

## TOWN OF GREEN BAY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

**DATE:** 12/18/18

**TIME:** 7:01 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Dawn Goodman, John Metzler, Gary Jonet, Mike Gilson, Jason Miller, Dylan Mercier, Brad DeChamps

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Town Clerk Debbie Mercier; Supervisor Cary Dequaine; Supervisor Ryan Debroux; Brown County Planner Devin Yoder; S. Nancy Langlois; Bobbi Jo Mulder, Donnie Soquet Jr, Ed Rudd, Board of Appeals Sec. Toni Mertens, Stacy Dallaire, Mary Abts, Dean Abts, Shrine Rep. Don Warden, Board of Appeals Rep Ron Abts; Board of Appeals Rep Pete Mathu

**APPROVAL OF LAST MEETING'S MINUTES:** John Metzler opened the meeting and asked if the meeting notice was properly posted in 3 places. Dawn Goodman confirmed it was. The 11/20/18 meeting minutes were reviewed. **(7:01-7:02)**

**MOTION MADE BY:** Gary Jonet to accept the minutes as presented. **MOTION 2NDED BY:** Jason Miller **AYES:** 7 **NAYS:** 0 **MOTION CARRIED.**

**ISSUE #1: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT PROCESS (7:04-9:43pm).** The Town of Green Bay, with the assistance of the Brown County Planning Commission, is amending the Town's comprehensive plan to better reflect the changing development conditions around the area near the Shrine of Our Lady of Good Help. The Town seeks to prepare a vision to inform a specific land use plan for this area to help guide and inform future growth. This is the Town of Green Bay Planning Commission's **eighth** meeting of the Town's Comprehensive Plan Amendment process. In this meeting, public review and comment will be heard in regard to the draft of the Shrine Area Overlay Zone Ordinance and Special Event Permit. The final ordinance for adoption will be available for a public review and comment period before the final public hearing for adoption (date TBD).

➤ **Review** of the top Options identified from the visioning session discussed at the past meetings—the Town Planning Commission examined, discussed, modified and incorporated them into a Final Model, along with input from the County Planner, Devin Yoder. The Town Planning members considered and then advised the County Planner on the future direction to be taken.

**John** opened this part of the meeting by starting with a review of the Area. Gary Jonet stated he would go with the majority of it except the area behind Broadleaf and six 40 acre parcels and four 40 acre parcels along Abts road. Mike Gilson asked him to clarify it more. Dawn addressed the public, referring them to the September 18 materials, Chapter 10 Shrine Area Overlay District map. Keep it simple. John asked for more clarification from him. Gary stated said people with agriculture and residential would stay that way. No changes. John then asked Devin what the Town should do next. Devin stated the easiest way is to decide of what we want the final thing to look like, he would make the changes and submit it for the final adoption. John asked if there has to be a motion on the matter or if it is enough for the PC to come to an agreement about it. Devin said in this instance, it's not necessary unless the PC wants to make recommendations of specific things for the Town Board to adopt, you could specify what you are recommending, then it would need to be like a resolution to adopt x, y, z. John clarified if each area discussed needs a resolution. Devin stated it did not. Jason Miller questioned: "so you (Devin) would be taking the items we address here and want to see, then he goes back and modifies the plan accordingly, and then bring it back for review to the Town Board.

More discussion took place about the area. Dylan Mercier clarified if the area along Depeau Road was included and Gomand Road. Mike Gilson asked what was wrong with just going up to Highway P and ½ mile back in each direction—it's a large area already...is it something we can change in the future if we need to? Devin said it can always be changed. Gary Jonet interjected it's a longer process then. Devin concurred, saying it would amount to doing what we are doing now all over again. John referred to the last meeting when it was discussed that anyone in Agriculture would not be affected. He then questioned, so then do we go bigger right away? Dylan questioned if there wouldn't be development along Highway K--just outside the area. Dawn Goodman interjected: It's called the Leap frog effect. Dylan speculated so as future development occurs, we'd be going off the Future Land Use Map, and there wouldn't be development down Highway K? Gary Jonet stated that Champion only has a couple areas zoned as business at this time—if it were to have any development at all, it would be better to keep it in the Champion area. That's why I thought we'd stop it at Depeau. We have a couple residential areas between Depeau and Highway P and if we start putting in strip malls or small businesses along there along with the

residences, then we may have people upset with that. Dylan said that's almost next to this area here. Gary agreed and said, right now there are really only a couple residential areas along the north side and if someone starts selling off the larger areas into smaller parcels, it would not sit well with the neighbors across the road. Dawn Goodman interjected that she would be one of the neighbors across the road and that her family has been aware that would be a possibility—a hotel or a residential development or some sort of business. She stated that it would not be to her liking but that they realize it could occur. Gary Jonet stated that Dawn's agricultural property would not be affected by that.

There was more speculation on how big or small the Overlay area should be. Dawn Goodman stated that it had been said in the past that it might be best to go big now, rather than going smaller, as some properties have the potential to be lost to development. Devin stated it depends on what the Town has as its Rezoning process. It probably wouldn't be as big a deal to take it away. Gary stated it could be handled by Conditional Use—if people wanted smaller businesses somewhere in the future, they could take it to the PC and then the Town Board, they could put a smaller business in this area with restrictions stipulated, like landscaping, etc. Devin agreed. You could have everything be a Conditional Use **plus** these standards.—it could be more standardized...if they meet the requirements you give them the permit **or** do you want to see it and talk about it first? Mike Gilson then questioned so anything in that district would need a Condition Use permit? Gary stated yes. Devin stated that the way he initially wrote it was anything besides Agriculture or Single Family Residential would need one.

John Metzler asked Mike Gilson if he still wanted it smaller. Mike stated he understood. Gary stated if they just stopped it over at Highway P, they would just follow our usual standards for business if someone were going to build a hotel or something like it.

Dylan questioned why not expand the area to the curve at Champion? Brad DeChamps stated if anywhere is going to “blow up into development” it probably is going to be right here. A few of the PC members agreed that could be a possibility. Dawn Goodman stated it made sense because the immediate area near the Town Hall is deteriorating/aging and ripe for re-development. Brad stated that at least we would have some say in how the downtown or “Hub” of our area would look like.

Dylan stated no matter how far we go, someone is going to try going outside the area to get around our standards. If we anticipate the area developing that far anyway, why not have it go to Gravel Pitt Road. No matter what we do, someone coming in to develop may try to go outside the standardized area so they can do what they want and not follow the standards we are asking. Maybe we should stipulate in the Conditional Use for them that they follow/maintain the same standards?

John Metzler stated, “if we do this right, in this area, someone buying land in the area adjacent/outside the area would come in and try to copy what we have in place...they may want to compete with what we have: attractive to get the attention of the visitors to the area, appealing, the structure sizes, landscaping, etc. Sure they come for the Shrine experience, but why not have them leave with a good overall experience from the entire Champion area?! Dawn Goodman stated that Champion is what they are looking for: the old time town with the rural, Belgian community, rural feel. John agreed.

Jason stated if he is coming to the area and wants to buy a large parcel, he would find it better to do in this district because he knows what our standards are and what to follow—lot size, landscaping, etc. It's easier because he would come with the packet prescribed for the Town to review and they would know what the development around them would look like too. He stated he agrees it would be smart to go further. Mike Gilson stated a developer would already know what is expected because they would just follow what we already have in place and if it's a PRD there are already standards in place for that.

Dawn Goodman asked Brad where he thought the overlay district should extend to? Brad stated he thought it should go to at least Gomand Road. There was talk then about if the area further away from Highway K (the main thorough fare), would be as desirable. Most thought it would not. Dawn Goodman stated that it depended on who the person was coming to the area and explained that she and her husband, who travels extensively, encounter people who express interest in living near the Shrine and that they have already been approached by a developer and also a family that wanted to buy their home.

Dawn Goodman asked Devin about how appropriate it would be for she and Brad DeChamps to vote on the project then, if they are now in the new district. Devin stated he can't say for sure, but if we keep it more about the Design Standards and less about the Use, then that is where you go back to the zoning process. That's where you address concerns about use. If we keep it about the standards it should not be an issue.

John Metzler asked if there is more thought on it. Mike Gilson stated he still object to too big. There was talk then about exact parameters. Mike Gilson expressed concern about access to the properties and the potential need for a road into some of the area. What if all along Highway K there are lots sold? Gary stated there would be the usual requirements like PRD's. Mike expressed concern that there could be houses on every lot with land behind locked and unable to be accessed. Brad and Jason stated it's that way already. Jason stated it doesn't change what people will do with their rest of their 40 acre parcel. It would control what happens to the rest of the back 40 so that they don't pave it and make it into a parking lot with a building in the center of it. The standards we are setting up would help avoid that. Brad interjected it could reduce arguments between business owners adjacent to residential parcels like what is currently happening in some locations. Jason stated "it's never going to be big enough or small enough...someone is always going to be on the outside...how far out do we want the town to stay looking Rural? Brad DeChamps stated we could start small and then 10 years down the road we'll have to expand again and it'll cost more for more meetings. It's probably better to go big, looking at what will be in 20 years.

Dawn Goodman stated that right now the Town's goal is to be bigger and think out further. She stated the Town is being Reactive rather than being Proactive because things have been going so fast with the Shrine hiring a marketing firm to market them, etc.

Brad stated this area is more attractive to a developer or any business. We really don't want to mess around with the roads too much or they will go over the County Line.

More parameters were discussed.

Brad decided the South side is as important as the North side.

Gary Jonet stated, whatever we decide, the outskirts of this area will be developed in time. I think that's where it will start. That's going to be the area that will develop first because people will be looking businesses, for places to stay and things to do in and around the district. How big an area do we want to keep Rural Residential atmosphere?

Dylan questioned Don't we want to have development in the district?

Gary stated not necessarily development, but if there is development, we want the **control** to keep it Rural Atmosphere in that area.

Dawn asked Devin "Are we interpreting this correctly?"

Devin stated "Yes. The focus is on the **protection** of what is inside of the area--where the pressure is."

Dawn stated: "keep it spacious, rural and peaceful." All agreed.

There was more talk about parameters.

Brad suggested the whole town be part of it to eliminate the issues between businesses and adjacent neighbors.

Devin suggested the PC consider if we want the whole Town to be at a certain level or extension of standards to the entire area. Gary interjected, "If it's feasible".

Dawn Goodman cited the example of the John McGivern tv show that visits various towns in WI and those towns often have a special feature they are known for and really market it with those type of attractions: restaurants, businesses, foods. etc.

Brad DeChamps stated that's why we need stronger buffers around things because you're never going to make every neighbor happy.

Dawn Goodman suggested that some of the home businesses might be very concerned about what could happen with the new standards.

Devin stated It's thinking of things in a different way: ***our standards being changed because of changing conditions.***

Dawn Goodman stated that the during the last Comprehensive Plan update that the consultants had suggested the Town tighten up on some of their standards.

Devin stated one advantage that way is that if things develop in Dyckesville or New Franken being developed, so that there is some guarantee that it's compatible with the rest of the Town. It would mean they have a certain standard they have to meet. No one has said that we just want this area here to have this. The sentiment has been for the ***whole*** Town. They seem to want it throughout the area. Dawn stated that was the continuous request through 3 Comprehensive Plan updates: keep the Rural atmosphere.

Mike Gilson stated it makes sense. Otherwise there will be all sorts of businesses mixed in with homes and nothing would be consistent.

Brad speculated that property values would be more consistent if the standards are Town-wide. So that there is no depreciating land value next to certain areas.

Mike questioned if we do that, then why do we need a district?

Devin stated that if we do that, we would be adopting ***Revised Standards*** with regards to landscaping, parking, etc. You set the terms and adopt revised standards. John stated that would be in all districts then.

Dawn Goodman stated that it would mean a lot of work but that the Town had already been told by its lawyer and DATCP that we needed to revise our zoning: wording, definitions, standards, etc. Debbie Mercier agreed that was correct. She stated that we already had some good things in place and just needed to update/tweek things.

Brad questioned: So we need to start over. Do we want a district or no district?

Devin stated you could keep the Overlay as just a ***design standards*** thing--any rezoning or land use changes would still come through yet in the rezoning process. You're just spreading the standards to a wider areas like Commercial and Industrial Development. They would go through the rezoning process if they want to change the land use.

John Metzler speculated on different scenarios that would not be allowed—eg: a warehouse or a trucking farm across the road from the Shrine. Would that be feasible? Dawn Goodman agreed that it would not be attractive or desirable to have that. John asked how could we control that? Brad said we need stronger buffers for when that happens to block light, the view, noise, etc.

Devin stated that you would approach that is that you have the pre-existing Future Land Use Map to prevent future inappropriate rezoning. If it's not identified as a future Industrial area, then that's not going to happen. If it seems that the area is evolving into something that would require different allowances, than it could be changed to meet those new circumstances. You would still have your zoning code and the Future Land Use map so that you're not just folding for anything that comes along.

Devin stated that is why the Future Land Use Map and this process is in place so that we do not have to re-invent the rules each time something comes along. If there is enough of a changing tide, then it can happen through that process.

Mike Gilson questioned if it was too confusing.

Dawn Goodman stated that we have to look at the wider implications of it.

Jason went back to the idea of an entire Town-wide standard. So we would no longer call it the Champion Overlay district. Instead we would say to someone buying a property, someone building something in one area would follow the same standards as anyone else. It would look the same no matter where you are in the town.

Gary Jonet agreed and stated we would have control. Gary asked Devin about the first plan that he presented, which utilized the Town's already existing PRD standards, which goes into great detail.

Devin stated that it would mean the Town might have to meet more often in order to address all the finer regulations it entails and it could be a hardship due to the smaller amount of staff we have.

We reviewed the Future Land Use map (page 49 in the Comprehensive Plan book). It was noted that it's mainly agricultural. Mike Gilson noted area around the Shrine is Agricultural. Devin stated it's Government/Institutional. Next to it should probably be changed. It should reflect that. Gary asked if it were passed, would that cover future businesses? Devin stated yes. Jason stated that if a business wanted to come into the area, then would it have to follow the new rules? Gary stated yes.

Devin stated if it wasn't business and it needed to be rezoned to business, you would have to say no because it is not zoned as that on the map. That's the general idea behind the Future Land Use Map.

Dylan suggested that we should use the Future Land Use Map correctly, instead. If we use it for future rezones, then we don't have to do that **Whole Town** approach. We are actually amending our map now, really. If we use it for future rezones more than we do now, then it won't be an issue because it wasn't zoned for that.

Devin stated you need to keep in mind that this only covers the Land Use part of it. But then if you only did it business it would only be to the current standards you have.

Gary stated if the whole town were under it, **every** Business would be scrutinized: looks, location, following the standards/more uniform, it would make it easier to make sure people do what they are supposed to and look better.

Jason and Brad agreed that the most recent issues that have come up are related to the standards not being followed (lighting, noise, set-backs, buffers) and then we have to have the lawyer come in.

Dawn stated this is an opportunity to do things the way they need to be. She compared it to when you build a new house, you know what didn't work with your old one and what you need and want for the new one.

Devin stated that this is occurring in many surrounding areas: growing pressures. Our Town is not the only one with these issues. Brown County is the same. It's a larger discussion everywhere.

John asked how much control other towns have in surrounding areas. Devin stated there are definitely Design Standards. Everything he's looked at has some local design standards. That is what having and administering a zoning code is in place for. You determine what the community wants and what they want to see and work it into the standards.

Johnn asked what will we do?

Mike Gilson stated we have to change our Land Use Map or there will be problems with the Shrine area.

Gary Jonet stated that we're in the process of updating it's Code book and zoning standards anyway. So this would be part of it. He asked Debbie Mercier.

She agreed, but stated that she had reservations about **not** having a Future Land Use plan (leaving things as they are), you leave yourselves open to liability when you evaluate each issue, case by case and you don't have an area. If you deny a rezone you'd have to have a good reason. Devin stated you can't just deny something because you don't like it. The standards have changed. Dawn Goodman restated the standards now: the denial is based on Health, Safety and Welfare.

Brad stated: so then we're back to borders.

Jason stated we're back to the main issue: we've already had 3 cases where people want to develop on the doorsteps of the Shrine. We need to prepare for several types of development in this area. Examples were cited from around the country.

Jason stated anything flies currently because we do not have standards unless it's PRD. We need to have something in place.

Dawn Goodman stated we minimally have to tweak our standards if we do nothing else.

Jason stated if we apply this to the entire town it would help but then it would impact the other areas too, like industrial. But there are more people coming to build/develop here. They are not going away. As land sells here more issues may arise..

Mike Gilson stated the biggest issue seems to be **Land Use**. How are you going to say no?! We have not said no. Dawn Goodman suggested that we may need to say no more.

Dawn Goodman stated that we do not enforce or define our current Land Use now. We should have something defensible if a lawyer brings us to court.

Devin stated that it probably cannot be held against us that we voted a certain way on a certain project. Conditions change, more people move to an area and what was good at one time may no longer be as such now. That's why the structure is in place to fall back on when making these types of decisions. It's representative of what the community wants to see, they've had a chance to weigh in on it, etc.

Jason pointed out that we've already allowed Business zoning in the Shrine area.

Brad asked do we want borders or no borders? What's the difference if we re-write our ordinances--will it be different inside vs. outside those districts? What's going to separate the two areas?

Devin stated that not everything needs to be spelled out or the same in each zone area. You could differentiate, using a table. He gave examples (if this is a business parcel zone adjacent to a residential parcel then that). You can tailor it among different zones and their proximity to certain other zones. He gave examples of tables for different zones that other municipalities have.

Dawn Goodman stated she had seen that in other municipality zoning when she was researching for this project.

The pros and cons of implementing standards Town-wide vs. area only were discussed further. Jason questioned how appropriate it would be and should we stick to just the immediate area.

Devin said that if we implemented it, the new rules/standards will not be retroactive. It would be from that time of implementation going forward. The older standards/zoning cannot be undone

John Opened up the floor at 8:20 pm because so many new ideas were discussed.

Ryan DeBroux complimented the productive discussion. But he stated that he did not think the plan should be Town-wide because it would be too many new issues that we do not have staff and time to pursue. Do we have time or staff to regulate or oversee all the minute standards. It's a different goal and a new and different

approach that could maybe be pursued in the future. Is your goal to fill up more businesses/industry in the Business/Industrial park over on Highway P or are you going to chew up a bunch of real estate (take a huge footprint for the sake of a footprint—extra buffers, landscaping, etc)? Aren't we satisfied with how most of our areas look like over there? If some of these businesses were building now, with the new standards being suggested, they would look very different. Then you have them not fitting in with what we currently have either. How is that going to look? Let's stick to the original area we planned to address and original issues.

Pete Mathu stated he'd buy a property with an "option" that can't be rezoned, then the sale would not go through. He also expressed concern that if the plan were town-wide, then businesses along Highway 54 for example, would end up losing Business Visibility due to buffers/landscaping requirements.

Don Warden stated he had a couple issues: 1. **Land Use:** What do we want the land, various areas of the Town, used for? Then bring the standards up to speed--enforce the current standards. It makes sense across the board to have the standards in place 2. In the Future: What would you want it to look like 20 years from now? You have a blank slate right now. How do you want it to look? You are sort of working backwards from there.

Floor was closed.

Jason Miller stated we should start with our immediate, initial issues: **Standards**. If we too far with this we push out potential businesses or development from our area. We need to protect what we have and what is aesthetically appealing, that's a big step. Eg: a 40 acres ugly blacktop lot or a nicer, landscaped, parking lot that is better looking.

Dylan restarted the discussion regarding the Size of the district.

Jason stated again that we have already allowed Business into the district. So now we must address how we want it to be going forward.

Parameters were reviewed again and defined by utilizing page 1 from the 9/18/18 Chapter 10 Draft Overlay zone map. (W: Gravel Pit Road and K; E: County Line Rd; N&S: P to W for ½ mile to Gomand Rd; P to E ½ mile.).

The PC gave Devin a map with blue highlights for the parameters.

Fine tuning on the rest of the plan included:

Discussion about the intention of this project—all agreed it was not to "knit-pick" each and every item because it would be too time-consuming and costly for the Town.

Devin and the group referred to September 18 Handout #2, Especially Section I: Design Standards and Guidelines #2 in Section I: Maximum Site Coverage.

The PC scratched Option 3 "Landscaping and Open Space" in the handout entitled Options/Alternatives to consider.

Lot Coverage Options were then discussed: Mike Gilson stated **no more than 15%** because 45% is way too high. If you're going to stay with the rural atmosphere, 5% is probably what it currently is.

Devin stated that's why he thought 15% might be better.

John was concerned about the amount of space a mound system uses.

Brad stated if there are not hard boundary numbers, there will be constant questioning as to the amount required, whereas if there are set standards to follow, it will be easier to follow.

Mike Gilson still felt the district is too big. He stated that having the district be bigger never came up during the meetings. He stated it should stay just around the immediate area.

Due to the length of the meeting, there was discussion as to how much further to proceed. The PC decided they should at least decide **how big** the Overlay district should be.

Devin stated it was also important to make a final decision on **Land Use/Permitted Uses or not with the Overlay** or does it follow what the already existing design standards are. If you want to do something different, then it would need to be rezoned and be approved and be consistent.

Gary Jonet stated he thought it should be decided with the meetings beforehand when they decide to rezone as business...they would need to present what kind of business they are going to have, and they'd have to show designs and plans for building and parking, etc. It should be approved there. The zoning is open, there are 3 pages of things you could do without having to get it approved. With the Overlay district, it's exceptional and it should be approved when it's presented as far as what business it would be.

Dylan stated, so then it would need a Conditional Use? Gary stated yes.

Permitted Uses: Everything could be a Conditional Use.

John revisited the Lot Coverage issue with Mike, questioning if 15% is ok with him. Mike stated that 15% was probably to keep the rural atmosphere here. Devin stated yes. Mike explained how in Ephraim Door County, where he has some property, he's at about 22%, which is too high. The max in DC is more 15%. He stated you have to take into account infrastructure requirements like sewer, water, etc. He stated Dawn added you also have to take into account how much room a mound system take up—she said it seems to be the standard for most of the area septic systems now due to the rock topography everywhere.

Then they discussed the various lot sizes Devin gave as examples. Talk of different pavement materials and the outbuilding impact have on lots—especially small lots.

Brad stated he liked using alternative pavement styles as an option.

Jason moved the group on to the Future Land Use maps. Various examples of smarter Land Uses were discussed. (like new strip malls with limited entrances so they look more appealing than the old style). Devin's thought was keeping it restricted to one business per lot. He said an alternative would be should there be a provision for "shared access"? It might be more problematic than it's worth? But it might make sense? Should there be an allowance for more than one in an area? Mike Gilson stated he thought that was the type of environment the Town was trying to avoid! Devin stated that type of stuff is addressed more in larger site developments.

Jason stated that all we've been discussing at the various meetings has to match up with our map.

Devin stressed The Future Land Use Map needs to **consistent**. Should it show the Future Land Use include the new overlay area? What do we want to call it—Mixed Use? Or Mixed Agricultural/Residential/Commercial? And then if someone wants to rezone, then they'd come in and go through that process but that option would be available to them. If you don't have that, to try and stay consistent with it, then you would have to deny everything.

Jason questioned then wouldn't we use the public review meeting in that case?

Devin stated if someone doesn't want to rezone an area, then it can be talked about.

Jason questioned so we're not going to specifically only allow agricultural, residential and B1 Business?

Devin stated that it's up to the Town as to what it wants to allow? Whatever you want it to be, it should be consistent with the map. Dylan stated Mixed Use? That the area is going to be transitional over the next 20 years.

Jason questioned then if it should just be called Mixed Use? Devin said it could or the Town could set some parameters within that mixed use means Residential, Commercial, etc. and EXCLUDE Industrial. Gary Jonet said that he was going to suggest that Industrial be excluded for sure.

Devin stated that if you do the Overlay area, then no one can presume anything. Then you just made all that and no one is going to use it anything..."

I can do those changes, revise the area itself and then whether or not you're all goon on this and any changes. And then I would recommend moving forward next time. At least in adopting the resolution.

Jason asked Dawn at what point will we turn it over to the Town's attorney for review? Now or at the final end?

Dawn stated she'd needed Debbie Mercier's advice on that.

Devin stated he knows the attorney has looked at what we had so far.

Debbie asked Devin if he was going to put it all (the new input) together again.

Devin stated he would be taking all of the input from this night's meeting and revise it as applicable, and if there is not anymore new things, as far as changes, he would present it for consideration for next time—between all those 3 things.

John and Jason questioned, that we should do what Gary suggested and leave out/**exclude Industrial** for that area.

Gary added that we also need to update our Industrial District wording.

Debbie questioned Devin as to what the attorney's concerns/input are so far.

Devin stated that when he met with the attorney he did not have any major issues with what we had so far. He seemed comfortable with it so far. I would advise having him look at it before having him sign off on it.

John asked if the Town needs to have him come to look it over or just review it before we proceed.

Devin stated if he reviews it ahead of our meeting, he did not think he (the attorney) would need to be at the meeting.

Dawn confirmed with Devin that he would revise it, have the attorney look at it, then bring that version of the project to the Town Planning meeting in January. Devin stated yes.

Dawn then questioned: So if we would review it, with no further public input at that meeting, then we'd approve it, pass a resolution to adopt it and send it on to the Town for them to review.

Devin stated that it would first go into the 30 day open Public Review period before actually going to the Town for final approval. John speculated it would then be March for final approval time. Devin agreed.

Dawn questioned Devin and Debbie if the foresaw any issues with Kewaunee County possibly having any issues with the proposed amendment—she sited someone in the public concerned about that possibility.

Devin stated someone could voice an objection but it is the Town's plan. Gary interjected that they could object BUT it's our Town's Plan and if the PC recommends it and the Town approves it, then that's it.

Dawn questioned if that has happened with other municipalities. John stated the City of Green Bay has some say in New Franken area policy implementation.

Devin stated that it has happened in other areas, but it would not be likely in our situation. A municipality (like the City of Green Bay) would have to have “extra territorial review” privileges in place for situations like subdivision development reviews. This would not apply for this overlay area.

Jason clarified, so in January, when you bring this back for review at the Planning meeting, it would then go into 30 day review.

Dawn questioned when does the 30 days go into affect—after the Planning Meeting in January or after the Town Board/Public Hearing in February?

Devin stated the 30 day review period would start after the Planning Commission resolution for approval at the January meeting. Jason stated that would mean it would most likely take until the March Town Board for a Public Hearing.

Debbie Mercier stated there is a February 19th election, which would interfere with Town Meeting dates. It was also noted that the Town Election would lead to a new Town Board voting on it, with new persons needing to be brought up to speed on the plan, depending on how the election turns out. Midnight April 2, 2019 would be the new Town Board. The new officers would be sworn in and take their places April 9, 2019.

Jason stated that the March Town Board meeting would be enough time. Ryan stated he will be out of Town for that meeting. Dawn stated they (the Town Board) could not do a vote then without Ryan because they are short for a quorum. Debbie speculated the Town could hold a special meeting when Ryan is available, if need be.

A number of PC members reminded the group to remember they also need to have time to have the Public Meeting postings.

It was finally decided to have the usual Planning Commission Meeting and proceed from that point, depending on the outcome of that meeting.

Dawn confirmed with Devin that he would send everyone materials for that meeting ahead of time for review.

**Date & Time of Next Planning Commission Meeting were set: Tuesday, January 15, 2019 at 7pm.**

Per Debbie Mercier, we will have to determine when the Public Hearing will be later.

**Motion to Adjourn Made by:** Jason Miller. Mike Gilson **2nded. AYES: 7 NAYS: 0. Motion Carried.**  
**Adjournment time:** 9:45 pm.

---

**Planning Commission Chairperson**

---

**Planning Commission Secretary**