time we went through this with the Korean Church there was a stipulation where if their plans fell through after the zoning was changed and everything that it would revert back. And I am wondering if the same thing can happen here. If we change the Comprehensive Plan and their plans fall through; can we change it back to residential? I realize this is a little different because this is a change in the Comprehensive Plan versus just changing zoning but that would be another thing that I would request that we maybe take into consideration as we look at this. I guess one of my fears is that we change the Comprehensive Plan, now their plans fall through, now we’ve paved the way for sure that there’s going to be multi-family homes back here and what we all really want in our neighborhood and I do think I speak for at least the people on my road, Pennsylvania, we want single family homes there. So if this falls through we don’t just want it to be a bulldozer for multi-family.”

Steve Kurkowski, Alderman 1st District: “I stood up here at the last meeting and I didn’t agree with it because my main concern was the density of the project. The residents and my

constituents in the area were opposed to it also. I think I would be up here for twenty minutes or so if I wanted to say everything based on discussions I've had so I have to minimize that. I appreciate the fact that they came back with a new plan and I appreciate that. And I sat in there on the meeting and I looked at that and I have tried to convey that to the residents on Pennsylvania and I know that you will hear from them they are adamantly opposed to that and I am not going to take a position tonight because while I have to balance the desires of the residents on Pennsylvania I also have to look at the overall picture how it's going to benefit the city and at some point I'm going to have to make that decision and I'm not going to do that tonight. I know that they have concerns about traffic on Drexel and Pennsylvania so I tried to explain to them that this is just a change in the Comprehensive Plan. Now I noticed tonight that it's listed as "Mixed" and I thought at the last meeting we had it listed as "Multi-Family". So if I'm wrong on that just let me know."

Mr. Seymour responded that the land use classification for Multi-Family is essentially "Mixed Residential".

Steve Kurkowski, Alderman 1st District: "I know that one of the concerns I heard tonight was that something other than residential would go in there. I'm sure that the concerns of something other than residential will be addressed. With regards to notices that were sent out for the meeting we had a concern that it may have been only 300 feet. Did it go past 300 feet?"

Ms. Papelbon responded that it did.

Steve Kurkowski, Alderman 1st District: "That question was raised so I wanted to ask that. So I appreciate what they've done. I appreciate the concerns from the residents. I know what we have to do as a city to try and make use of the land that we have. I know that they want it to stay single family or as is, and I know that today things are different; so make the right decision, listen to everybody and hopefully everybody will continue to have open minds and perhaps try to think outside the box as to what we're trying to do here. We're not going to please everybody I understand that, we're all trying to do the best thing. Thank you."

Thomas Sprague, 2201 E. Oak Ridge Lane:

"I would like to start out tonight by offering an apology publicly to Doug Seymour. At the September 8th meeting I attributed some comments to him that were not true and I was corrected but I don't think the record corrected itself. So I would like it to because I was wrong in what I said. The second letter I would like to cover is a letter I received from the Planning office and Tony spoke of it earlier when he said there were two options; the City Attorney offered two legal options after the tie vote. And one was to take it directly to the Common Council sans a recommendation from the Planning Commission and the second one was to change or amend the proposal and bring it back here. I read the September 8th proposal, I'm reading today's proposal; no difference. If we're talking about what Doug was just saying, all this body is worried about now is modification, amendment of the Comprehensive Plan. Then this should not be on the agenda. If they want to try and change their presentation to try and get the Common Council to accept it on their basis then I think that's the place it should go; not back here. This is a second bite at the apple. I just don't understand why we're back here."

Mayor Scaffidi responded that they applicants made that decision and that they did not have to return here. Mayor Scaffidi also explained that getting more input from the public is a good thing and ultimately the council is going to decide this either way.

Thomas Sprague: "I agree with that and I appreciate that but it just goes against the grain that we didn't get it the first time so let's go back and try again and see if we can change some minds. The second thing I want to talk about is the Comprehensive Plan. At the September 8th meeting we talked and I was told several times the Comprehensive Plan and I think Alderman Bukiewicz you talked about the fact that the Comprehensive Plan was a planning tool and strict adherence to the Comprehensive Plan wasn't required. As a matter of fact a couple places in it say you do the best for the city. But I spent a lot of time reading the Comprehensive Plan in the last two weeks and it isn't interesting reading. I will say I did find some key points in it and one of the most pressing points that I found was contained in the framework of the goals and objectives in the policies of the framers of the Comprehensive Plan. And that was this body and everybody in the city administration should be communicating to private developers when they come up with plans that hey this is our Comprehensive Plan, you try to match this. Don't ask us to amend our plan so you can build in our city. Otherwise why have a Comprehensive Plan. Everybody that comes along with a tasty tidbit where somebody gets excited about an increased tax levy and now we're just going in different directions again. A lot of money, a lot of time, a lot of people worked very hard on this Comprehensive Plan and I think that unless there is a compelling reason to change it that we should be obligated to stay as close to the terms of the Comprehensive Plan. And the last thing I'd like to say, that I did read in here, was that the Comprehensive Plan is outdated. It says we should be looking at it every ten years and I think we're a little delinquent. And maybe getting caught up in that endeavor would help with some of these conflicts. That's it. Thank you."

David Kubicek, 7911 S. Long Meadow Drive:

"Good evening I'm Dave Kubicek, 7911 S. Long Meadow Drive. I'm going to request that you reject the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. The reason why with the notes stated today; the staff of the Planning Commission the notes, it says right here staff recommends, staff has raised concerns about utilizing land within the city that is suitable for single family residential development for other purposes. As single family residential development sites become increasingly scarce, it will become more important to think strategically about the mix of development types and densities within the community moving forward. Why not talk about it now? I mean let's bring up the idea the level of apartment buildings to single family. The last time I came up here and I told you it's 42% apartment buildings which is quite high. What is the level, the acceptable level that we need? Not only that, in this recommendation the staff makes mention about South Milwaukee's apartment buildings but they don't mention about Abendschein Park or the Oak Creek River Parkway those are resource protected areas. In the Comprehensive Plan Page 22 Section D it states District #3 is defined as a Conservation Neighborhood District which is unique to preserve the Oak Creek River Parkway Resource Protection Area. Single family housing is or will be the dominant development in these districts. Also with recommendations for natural resources it states, it refers to generally only very low density development should be allowed in or adjacent to these resource protection areas. I think we need to find out how many apartment buildings we really need in this community. It is a unique area. It's not like the rest of Oak Creek. Those areas are particular in character and they should be handled that way. I again I ask for you to reject the amendment."

Alderman Joe Bukowski – 3rd District – City of South Milwaukee:

"Thank you Mayor and Commission Members, I wish we had these kind of problems of what to do with land in South Milwaukee but we don't have too much to develop. I'm just here representing the 3rd District of South Milwaukee that borders on the other side of Pennsylvania that's going to be affected and I also have a number of constituents that have expressed concern and the only thing that I'd like to suggest, and I don't want to tell another community

what to do; but I think there's a bad traffic situation there already especially on Pennsylvania. If any of you have had the pleasure of commuting and coming home southbound on the area it's backed up tremendously. And I think we did a really good job working together from College Avenue to Rawson and it was always my understanding that we were going to do the same type of road from Rawson to Drexel there so I'm thinking that I just don't think that, I would prefer that the road infrastructure would be in place and we could work together on that and then I think we'd be better suited for development like this. Because I do feel that it is a quality of life issue for the constituents I represent as well as some of the folks I am hearing in Oak Creek. Thank you."

Mayor Scaffidi responded that he did speak with Mayor Brooks from South Milwaukee and they will be meeting in two weeks along with both cities engineers to discuss the possible expansion of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Anthony Mirenda, 7675 S. Pennsylvania Avenue:

"Well I guess I want to reiterate what everybody has said. I believe that the plans that were laid for the City of Oak Creek should be maintained, that they should stay residential. You know you talk about the taxes that that would bring in, \$770,000, that is a lot of money but that's a gross tax number. What would it cost the City of Oak Creek to maintain an area with that type of density with 288 units. There is of course more police, more road construction crews plowing snow, garbage and all of that stuff enters into it. I think we would be hard pressed to say we don't have at least 70 homes between Oak Creek and South Milwaukee that are opposed to this. And if you take an average of \$10,000 taxes per home of 70 homes, you've got \$700,000 in which we have a voice in. Again I believe that the best use for that land the City of Oak Creek and thank you South Milwaukee we do have some land here, that we need to use it very wisely because it is a finite area of land and we will run out eventually and then what? It's just, I appreciate that they wanted to bring up this new plan but as I look at it there were more people from Drexel at the last meeting than from Pennsylvania. So what happened to that plan? Everything was pushed onto the Pennsylvania north end. If you can bring that plan up again please. Okay, I'm thinking Zone AE would be the north part of that land. I am correct? So at my house and at my son-in-law's home and my next door neighbor's home we have this huge retention pond. Correct? Is that that grey area, is that retention? Up here (points to diagram), so all of that water is going from north to south to a retention pond. The way that land drains right now is exactly that way and when we have a lot of rain that land between my house and my son-in-law's home floods. So now we're creating even more so with the retention pond being there. It doesn't make sense. So, I mean was it Walter last time you said you had apartments next door to you. Not you? Somebody said that. "You don't mind that?"

Alderman Bukiewicz responded that he had apartments next to his home and he has lived there 25 years and has not had a problem. He responded that he has had more problems with single family homes than the apartments.

Anthony Mirenda: "That's a good thing, you're very fortunate. I don't know, this just doesn't make sense it really doesn't no way. You look at it from an outsider, I understand where you gentlemen bought this land and you've got to use it but I hope you put a contingency on your offer to purchase because this isn't a good thing. This is not a good deal. It just doesn't make sense. Pennsylvania Avenue is just a mess. If you try to do this and the road at the same time you'd have a huge problem. How would we gain access to our homes, there's no other way in to Pennsylvania Avenue. I can't come in through the creek with a boat. You know it just doesn't make sense. So before we could even think about something like this I think we need to get together with South Milwaukee, make some new roads, then take another look at the situation.

As far as the land from the Korean Church, somebody brought up a great point, if that land wasn't used at that time it would be brought back. Did it revert back? Don't know. So I guess that's about it. The plan brings the stormwater down too close to that south lot line, north lot line I'm sorry. It's too dense, just doesn't make sense. Thank you."

Ald. Mark Verhalen – 3rd District: "Even though this doesn't directly involve my district; my district is right adjacent to this development. Besides reiterating what has been talked about before, I guess just a few statements. I was around Oak Creek when we did the last Comprehensive Plan. I was pretty involved in it and basically the Comprehensive Plan when the City redid it at that time was supposed to be a guide for future development. A lot of in depth study and research went into coming up with that plan, you know pretty much laid out the best type of developments for many areas in the city, if not all of them. As was stated before, this area was kind of designated for more less dense developments; single family homes maybe bigger lots and a lot of factors probably went into that. We didn't have the traffic problem on Pennsylvania at that time like we do now. That's just something that added into the mix in the last probably seven or eight years. That's one thing. So I guess Plan Commission besides looking at the tax advantages to having multi-family versus single family which at this point in time that's the only thing I see that's the big advantage to the city. More tax revenue coming in because of the development differences. Another person stated before we're already at 42% of our developments are apartments. For those of you that are not aware, and I know the commissioners are but for the audience's benefit there's three apartment complexes being proposed and built right now. Two of them by Wimmer Brothers and one by the company right next door to city hall here which is very extensive. There's a lot of units in that. Wimmer Brothers one is fairly large the other one is small but there's also other properties in the city that are zoned for apartments at this time. I guess you know at some point in time when we reach 50 or 55 percent, when are we going to say that we've got an abundance of apartments when we have to start looking at more single family and stuff to put the mix back on a more balanced type of scale.

And I do have some questions for the developers: They stated that the building materials and what not are pretty much going to stay the same but at the last meeting they said the density of the units was going to be tied to what type of amenities and what type of construction was going to be used on the buildings and they've taken more than 100 units out of that mix. Not so sure, I mean they've stated tonight that they're going to stay probably to using the same materials, amenities in the complex might remain the same but we don't know that until they come up with their final plan but that's something that's got to be considered too.

As an alderman I have to listen to my constituents and there's been a lot of people voicing opposition to this. You've got a little bit of opposition from South Milwaukee as well. So when we look at this I think we have to look past just the tax advantages to the city and look at what the Comprehensive Plan says and was stated before by somebody else, if we start amending the Comprehensive Plan for any developer that comes in whether it's somebody who wants to put a factory in here or a big commercial development in the middle of a residential neighborhood or something like that; I mean it just leads to more spot zonings and all kinds of stuff that we in the past have tried to clean up with going through the city whether it be zoning amendments and I sat through that stuff too about fifteen years ago we went through the whole

city and looked at all the zoning on every parcel of land in Oak Creek and switched it so we didn't have spot zoning and things in Oak Creek. So I hate to see us go back to that type of thing with a plan that shouldn't really be there."

Jack Hubbard, 2130 E. Green Valley Lane:

"Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'd just like to reiterate the issue that I have daily. I have to turn off of Long Meadow left and go west on Drexel daily and my commute has changed considerably in the last few years with the volume of traffic that's on Drexel now. There's many times I have to wait a long time to get onto Drexel. The stagger just doesn't seem to work between the traffic lights on Howell and then the traffic lights on Pennsylvania to where you can get a gap to make that left hand turn. The other day, just by coincidence, after looking at my watch it took me nearly twenty minutes to go from Long Meadow Drive to the ramp that I take on 94. So the increase of rail traffic, the length of the trains that are there are backing up. The other night I was in line all the way back to Quincy as I was heading eastbound waiting for that train there. If we're going to add roughly 500 vehicles that are in that particular development area there to that daily morning and night commute it's just going to make things that just more miserable for sure.

The other thing that I had a little bit of question in, I think the developers did a fantastic job, I have a little bit of architectural background, and I think the plans look phenomenal; but I just don't think it's the place for this particular apartment complex. The comment that it's supposed to be luxury apartments, I don't know how you control that; if you control the quality of the environment by the cost of the rent or what you do. I just don't see it there. We have a perfect situation with the reconstruction of Ryan Road to handle lots of traffic very well to the interstate, to the industrial areas that are on the south side of town where I would assume we'd have a fair amount of employment. I think there's lots of property in that particular area that would be much better suited for this kind of use. Thank you."

John Greco, 2121 E. Oak Ridge Lane:

"I've just been looking over HSI's little stats form here and I noticed that between the studio and one bedroom apartments it equates to 59% of this apartment complex. And I guess my concern is, to me, studio apartments are barely one step above a rooming house. And at the last Plan Commission meeting, when HSI made their presentation they indicated that there are no income limits. This is a big concern of mine. Studio apartments, one bedroom apartments and no income limits. What type of clientele are we looking at? Thank you."

Elizabeth Senica, 2101 E. Drexel Avenue

"I was looking at the slides and while I sincerely appreciate all the modifications that were made to the property since you know I'm right across the street and I'll be looking directly at it, I appreciate all of that. The scariest thing that I saw on the slides was 625 parking spaces, 625 vehicles, 2.5 parking spaces per unit, 625 vehicles coming out of there and that doesn't include visitors and that's what's going to happen in front of my house. It's scary to me. That's all I have to say."

Rita Graeser, 7933 S. Long Meadow Drive:

“Good evening Council and attendees. I’ve been in Oak Creek for twenty years so it’s my heart. I love being in Oak Creek and I’m also concerned. A lot of people have said pretty much what I was saying or going to say to you about the 288 apartments. To me that’s like almost having 288 occupied homes. So that’s 288 then maybe you have another car, you have so many cars so it’s like double. So there again we’re at 600. I have some concern with the traffic because as of right now it’s very dense to get out in the morning and when you leave you know in the evening and stuff so I’m really concerned with that. I’m also concerned with it being an area that has been a very quiet community, very peaceful and then having just a lot of people a lot of condense in one area. It would just really change the area. And also I believe probably there’s another location for the apartments, they’re beautiful apartments and probably someplace else would be another, I think there’s other land that’s available. And I’m asking you that you keep this area for single family because that’s how when we all looked for our apartments and we found the places that we wanted to live, and we had the understanding that it was to be single residential and I’m asking you that you maintain and honor that commitment that was what you set it up for as to be single family residential. And I would just ask that you just reject the other plan.”

Arden Degner, 8540 S. Pennsylvania Avenue:

“This is an interesting proposal. Did you see the change in elevation from the north end to the south end? Just think the problems in winter with snow. And with this change in elevation, where and in what direction will the vehicles be able to go? In fact if you look at this plan, and I’m sure you’ve seen it, it’s evident that you have bottlenecks. You’ve got a bottleneck at Pennsylvania and you’ve got a bottleneck at Drexel. This will never work, it will never work! It’s already filled with traffic during the, prior to the working hour and especially after school. Turn this down please.”

Rosemarie Annonson, 3920 E. Ryan Road:

“I want to know of the 288 apartments how many of them are going to be studio, one, two, three bedroom and what the rent scales are going to be.

HSI Representative responded that it was on one of the slides but these are conceptual allocations right now; they are subject to change. Currently the slide says studios 10%, one-bedrooms 30%, one-bedroom plus dens 19%, and two-bedrooms at 41%. All subject to change.

Rosemarie Annonson asked if there will be three-bedroom units.

Tony DeRoso -HSI Representative responded no threes on the plan you see before you. The rents are going to be an average range between \$1,000 and \$2,000 approximately.

Rosemarie Annonson: “I fail to see where we will be able to fill the \$2,000 rentals. I don’t think that our \$54,000 mean income; that those people can afford it. And I don’t see people moving into Oak Creek to pay that kind of rent when you can buy a house. 7.9 units per acre would verse 2 hours on half acre lots per acre. So instead of 288 were looking at roughly 60 homes and 288 apartments would fill an elementary school. So we’d be building another school. And

right now were looking at an 8.6 tax increase on the school side so I just don't think it's a good idea.

I have a question in regards to the clubhouse. How far away from Pennsylvania Avenue would that clubhouse be because we have prevailing southwestern winds and that's going to carry that noise from the clubhouse dependent on if they're doing to use it for large parties. It's going to carry music and noise into those residences along Pennsylvania Avenue. I get it from the bar up the street. What else do I have here, I think that's all. But I didn't get the distance on the clubhouse. One more thing, their roads are wrong because in Oak Creek we have an ordinance that you may not have a road a dead end road that is longer than 500 feet. So they'd have to go back to the drawing board on the roads and that's a big problem from every aspect on this project."

Mayor Scaffidi made the third and final call for public comment, seeing none he closed the public hearing.

Comprehensive Plan Amendment

2020 Vision – A Comprehensive Plan for the City of Oak Creek

Update the Planned Land Use category and Map 2 in the Comprehensive Plan from "Single Family Residential" to "Mixed Residential" for the properties at 7721 S. Pennsylvania Ave., 2100 E. Drexel Ave., 2200 E. Drexel Ave., and 2280 E. Drexel Avenue. Tax Key Nos. 779-9991-001, 779-9006, 779-9007, 779-9008

Alderman Bukiewicz stated that the last time this came before the commission he was in favor of adjusting the Comprehensive Plan to accommodate this type of use and he is still in favor of it. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan is a guide the City cause use and adapt from time to time in the best interest of the entire community. Advised that in a situation like this you must look at the entire picture, what will benefit the community over the long run over the next ten to twenty years. He believed a use like this would benefit the city more than single family homes. Stated that the cost to 35,000 residents and growing in this city versus the two dozen homes that abut this is just too much to give up not to change this. Stated that this is a community issue and going forward we are in a tax levy freeze. This shouldn't be based on a monetary value; we will never achieve those taxes on single family homes as there is no value for a single family home developer to put those roads in and the infrastructure to support those homes. Advised that this will happen with the developer and this is not TIF'd money. It will go right into the general fund looking to support to hire more police, fire, streets, utilities and more services. This will benefit the city from a tax base. Stated that the plowing of the roads and garbage pickup will be the of the apartment complex, not at the City's expense. Stated that a traffic impact analysis study needs to be completed not only in this area but also westbound on Drexel. Alderman Bukiewicz spoke of Camelot Trails which only has one exit in and out and asked Assistant Fire Chief Kressuk for his comments.

Assistant Fire Chief Kressuk responded that the alderman was correct with that statement but cautioned that in the past that may have been an acceptable design practice but the fire department does strive for multiple access points.

Alderman Bukiewicz addressed the various comments from the citizens pertaining to number of apartments, need for more apartments, rental prices, and number of vehicles per unit.

Alderman Guzikowski stated that he did appreciate the effort that HSI brought forward after listening to the commission and to some point the residents. Stated his biggest concern is about the traffic and until the traffic and the roads can get fixed, this will be a problem.

Commissioner Dickmann stated that at the last meeting he did vote for this project. Stated that he was part of the Comprehensive Plan committee and a lot of thought was put into it that it was a guide and he knew that if the change was made it would allow for mixed residential units; single family homes, apartments and condos under the change. Commissioner Dickmann stated that there are still too many apartment units in the development. He is also concerned about the number of children in the apartment complex and their effect on the schools. He also voiced concern over the road structure in the complex area.

Assistant Fire Chief Kressuk: Stated that this is a conceptual drawing and that the fire department has not had the opportunity to review any final site plans or plans submitted to the City. He stated that there are guidelines they must follow regarding "one way" roads and access to those northwest buildings.

Commissioner Dickmann stated that he will be making his decision based on the new plan that was brought forward. He thought when they came back it would have been more of a mix of single family, duplexes and apartments which would not have been as dense of a population.

Commissioner Correll stated that he voted in favor of this the first time with concerns and wanted to see more in the plan. He was surprised at the time and how comprehensively HSI listened by dropping the number of units by 25%. He stated that the traffic impact study is his biggest issue and until that is done nothing can really be decided. He commended Alderman Bukiewicz on his strong stand for this item. He also commented on the school concerns on apartments versus single family homes and felt that it was a wash.

Commissioner Carrillo thanked HSI for the work they had done on this plan. She advised that she is amongst a group of people looking for luxury apartments in Oak Creek. Stated that she believed there is a niche for this development in the city. She stated that over the last ten years she has not altered her path along Pennsylvania from Oakwood during her rush hour commute to the expressway. She stated she was in favor of this before and is in favor of it again.

Commissioner Siepert stated that it's great to see a new development come to the city but he is concerned about the density of it. He is concerned for the fire department and their safety with only the two exits coming into the development and it would be good to come up with another road pattern to open it up and give a little more flexibility.

Alderman Guzikowski questioned the timeline for the traffic impact study.

Commissioner Johnston responded that it would be at least a year for the design of the study. Stated that they are going out for STP funding and if they are able to procure the funding that will be for the design, the construction and the real estate acquisitions and were probably looking at a two year process before the road is done.

Alderman Guzikowski stated that whether it's for this project or residential, the infrastructure needs to be in place. He also stated a third road/entrance needs to go in.

Commissioner Johnston stated that he voted against this last time and he still is not in favor of the density and we do have traffic concerns that will need to be addressed but he believes this land will be developed as some sort of mixed use property in order to go forward. He stated

that for what the item is before them, changing the Comprehensive Plan to a “Mixed Use” zoning fits with this property.

Ms. Papelbon clarified that the request is for “Mixed Residential”, not “Mixed Use”.

Rosemarie Annonson: “First of all I think we need to talk about the math. It’s not a wash Mr. Correll. If you look at the one bedroom and the two bedroom and the one bedroom with the den; so I took roughly 55% or 56% and it would come up to 161 kids if they had one kid. You can double it if they have two. In contrast if you have sixty homes with one kid, you’ve got 60 kids. If you’ve got two you’ve got 120; so even with two kids we don’t have as many with one kid at the apartments. And Mr. Bukiewicz, I’m really disappointed I think it’s a really big problem we’re seeing with our Oak Creek Officials elected, workers, whatever. What is best for the community? I’d like to poll this audience and have those people who are not in favor of this project please stand. If you don’t support this project please stand.”

Mayor Scaffidi stated that it is appropriate for her to poll the audience.

Rosemarie Annonson: “So you’ve got all these people against it. They vote for you, you represent them, not the City remember that.”

Mr. Seymour suggested that rather than trying to figure out what the school age is per dwelling unit, that the school district can provide those numbers.

Rita Graeser, 7933 S. Long Meadow Drive: “I know they responded and I know you want to do all these different traffic patterns and all that but you know a couple years ago, three – four years ago they said let’s pass the bill before we know what’s in it. And my question is, maybe I’m not quoting that correctly, get your facts straight and then come back and if you have to pass the bill or make the changes do it then. But if we don’t have the facts with all this, you know the traffic patterns and these are important safety features here and facts that we have to have in order and that’s all I want to say.”

Tony DeRoso – HSI Rep responded that on the traffic side as it’s already an existing issue sometimes a project like this can help spur solutions to existing situations. Secondly, we still have a critical mass with the number of units on the plan and we can still provide the same level of amenities that we talked about in September the finishes interior and exterior are still the same. He stated that they have a professional management company that does both a credit and criminal background checks on all applicants that wish to live there. He stated that the clubhouse is set back 176-feet from the east property line and that it is a private facility with rules and hours of use in terms of not being a nuisance to surrounding neighbors. He advised that this is step one of many steps to amend the plan. Advised that an approval this evening does not mean we can show up tomorrow and get a building permit. He stated that an approval this evening means they can go back and refine these plans; work through engineering, work through traffic, work through architecture and we would still need to come back before you numerous times as well as the Common Council and there will be conditions put on us that if we don’t satisfy, this project will not go forward.

John Greco, 2121 E. Oak Ride Lane:

“I just want to make a reference to the millennial statement that was made. There was a Census Bureau report out and this comes from the Population Reference Bureau in Washington D.C. that 15% of the millennials between the ages of 25 and 34 live with their parents. So if you’re looking for millennials to be renting studio apartments and one bedroom apartments; I

don't think that number is supported. And secondly, there's 82-million people that were born between '81 and 2000 which puts them close to the millennial age. And their problem is with under employment and you have college graduates that are serving as coffee baristas and these people have long lasting school debt. And this is why you have millennials living at home and living with their parents. And I don't see a big draw for studio and one bedroom apartments especially when there aren't any income limits."

Al Ismaili, 2230 E. Cody Court:

"We have discussed various factors but we've never discussed the LLC failing; two – three years down the road. That's a big project thirty-four million dollars. Bank possesses the property, bank is not looking to sell it high price, sells to many different owners. Here we're becoming a luxury apartment to maybe an average or low income apartments. The owners could be from twenty buildings we could have twenty owners right? That's becoming an issue too as well. So that tax income that we're planning to generate may dwindle down significantly. So that's another risk, a risk we never talked about. Thank you."

Alderman Bukiewicz responded that the millennial statement he made was based on something he learned at the MMAC a few weeks ago on millennials and the Milwaukee rental units going on downtown. Secondly Ms. Annonson was correct that he does represent the people in the audience that mostly opposed this but he also represents the remainder of the people that chose not to attend this evening and in order to get an accurate reading he would have to poll them as well.

Mayor Scaffidi called for a motion on 6B.

Alderman Bukiewicz motioned that the Plan Commission adopts resolution 2015-02, amending the Comprehensive Plan and Planned Land Use map for the properties at 7721 S. Pennsylvania Ave., 2100 E. Drexel Ave., 2200 E. Drexel Ave., and 2280 E. Drexel Ave. to reflect the change in land use from Single-Family Residential to Mixed Residential, following a public hearing and adoption by the Common Council. Commissioner Correll seconded.

On Roll Call: Commissioner Dickmann, no; Commissioner Johnston, aye; Commissioner Carrillo, aye; Alderman Bukiewicz, aye; Mayor Scaffidi, aye; Alderman Guzikowski, aye; Commissioner Correll, aye; Commissioner Siefert, no; Commissioner, Chandler, aye. Motion passed.

Rezone and Conditional Use
Shawn McKibben, Oak Park Place
1980 W. Rawson Ave.
TAX KEY No: 736-899-5001

Ms. Papelbon provided an overview of the Rezone and Conditional Use Permit request.

Alderman Bukiewicz questioned the minimum of parking for such a large development. He inquired as to how many employees will typically be working.

Mark Kruser, ADCI, 5100 East Park, Madison Wisconsin. Mr. Kruser advised that he is representing Shawn McKibben, the owner's developer for the project, who was unable to attend the meeting. Wanted to clarify that the future independent living will actually be three stories, 36 to potentially 40 units and that would have underground parking. He advised that there will

be three shifts; 1st shift will have 8 full-time and 14 part-time, the evening shift will have 8 full-time and 12 part-time, and a little less on the night time shift. He advised that the memory care people do not have cars. The other assisted living places that Oak Park operates the assisted living people have cars at the rate of 5% which means for forty units they have two cars.

Alderman Bukiewicz questioned Assistant Fire Chief Kressuk as to the layout of the property, the number of calls for service and the response.

Assistant Chief Kressuk responded that the preliminary review looked good. As the company submits formal plans, Fire will vet those and make the best determination of what fits that site. He advised when inquiring about call volume, you're looking at roughly one call per bed per year but that can fluctuate depending on the specialty and kind of care required.

Commissioner Siepert questioned about the southwest entrance/exit road onto 20th Street and how far it was from the corner of the intersection.

Mark Kruser responded that it's about 65-feet from the right property line and they have room to move that in their plans and would be happy to move it.

Commissioner Chandler questioned the deliveries.

Mark Kruser responded that deliveries would be made approximately three times per week on the north side lower level of the building. Deliveries are made using a small semi. He also advised that the trash is stored inside on the lower level until pickup day.

Commissioner Chandler asked what the required number of parking spaces that should be there.

Ms. Papelbon advised that is why the Plan Commission needs to have a discussion on this matter. For elderly housing it's one stall per dwelling unit and for multi-family its 1 & ½ per efficiency or one-bedroom apartment or 2 for two-bedroom apartments. Azura was approved in April to use the nursing home.

Mark Kruser advised that the independent living apartment building hasn't been designed yet but with it having 36 to 40 units they will certainly have underground parking to cover the units and there would still be parking for visitors at grade level.

Commissioner Dickmann stated that he is in favor of this project but is concerned about the traffic situation not because of the traffic but because of the unique situation in that area. He suggested the City look into widening that section of roadway.

Mark Kruser responded that if you want to slow traffic down the roads should be kept narrow. He suggested minimizing the amount of traffic that cuts through on this road.

Commissioner Dickmann added that when heading east on Rawson and waiting to make a left turn onto 20th there is no cut in lane where you can get out of traffic so it all backs up behind the vehicle.

Arden Degner, 8540 S. Pennsylvania Avenue questioned the layout around the parking lot showing a sidewalk and where the residents can get out and go outside.

Mark Kruser responded that there is a sidewalk around the parking lot and there is also a

DRAFT