



Plan Commission

Special Meeting

Final Minutes

335 South Broadway
De Pere, WI 54115
<https://www.deperewi.gov/>

Monday, December 20, 2021

7:00 PM

Council Chambers and Virtual

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Mayor James Boyd

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
James Boyd	Mayor	Present	
Derek Beiderwieden	Commissioner	Present	
Brenda Busch	Commissioner	Present	
Dan Carpenter	Aldersperson	Present	
Mark Higgins	Commissioner	Present	
Dean Raasch	Aldersperson	Present	
Grant Schilling	Commissioner	Present	

Also present: Development Services Director Daniel Lindstrom and City Planner Peter Schlein.

2. Approval of the minutes of the November 22, 2021 Plan Commission meeting.

RESULT:	ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Derek Beiderwieden, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Brenda Busch, Commissioner
AYES:	Boyd, Beiderwieden, Busch, Carpenter, Higgins, Raasch, Schilling

3. Public comments upon matters not on the agenda.

There were no public comments.

RESULT:	DISCUSSED
----------------	------------------

4. Discussion about proposed changes to the City's proposed DRAFT Zoning Code related to zoning districts, downtown design standards, and the administrative process for site plans.

Development Services Director Daniel Lindstrom and City Planner Peter Schlein provided an overview to the City's new zoning code, focusing on the following three topics: zoning districts, downtown design standards, and the administrative process for site plans. The presentation began with a review of the new proposed zoning districts. Peter explained the new residential districts which will replace the current R-1, R-2, R-3 and R-4 districts. Mark Higgins asked if the concept of tiny homes would be included in the new code. Peter replied that tiny homes are not included, but backyard cottages will be allowed, with certain limitations and restrictions. He added that front, side and rear yard setbacks have also been reduced. Other changes include separate house and attached garage setbacks, rear alley driveways in the R1-45 and R2-45 districts, increased square footage for accessory buildings, and short term rental regulations for VRBO and AirBNB properties. Daniel added that these changes are being proposed to try to bring more homes in De Pere into conformity. The discussion moved on to downtown business districts, with an emphasis on mixed-use districts. Derek Beiderwieden questioned the idea of limiting the number of stories allowed in certain districts. Discussion followed and the Plan Commission members were in agreement that there should not be a height limit imposed for the MX1 district. Peter highlighted the MX districts, which defines separate requirements for six types of buildings, updated facade and cap materials,

textures, and shadow lines. He also noted that landscape requirements will be clarified and more clearly defined in the new code. New special districts include: PI-2, PI-2, and PUD (universities, schools, churches), CON - Conservancy (no change), AG - Agricultural (no change).

The second topic of discussion was related to downtown design standards. Peter discussed the six main facade materials that are currently in the code: brick, masonry, concrete, natural stone, PC approved material, and metal panel accents. Changes in the new code in the MX and GX districts call for seven "major" materials that must cover 70% of front facade: brick, CMU, fiber cement board, glass, metal, stone, wood and twelve "minor" materials that can cover up to 30% of front: concrete, fiber cement board, glass, metal, composite material, corten metal, stucco (20%), ceramic tile (20%), translucent panel (20%), vinyl (20%), wood (20%), wood composite (20%). This would give developers more options & flexibility. Other building design elements include: windows/shutters/balconies, with specific requirements for each category.

The third topic of the meeting was to discuss the administrative process for site plan review, which was presented by Development Services Director Daniel Lindstrom. With the current schedule, the review process follows this path: concept sketches are submitted to staff, pre-consult with plan reviewers, formal site plan submitted, staff reviews plans, conditions of approval created, staff writes Plan Commission report, Plan Commission agenda published, Plan Commission conditionally approves, post approval revisions with staff, final site plan approval, applicant applies for permits. In the first example, the entire review process took almost 6 months from start to finish. The pros of this process are that Plan Commission knows of the site plan prior to permits being issued and meeting dates are established for reviews. The cons of this process are that a lot of staff hours are used for meeting preparation, staff is rushed to complete reviews in time for meetings, and the City may appear development-unfriendly due to the lengthy process. In order to be more development-ready, the Development Services Department proposed an alternative review process that could be adopted by the City which highlights a staff-only review process for site plans. In this scenario, the plan reviewers review the plans instead of the Plan Commission and staff conditionally approves the site plan instead of the Plan Commission. After the final site plan approval, the applicant can apply for permits and staff provides a summary of approvals to the Plan Commission. In the second example, the entire review process took one to two months as opposed to six months. Ald. Raasch asked if Plan Commission can appeal a decision made by staff and Daniel replied yes. Staff would create a web portal for all existing site plans to reside and would present a monthly summary for the approved site plan. The applicant and Plan Commission can appeal an administrative decision and Daniel restated that appeals and revisions need to be based on interpretations of the prescribed zoning code standards. Discussion followed and it was agreed that staff should move toward implementing this new process as long as the Plan Commission had the means to appeal a decision. Daniel noted that the next review of the zoning code will include a more formal review of the approval process and procedures as well as a review of the sign code.

RESULT:	DISCUSSED
----------------	------------------

Adjournment

Derek Beiderwieden moved, seconded by Mayor Boyd, to adjourn the meeting at 8:46 pm. Upon vote, motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,
Kelly Barker