

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD AT THE
GREENFIELD CITY HALL ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2015**

1. The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m. by Mayor Neitzke

ROLL CALL:	Mayor Michael Neitzke	Present
	Ald. Karl Kastner	Present
	Mr. Brian Weis	Excused
	Ms. Denise Collins	Present
	Mr. Frederick Hess	Present
	Ms. Christine Hallen	Present
	Mr. Bradley Sponholz	Present
	Mr. Steve Rogers (alt.)	Present
	Mr. Don Carlson (alt.)	Present

ALSO PRESENT: Charles Erickson – Community Development Manager
Rick Sokol – Director of Neighborhood Services
Jeff Katz – City Engineer
Ald. Bruce Bailey

2. Motion by Ms. Hallen, seconded by Mr. Hess to approve the January 13, 2015 minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Discussion regarding the Common Council meetings held on January 20th & February 3rd.
At the January 20th meeting the reconsideration vote occurred regarding the Denny's Special Use denial that occurred at the January 6th meeting; the Special Use/Site/Building/Landscaping was then approved. Also approved were the changes to the Greenfield Emporium Square at 27th & College including Xperience Fitness going into the former Drug Emporium space, and the building addition for Greenfield Auto Body (4739 S. 27th).

At the February 3rd meeting the Supreme Gas (4691 S. 27th) Special Use Review was held over.

4. James Ostrowski, Meijer Stores Limited Partnership, 855 S. Randal Road, St. Charles, IL 60174, represented by Paul Phillips, Greenberg Farrow, 1050 S. Grider Street, Appleton, WI 54914 requests a PUD Amendment/Site, Building, & Landscaping Review/Special Uses (gas/convenience store, alcohol product sales in the grocery store, pharmacy drive-up, & outdoor display/sales) in conjunction with the proposed construction of a 193K s.f. grocery/general merchandise structure with a 22K s.f. attached garden center, and a separate 2,500 s.f. gas/convenience building at the former Mt. Carmel site, 5700 W. Layton Avenue. Tax Key #602-9947-003 & 602-9945-001. [[Follow-up to discussion at the August, September & December PC meetings.]]

1. Background: [[The following narrative is similar to what had been presented at the earlier PC meetings, *but any new substantial comments applicable to site and/or building changes are in Italics.*]]

The main 'new' attachments pertain to these elements discussed at the December PC:

- *Building elevation updates for both the main building and the gas/convenience structure (dated 2/4/15).*
- *S. 60th Street access and site layout modifications (dated 2/4/15).*
- *Revised signage submittal from Meijer (dated 2/4/15).*

[[It should be noted that every document referenced in this lengthy write-up that may have been distributed at one or more of the three previous PC meetings, are not necessarily attached again if it had been distributed previously. However, all those materials are considered part of the formal record regarding this project.]]

This request is a follow-up to prior reviews at the August PC (Conceptual Project Review) and a PUD Amendment/Site, Building, Landscaping Review (SBL)/Special Uses at the September and December PC meetings. The action taken in September was to authorize the public hearing process to get underway, and that hearing will be held at a CC meeting in *in mid-March/early April. The timing of the hearing has been deferred based upon prior requests from Meijer.*

- 12/2/14 letter from GreenburgFarrow (GF – Meijer architect/engineer) related to prior City review comments. This letter is very important in that it outlines/details the responses GF is providing on behalf of Meijer, and should be reviewed concurrently when these PC Notes are being reviewed, because a verbatim word-for-word may not be repeated for all the respective responses. This seven page letter is broken down as follows:
 - pp. 1 – 2: pertaining to a Storm Water Mgt. Review email from AECOM dated 9/10/14.
 - pp. 2 – 5: pertaining to a 10/8/14 letter from Jeff Tamblyn – DNS Engineering Div.
Also see #25 – Engineering Comments of these Notes.
 - pp. 6 – 7: pertaining to further Plan Staff site/building plan review dated 10/22/14 & 10/28/14. *[[Keep in mind that these were made prior to the receipt of the building plan ‘flip’ as described below.]]*
- The major site change from the earlier review is that now on the west side of the building is the garden center and the loading dock aspect is on the east side of the building. Also, review comments from WisDOT – factoring in future preliminary road improvement design possibilities for I-894 and the S. 60th bridge – have impacted some site layout and building placement aspects.
- Full range of detailed site plans (most recent date: 12/1/14) and building plans (store: dated 10/31/14 and gas/convenience building: dated 12/1/14). 22 pages total.
- Stormwater Report dated 12/1/14 as it relates to the design of the site/roof-top collection system and design of the retention basin. The summary portion is attached
- As of doing their ‘site due diligence’, a soils analysis was done. The summary portion is attached of a Draft document titled ‘Subsurface Exploration and Geotechnical Engineering Evaluation’ and dated 10/24/14.
- Traffic Impact Analysis dated 11/18/14. Overall this document is a couple of hundred pages long; attached are approx. +/-25 pp. which is the main narrative and key exhibits. Actually this document was prepared for review/comment not only by the City, but by WisDOT and Milw. County Traffic Engineering Division. See pp. 16 – 18 for the ‘Recommendations & Conclusion’ section.

As previously discussed at the earlier PC meetings, Meijer has proposed to construct on the former Mt. Carmel site, 5700 W. Layton Ave. an approx. 193K s.f. grocery/general merchandise structure with an approx. 22K s.f. attached garden center, and a separate 2,500 s.f. gas/convenience building on the SW corner; overall parcel size is approx. 24 acres. See attached five page ‘Description of Proposal’, for greater background about their proposal for this site and other historical/operation information about the Meijer company (*i.e. as a ‘refresher’, this Description is attached again*).

Meijer also provides interior leasable space (typically banks and other complimentary services). Those potential occupants have not been finalized, but the building elevations depict the general expected façade in anticipation of those tenants occupying their respective portions of the building. The fuel center, located at the southwest corner of the site has 6 pump islands (12 pumping stations). The vacuum, air pump unit, propane cage, and ice chest will be screened/located along the east exterior of the convenience store.

2. Architectural Review/Exterior Materials: *Changes reflected in the 2/4/15 elevations include a dark accent band (i.e. 'Terra Brun') along the bottom of the building and minor changes in smaller accent bands on the south face. As discussed at the December PC, the use of the precast panels in accordance with the exterior finish legend remains the same. A product sample board is being worked on and hopefully will be presented at the meeting.*

The layout of the fuel pump canopy and convenience building has been reoriented where the canopy is more 'directed' toward S. 60th Street instead of toward Layton; this 'turn' eliminates one pump (6 → 5). The canopy design reflects changes for a cornice element, color change (white to tan), and brick cladding up half-way on the canopy support columns. It should be noted the two of the columns next to the building still need to be cladded. As a reminder, no seasonal outdoor sales at the gas/convenience store are allowed. The propane storage area is on the north side of the building behind its own enclosure.

The façade is mainly comprised of a brick imprint precast panel ('macadamia' with 'tanbark' accents and accent bands). Precast stone bands occasionally divide the two panel colors. The two main entrances are to each side of the main "Meijer" central sign. They each extend above the roof at varying heights including the glass storefronts. 'Award blue' metal fascia bands containing licensee signage are above each entrance.

Within the context of the City's Site Development Standards for building design, the following elements are provided for:

- 'façade articulation' for some elements of the building foot-print
- 'shade coverage' variables for the canopy features over the entrances
- 'horizontal roof plane' variables where the roof-line heights above-grade can vary from 21' to 29' to 32' to 37' to 40'.
- 'fenestration' variables for the raised window/storefront entrance feature

There is a consistent general building design and use of color combinations for their new Wisconsin stores (i.e. Grafton, Oak Creek, Sussex, & Wauwatosa; staff has these respective building elevations for comparison purposes only). The Meijer reps. have discussed their ability/flexibility in working with municipalities to consider a range of exterior material options, and certainly a lot of that consideration involves the orientation of the building on a parcel, whom/what are the neighboring land uses, etc. As a small example, maybe more of actual stone or brick is used instead of a pre-cast panel that is either 'smooth face' or has a 'brick' imprint. In the project narrative and as shown on the site plan, there is a 'screen wall' design on both the south side and southwest corner of the building for cart storage.

With this site the overall building orientation is shown as follows:

- South: main front façade; in this 'view' also is the gas/convenience store. Per the exterior finish legend, the main exterior material is a 'precast panel with a brick imprint' that is either a 'macadamia' or a 'tanbark' color. Staff believes that actual stone (where shown as 'tanbark') and brick (where shown as 'macadamia') are needed on this façade instead of the precast

panel. Furthermore, in the area between the west entrance and the SW corner of the building, that some type of design feature is needed to break-up that 'long wall' (i.e. the use of a 'projecting rib' or 'reveal' or 'offset' could work). Stone columns are needed as part of the garden center fencing facing to the south.

See p. 6 of 12/2/14 letter (Response 1) which reads "...We have added two pilasters between the 'Fresh' entry canopy and the corner pilaster element to help break up the mass as requested. We have also added a brick imprinted precast kneewall along the front of the Garden Center at the south to dress up that feature. Per Meijer's direction we are maintaining the imprinted brick precast wall material along all facades..."

- West: loading dock area and other ancillary uses for the store operation; grade change in that NW corner of the site will partially screen this perspective from S. 60th Street. Since this is a very 'public' side as well given the entrance close by, actual stone and brick are needed instead of pre-cast panels. [[Garden Center now on the west side.]]

See p. 6 of 12/2/14 letter (Response 2) which reads "...Per Meijer direction we have maintained the imprinted precast panels along this elevation which is also broken up by the addition of the larger pilasters elements with cornice..."

- North: rear of the building facing I-894. The use of the pre-cast panels with the brick imprint can work on this façade, but some design feature is needed to break-up the really 'long wall' similar to the comment about the south face and SW corner.

See p. 6 of 12/2/14 letter (Response 3) which reads "...Per Meijer direction we are maintaining the rear elevation as designed with the large corner pilaster elements. The different planes of the material as well as the color differences dress up the façade and break up the plane of the wall length..."

- East: Garden Center portion of the site, which also includes employee parking area and large storm basin. The use of the pre-cast panels with the brick imprint can work here as well, but some 'wrap-around' feature of the desired stone and brick combination is needed at least just past the pharmacy drive-up window. [[Loading dock now on the east side.]]

See p. 6 of 12/2/14 letter (Response 4) which reads "...As currently designed the large corner pilaster elements wrap around both front and rear at the corners. The different planes of the material as well as the color differences dress up the façade and break up the plane of the wall length..."

The gas/convenience building is intended to match the main store's façade materials and colors. There was an early staff concern about the initial submittal of 'white' canopy with a 'blue' band having no architectural 'connection' color-wise or design-wise with either building (i.e. the 'blue' band isn't considered as any significant 'connection'). However, this submittal now reflects revisions such as the 'white' being replaced with the 'macadamia' (or tan) color on the canopy and on the support beams, and also the support beams have brick-cladding on approx. the lower half of the beams.

The prior review of these elements for gas/convenience store designs was based upon review of new construction that had taken place over the years here (i.e. BP @ 124th & Layton; BP @ 27th & Layton; Speedway @ 60th & Cold Spring), where the PC made a real effort to ensure that the canopy design incorporated design elements of the main building. These other local examples were intended to simply show possible alternative design options to maintain a stronger design connection between canopy and store in terms of color, materials, and shape; not just standard flat rectangle.

The exterior of the gas station –needs to match the main building – no panels. Screening details for the propane/ice chest are still needed.

See p. 7 of 12/2/14 letter (Response 1 & 2) which reads “...Per Meijer direction, we have maintained the imprinted precast panels along these elevations...”.

A product sample board and presentation regarding these panels will be presented at the meeting.

3. *Parking/Traffic Flow/Access/Curbed Parking Lot: Since the December PC, there has been a significant amount of staff and Meijer discussion, consultant review/evaluation about the 60th Street access to the gas/convenience building about possible design alternatives including not being allowed at all. The proposed site plan shows a ‘right-in-only’ element from 60th Street where the stacking/turning lane has been redesigned and has been shifted about 40’ north. This redesign is acceptable to staff.*

The main exit to 60th St features a raised curbed element (i.e. ‘pork chop’) in the drive approach to restrict exiting to “right-out” only. This also acts as an ‘in-between’ haven for pedestrians crossing the entire approach. That entrance redesign also restricts direct access to the gas station through the westernmost aisle by extending the curbed, landscaping area east about 80 ft. This is intended to mitigate turning movements within the approach area so close to the street and the potential stacking of cars back out toward the S. 60th Street.

The required parking is 792 stalls, with 702 previously provided. The current plan eliminates the employee parking on the building’s north side, leaving 687 total spaces (105 short). Part of this reduction is applicable to factoring – as noted on the site plan – an anticipated future dedication to WisDOT for I-894 R-O-W.

The Site Plan includes a reference along Layton Avenue and S. 60th Street of “...Extent of Road Improvements by the City...”. This phrase needs to be eliminated because the final determination of who is paying for what is not finalized yet, and would be covered under a separate agreement.

Attached is a 2/5/15 letter from Milw. County Dept. of Transportation – Traffic Engineering office regarding the Layton Ave. and East driveway, and Layton Ave. and S. 60th Street.

Attached for the earlier PC meetings was the narrative portion of a report entitled ‘Initial Redevelopment Review’ (dated 8/22/14) that was prepared by TADI (Traffic Analysis & Design - Cedarburg) which has been submitted to WisDOT, Milw. County, and the City Engineer. The document’s purpose is to essentially raise the broad question of whether or not a full TIA (traffic impact analysis) will be needed, and their own conclusion(s) is ‘Yes’ to that question, which staff concurs. Broad elements to be reviewed include but are not limited to:

- As noted on the site plan, there is a proposed traffic signal at the existing Layton driveway for Mt. Carmel – this is subject to Milw. County approval.
- Related to the potential of a signalized intersection at this location, discussions have occurred with the GF School District about the merits of having a driveway and sidewalk go south from this point, stay east of the baseball field, and make a connection at the northeast corner of the high school parking lot. Everyone is aware of the grade challenges and ‘tightness’ of that general area, but it’s believed to really improve school-related traffic flow by having a second street for ingress/egress.

- The site plan at the time identifies that the other main entrance is off of S. 60th Street, and that the 6-bay loading dock element is now on the east side of the building. Since it's anticipated that many of the semi-truck deliveries will be exiting onto S. 60th Street from either west-bound or east-bound I-894, the TIA will be addressing the ability of trucks to access the site going south on 60th and crossing over via the left turn lane in what is the existing drive-way access to/from Mt. Carmel now. The project narrative indicates that on average there typically are 3 – 4 semi-truck deliveries per day, with increased frequency during the holidays. In addition, other vendors will be coming to/from the site. The site plan 'super-imposes' a semi-truck handling various turning movements entering/exiting/traversing the site (i.e. Sheet C204) from both S. 60th Street and '57th Street'. Obviously the purpose is to ensure that the design is sufficient for those types of turns for the bigger vehicles.
- The fuel center was proposed to have a one way entrance from Layton and a one way exit onto 60th Street (north). Per the attached letter to Keri Williams (GF), City Engineering staff has learned from Milwaukee County that the 'entrance only' opening proposed for along Layton Ave. will need to be removed. Similarly, staff believes that the initially proposed 'exit only' onto S. 60th and subsequent plan change of 'entrance only' from S. 60th Street with its own 'stack/turn' lane, still needs to be removed.

There have been further discussions with Meijer reps. on their desire to retain this 'entrance only' from S. 60th. This element had also been discussed at the Dec. PC meeting, which had included the broad idea of the fuel canopy area being shifted northerly (i.e. 'flipped' to the other side of the convenience building) so it was closer to the main 60th Street entrance as its access point.

- Staff has raised the question to GF about the pros/cons that were considered when internal building layout options were being considered, which then might have impacted the site layout. Specifically, what would happen if the load-dock area were on the east side of the building and the garden center area were on the west side of the building?
- Very preliminary plans have been received from WisDOT regarding potential future roadway and bridge improvements for both I-894 and S. 60th. It would appear to have some impact on the current Meijer site plan at its NW corner, but how much is still to be evaluated by the GF team.
- The driveway off of Layton at '57th' is needed to be dedicated R-O-W at least back to the same depth of the adjacent 'May' parcels (i.e. +/- 270').

Other parking-related aspects include:

Parking calculations use the building sizes (193,000 s.f. – main building & 2,500 s.f. - gas/convenience) ÷ 1,000 to determine if the required parking is met.

$$193,000 \div 1,000 = 193 \quad \text{and} \quad 2,500 \div 1,000 = 2.5$$

The ZC Parking regs.:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{--'Department Store': } & 4 \text{ stalls/1,000 s.f.; } 193 \times 4 = 772 \text{ stalls} \\ \text{--'Gas Station w/Convenience': } & 8 \text{ stalls/1,000 s.f.; } 2.5 \times 8 = \frac{20 \text{ stalls}}{792} \end{aligned}$$

- The site plan shows the stall count (including barrier-free) as: 672 (main store) + 15 (gas/convenience) = 687. Overall the number of handicap stalls (27) is sufficient per code.
- $672 \div 193 = 3.5 \text{ stalls/1,000 s.f.}$
- $15 \div 2.5 = 6.0 \text{ stalls/1,000 s.f.}$

- Parking stall size (9' x 19') with both a 25' and 26' aisle/s meet ZC regs.
 - A drive-up pharmacy is proposed for the southwest corner of the main building looping clockwise.
 - Parking lot has concrete curbing.
 - See Sheet C500 for parking lot signage/stripping plan.
 - The attached site plan materials include a 'truck turning' template for a cab/trailer that is approx. +/-70' long. See Sheet C204.
 - It's understood that when using the 'Department Store' category use for parking purposes, the amount of on-site parking that is provided is less than these specific ZC regulations. However, for comparison purposes when thinking about how the last big-box parking calculation was done in 2010 for the Walmart Supercenter, they were at 4.2 stalls/1,000 s.f. parking (i.e. $148,000 \text{ s.f.} \div 1,000 = 148$; $625 \text{ stalls provided} \div 148 = 4.2$). When viewing the 'parking operation' of the Supercenter over the years at different times of a day/week, clearly sufficient parking is provided. Using some of that practical/anecdotal application is the basis of staff being satisfied that sufficient parking is provided for with the approx. 690 stalls being on-site.
4. Storm Drainage/Grading (lot & building): Attached is the summary of the Stormwater Management Report. The proposed grading plan is also attached. As noted on the site plan, a large tract of land (approx. 3 – 4 ac.) are at the NE corner of the site is set aside for the storm basin. With all new basins, a stormwater management report/analysis will be prepared for City and MMSD review/approval. It's possible some of the design of the basin will incorporate some of the wetland elements on that portion of the site near Honey Creek.

The conclusion of the report dated 12/1/14 is that the "...Storm Water Management Plan has been designed with permanent post-construction storm water management features. Discharge rates will be controlled per the requirements of the City and MMSD. The site has been designed to manage water quality for the development in accordance with DNR requirements....".

Also, see Sheet C300 – Overall Grading Plan and the last two pages of the 11"x 17" submittal which are detailed survey data of the existing building/site.

5. Lighting (building & site): *Clarification is still needed on canopy fixtures. It is uncertain which fixtures are under the gas/convenience store canopy because those lights need to be 'flush' with the under-side of the canopy.* Attached is the photometric grid and luminaire schedule for the various locations of the overall lighting.

Sheets C801 & C802 are lighting related. While the descriptions on C802 may provide the answer, clarification is needed as to if these fixtures are true cut-off style fixtures, plus it is uncertain which fixtures are under the gas/convenience store canopy because those lights need to be 'flush' with the under-side of the canopy. *Heights of the concrete pole bases need to be clarified since 6" above grade is what is desired for curbed landscape areas, and two feet (2') high is fine within parking lots (i.e. unprotected poles).*

Proposed mounting heights are at 33' for the main lighting poles, with 1000 watt being the highest.

6. Utilities: Attached is the proposed Utility Plan. The Mt. Carmel building(s), like this building footprint location favors the northerly side of the parcel. It may be possible that on a limited basis some of the existing water and sanitary system as it comes into the site will still be able to be used, which might preclude the need for any road cut(s). However, most of the utility lines within the site are new installations.

See Sheet C400.

7. HVAC/Utility Box Screening: Parapet wall design will screen the roof-top HVAC units. The west side of the building also includes other building operational features, so the screening of that element will be part of the continued review.
8. Signage: Attached are the proposed signage plan. The two existing on-site billboards are expected to be removed. As noted on the front building elevation, there is a large wall sign (i.e. approx. 10' high) and on the north (freeway side) as well. Plus there are other accents on the building, a couple of free-standing signs are near the entrances for the main store. The gas/convenience store has its own signage elements on the canopy and free-standing pricing signs.

Overall signage detail is on sheet C501 (dated 2/4/15)

- Store signage = 726 s.f.
- Convenience store = 75 s.f.
- Monument signs (2 - store & 1- gas) = 430 s.f. (see first bullet point below)
1,231 s.f.

Since the proposed monument sign background is 'white', the Sign Code requires that the background be opaque so that at night only the letters are lit. Overall height of just under 10' is per code. Keeping the monument sign off of S. 60th Street at least 25' back from the lot line, as proposed, will be important due to 'sight-line' concerns for exiting vehicles and north-bound traffic.

Other signage changes:

- *Proposed pylon style sign on the north side of the parcel that is 50' high, with a sign that is 13' x 30' = 390 s.f. (i.e. sheet C501 references this dimension @ 200 s.f. – clarification needed). The idea of having free-way visibility is an understandable request, and having another wall sign and using the building to 'create' its own height was actually part of earlier building elevation plans for this north side wall. In this case the sign is proposed to be perpendicular to I-894. The problem Sign Code-wise is that pylon-style signs, or alternatively a sign on top of the roof, are not allowed. Staff believes that adding yet another almost 400 s.f. of signage with a pylon is too much square footage and is a style not even allowed at all. Another wall sign on the highest portion of the north wall is an acceptable alternative. Given the size of this building and the overall amount of signage already, finding this location is not going to be a difficult task.*
 - *The monument sign proposed at '57th St.' entrance has been shifted closer to Layton, with a setback of 25' to 10'. The southerly shift is fine, but it may need to be shifted slightly (5') to the west when the final R-O-W determination is made for 57th Street.*
 - *The 3-sided monument price point sign proposed at the SW corner of the parcel, has been shifted from a 25' setback to a 10' setback.*
9. Dumpster/Screening/Gated (materials used): *Screening details for the propane enclosure are still needed. Additionally, the trash enclosure (which needs a service door or maze entry) has been shifted to the north side of the convenience store.*

Clarification is needed on the location and the type of screening of the ice chest, outside sales, and propane cage at the gas/convenience building. It's understood that having propane outside the building is a basic Fire Code element, and the proposal description suggests the propane and ice chest are all screened and located against the east wall, but that 'screening' feature still needs to be further identified. From past experiences, having seasonal outdoor sales at the gas/convenience store, whether it's by the building and/or within the canopy area (i.e. wood to soda to salt to auto

maintenance products) is specifically not allowed in the ZC and that standard needs to be maintained. Allowing it here only 'opens-the-door' for this type of stuff to multiply throughout the City given the large number of gas/convenience stores here. The dumpster enclosure still needs to include either a 'service door' or a 'maze' wall entry element.

See p. 7 of the 12/2/14 letter (Response 5) which reads "...The trash enclosure wall is a brick imprinted precast concrete wall that matches the building. The service gate is a solid wood face on a steel frame.

Staff believes having this dumpster in the 'front yard' of this corner lot due west of the gas/convenience store is not desirable. A more 'screened' location, at the very least, is on the north side of the gas/convenience building or at its northeast corner, where the access could be aligned with a drive aisle.

10. Fencing: The garden center on the west side is surrounded by a 'black' decorative fence.

More brick columns are needed particularly on the south face of the garden center.

11. Landscaping/Buffer Yard: *Meijer has been requested to revise the landscaping plan along the Layton Ave. frontage to factor in the impact of the existing Milwaukee Water Utility easement (20' x 450' +/-) and the practical limitation that has in the range and type of plantings in this buffer landscaping area. Further review with the City Forester and Milw. Water will be needed when that info. is re-submitted.*

Attached is the proposed and detailed landscaping plan (i.e. six pages, but the site is 'divided' into four areas to better enable specific review. As noted previously, in reviewing site layout options, staff has recommended to Meijer that creating more landscape perimeter areas such as along Layton (i.e. 33' wide) and having bigger landscape islands on the parking stall 'end-caps', would probably work best instead of having multiple and smaller 'islands' in the parking lot, and the current site plan has incorporated those types of suggestions.

On an overall basis, there are approx. 65 trees being planted (Autumn Blaze Red Maple, Shademaster Honey Locust, Prairie Fire Crab Apple, Greenspire Linden), approx. 1,000 bushes/shrubs, and other items such as annuals/perennials, grasses, and ground covers.

The PUD-Commercial zoning district has a desired 35% greenspace ratio. As noted on the site plan materials, while the overall site is approx. 24 acres, about 9 acres is pervious area (39%). This calculation naturally includes the large area at the northeast corner of the site for storm basin purposes.

12. Landscaping Cash Deposit/Letter of Credit: When a landscaping plan is submitted, the following are pertinent financial security requirements: 125% of the landscaping costs with 30% retained for two years after initial planting. Furthermore, an on-going condition of approval will be that the landscaping will be subject to annual review by the City to make sure all landscaping features are still being maintained, and that any dead/dying landscaping be replaced as necessary.
13. Street Trees: See comments from Mr. Ferminich referenced below.
14. City Forester Site Inspection: Landscaping plan review underway. A more detailed analysis provided by Mr. Ferminich – City Forester was distributed at the Dec. 9th meeting.
15. Hours of Operation: Both the store and the fuel center operation are open 24/7, however full access to the fuel center convenience store will only be from 6:00 a.m. – 11:00 p.m. with transactions outside those hours occurring via a 'lazy-susan' device with a fuel center employee.

16. Sidewalks: The existing sidewalk along the north side of Layton and east side of S. 60th Street naturally remain, but there likely will be some re-laying of portions of it in relation to proposed new drive approach locations. A private sidewalk is provided near the Layton access to/from the SE corner of the building, one location from S. 60th St. to/from the SW corner of the building, and one location from S. 60th Street to the gas/convenience building.
17. Fire Department: The buildings will be sprinklered, and there likely will be other life safety measures the FD will be considering.
18. Police Department: Site plan review underway.
19. Outside Agencies: Given the scale of the project and the fact that Meijer's has approvals in at least four other SE Wisconsin communities, they are familiar with working with a host of state/local agencies and in this case it will include: MMSD, Milw. County, Milw. Water, DNR, WisDOT, Wis. Dept. of Workforce Development, FEMA.
20. Erosion Control: Will be needed from the City Engineering office prior to any site work starting.

An erosion control plan is included in the plan submittal. See Sheets C304 & C305.

21. PUD Requirements: Since the existing zoning is PUD-Commercial (i.e. actually going back to 1997 when this formal designation was made – see attached CC minute excerpt), given the nature of the Meijer's proposal it will be considered a PUD amendment, naturally as a 'major change' needing a public hearing. Concurrent with that will be the respective Special Use requests that will be combined under one broad public hearing for multiple items.
22. Miscellaneous: *To protect pedestrians and shoppers in the garden center/outdoor area, bollards will line the pharmacy drive up. Staff still needs to get some idea of what materials will be on display or sold at the "Outdoor Sales Area" at the store's SW corner.*

Attached is a 11/14/14 letter from Harbhajan Singh, 5030 Loomis Rd, to the Mayor and Common Council regarding his objection to this proposal.

Special Use – liquor sales area. The required enclosure of the sales area needs to be provided in the basic foot-print design, plus it is anticipated that the ability to program the electronic cash registers is a standard operation to make sure certain products (i.e. alcohol) are not sold before/after the statutorily allowed time-frame. Details still needed.

Staff had previously discussed with Meijer reps. the potential of acquiring the 'May' properties at the SE corner of the site, but they have indicated that they don't have a current interest in them. Separately staff has discussed with the property owner – Barb May – some of the potential impediments to her property (i.e. wetlands and flood-plain) which would need to be resolved either by her or any prospective buyer in the future. At this point, she and other family members are not ready to hire outside persons/companies to address or correct those elements.

Part of the Special Use request pertains to 'outdoor display/sales'. At the SW corner of the store building is a proposed 'Outdoor Sales Area' (i.e. surface is concrete), that is surrounded by the Pharmacy drive-up lane. The narrative/plans presented thus far are 'silent' on any specificity of what types of materials will be on display or sold there.

Clarification needed on that aspect and how customers in that 'sales area' are 'protected' from vehicles – beyond a concrete curbing element – in the immediately adjacent pharmacy drive-up lane, the east/west aisle along the front of the building, and the north/south aisle leading to the garden center area.

23. Engineering Comments: Below is the 10/8/14 letter to GF from Mr. Tamblyn detailing these comments (also refer to the 12/2/14 GF response letter on these items):

- Plan review comments are attached. Comments are based on plan set dated August 29th, 2014. Given the items discussed during our October 2nd, 2014 meeting regarding the pending Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and WI DOT, the City is anticipating design changes. Based on the plans submitted to date, we are providing the following general comments at this time.
- Land Division: A Certified Survey Map (CSM) will need to be prepared to combine property within development prior to/in conjunction with development construction. Any easements being dedicated to the City should be included on the CSM to eliminate the need for separate easement documents.
- Demolition: A demolition plan should be prepared to identify demolition phasing, trucking routes/tracking pad, how utilities are being abandoned, erosion control measures that may be needed, etc.
- Erosion Control: An erosion control plan needs to be prepared and included in the plan set. Given the scope of the development, a phased erosion control plan from demolition to finished grading is required. The City typically likes to see Type D inlet baskets for inlet protection. WI DNR Construction Site Storm Permit (formerly NOI) may be applicable.
- Environmental/Wetland/Floodplain: Based on the plans provide, it appears that wetland delineation has been completed on the site and that wetland mitigation is not warranted at this time. Please provide City with a copy of the wetland delineation concurrence paperwork from the WI DNR.

Based on the plans provided, a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) for flood plain will be required from FEMA. City is working with Developer on the submission of LOMR paperwork.

- Grading: Given design/layout changes are anticipated, there are no grading comments at this time. Provide a detailed grading plan to reflect those changes.
- Water Main: Obtain water main review comments from Milwaukee Water Works. Water main system subject to review by Greenfield Fire Department. Details should be provided for meter pits – location, size, etc.

With the proposed design, there appear to be several water main crossings with the storm sewer. We did not find any vertical information provided for said water main. Confirm elevations for clearance and WM freezing issues.

- Storm Sewer – Storm Water Management: Please refer to September 10, 2104 storm water management plan review comments from AECOM. Additional comments may be added as development design/layout is modified. The southernmost storm sewer line must outlet into the storm water management basin. Given the size and location of the storm water management basin, it appears that the top of the embankment will be used to accommodate future construction equipment used for basin maintenance. Basin design should be such to accommodate said constriction equipment.
- Sanitary Sewer Standards: CCTV existing private main and provide video to City for review. If warranted, rehabilitation may be needed on existing private main to address I/I issues and other defects. Conduct private sanitary manhole inspections and forward data to City, including photos. If warranted, rehabilitation on existing private manholes may be needed. Of specific concern is the existing manhole that you are proposing to connect into. There are several existing lines coming into this manhole and its condition may warrant more extensive rehabilitation based on its condition.

All new sanitary sewer MH's to have external seals. In addition, external seals should be added to existing sanitary manholes that are going to remain. Sanitary sewer manholes are to have solid covers. The City requires Neenah R-1661 covers. Those sections of sanitary sewer that are being abandoned should be identified and include a note indicating how they are being abandoned. A 4" PVC is servicing the gas station from your 8" main. Please verify that a 4" service will be sufficient.

Also, we assume there are clean-outs located at the angle points; however they have not been noted. Following installation of any new sanitary sewer, City will require post construction CCTV and manhole inspection. During construction, steps must be taken to ensure that debris is not deposited into City sanitary sewer.

- Pavement / Roadway: A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is required for I-894/I-43, W. Layton Ave. and S. 60th St. Said TIA is currently under review by the WI DOT and may impact the development design/layout.

In preliminary discussion with Milwaukee County, the 'entrance only' opening along W. Layton Ave. will need to be removed. The 'exit only' opening onto S. 60th St. will need to be removed. Traffic exiting onto S. 60th St. shall utilize the main S. 60th St. development entrance/exit.

[[The 12/2/14 letter from GF (see Response 27) reads "...This driveway has been removed from the plan. An 'entrance only' has been added in its place; this is accounted for in the TIA...". For the reason(s) that the City Engineering staff in its 10/8/14 letter indicated that the 'exit only' opening needed to be removed, the same rationale also applies to not wanting an 'entrance only' from S. 60th Street. Mainly it's too close to the corner even if there is a separate 'turn lane' shown.]]

It appears that private curb and gutter has a 19" cross-section. For those sections that connect into public streets, the curb and gutter cross-section shall match the cross-section of the public street through the curb return radius.

- Lighting: City street lighting modification will need to be identified once TIA impacts and pavement design changes to public streets are determined. Private lighting has not been reviewed at this time. Private lighting comments will be forthcoming as part of site, building and landscape review.
- Non-City Utility Standards: A specific plan sheet has been provided showing the location of existing non-City utilities, however a specific plan has not been provided to detail how existing non-City utilities are being abandoned, nor where non-City utilities are being installed.
- General Comments: A Developers/PUD Agreement will need to be executed between Developer and City. City will provide a draft version of the agreement once the site design is closer to being finalized and plan review issues are further along. Please provide impervious area calculations for existing and proposed conditions. Appendix A of the City's Infrastructure and Development Design Manual was forwarded previously.

Recommendation:

For the Dec. 9th PC meeting:

Staff is supportive of the overall redevelopment of this site with both buildings and general site layout as proposed by Meijer. However, at this point staff would suggest actually not forwarding any recommendation to the CC in advance of the 1/6/15 public hearing at this time, but re-visit this matter at the 1/13/15 PC meeting.

The reasons being:

- Meijer prefers no formal action from the CC at the Jan. 6th mtg., so there isn't any need to 'hurry it' through the PC review process now (i.e. other 'outside entities' still need to approve various elements of the project such as WisDOT and FEMA).
- PC could then consider elements as a follow-up to whatever may be presented/discussed at the public hearing.
- There may be a need for Meijer to still address certain 'open' elements referenced above and/or which may come up separately at the Dec. 9th PC meeting.
- Due to the large scale of this project naturally a great deal of materials are being distributed to the PC, and maybe without as much lead-time as normally would be desired.
- Staff is concerned about the -- in so many words -- rejection by Meijer of the suggestions to improve the south exterior by using actual stone and brick instead of the wholesale use of the panels. Like most municipalities, we have Site Development Standards, where these design features are basic elements that are relied upon. But the idea of using more stone/brick for a Meijer building is not an original idea. Staff simply extracted from the 'exterior finish material legend' of approved projects in Grafton, Oak Creek, Sussex, and Wauwatosa.

At this site:

- except at the SW corner, most of the west side is 'covered' by the garden center, so the predominate use of panels is ok;
- the north side is next to the freeway and is the back of the building, so the use of panels is ok;
- except at the SE corner, most of the east side is now the loading dock area, so the predominate use of panels is ok.

For the Jan. 13th PC meeting:

- *Approve subject to PC and staff comments, the PUD Amendment/Site, Building, Landscaping Review/Special Uses (gas/convenience store, alcohol product sales in the grocery store, pharmacy drive-up, and outdoor display/sales) in conjunction with the proposed construction of a 193K s.f. grocery/general merchandise structure with a 22K s.f. attached garden center, and a separate 2,500 s.f. gas/convenience building at the former Mt. Carmel site.*
- *Forward this favorable recommendation to the appropriate upcoming CC meeting when the public hearing on this matter is to be held.*

Jim Ostrowski with Meijer and Paul Phillips with Greenburg Farrow, the architectural firm, were present to answer questions.

Mr. Erickson gave a review of the project to date. Mayor Neitzke stated that there was confusion over the discussion at the last meeting with regard to what the building should look like. It appears they've tried to incorporate the corner element, the color schemes, and the architectural features such as awnings, lighting and wall sconces that the City is looking for, with a final rendering coming forward at the Public Hearing in the next 6-8 weeks. The biggest change to the site plan was with the traffic flow patterns. Also of concern is the pylon sign, its height, and its location. The City is trying to be accommodating to Meijers but the proposed pylon sign that is 50' high and almost 400 sq. ft. is something that we may not be able to approve for a variety of reasons, but perhaps a north side wall sign might work. Also important for the north elevation is to add some vertical relief wall design features. Discussion occurred on how there is a general uniformity on the stores they are bringing to Wisconsin, with just slight tweaks to each one. The Greenfield store is most similar to the Oak Creek store in terms of the color scheme, with the Greenfield store having three base colors, while most have two. The building elevation at the rear is approx. 25 feet high, where the existing Kindred building is about half that. Therefore this will dramatically change the view from the freeway.

Mayor Neitzke spoke on the challenges of this site, including soil issues and asbestos/environmental concerns. A minor issue is a bus shelter location at 57th Street, near the main entrance. The lines of sight for this need to be determined with the County. The City initiated a TIF at this site and we are currently going thru the initial discussions on that, with it noted that Meijer isn't seeking any TIF assistance for their project. The TIF is an opportunity for the City, Milwaukee County and the Greenfield School District to get some much needed infrastructure improvements done. As part of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan the City has tried to make the area surrounding Konkel Park, the Library, the Police & Fire buildings, etc. a type of "City Center", where the majority of civic activities occur. A portion of the TIF would be utilized to incorporate some street scaping for this area. Mayor Neitzke stated how Meijer has been very accommodating and very accessible to work with, and it is truly appreciated.

Ms. Hallen stated her concerns over Meijer having a gas station and that effect on neighboring gas station owners and questioned if there has been further response from those owners. Mayor Neitzke stated he hasn't heard anything from those owners since the initial discussions, and noted an alderperson is concerned about there being too many gas stations. As a gas station is a Special Use, it requires a recommendation by the Plan Commission to forward on to the Common Council, who ultimately decides if it is allowed. Ms. Collins and Mr. Carlson both stated they feel more competition is better as far as the gas station issue is concerned. Mayor Neitzke noted that the improved commerce provided by the store would benefit the overall neighboring businesses.

Motion by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Sponholz to recommend approval of a PUD Amendment/Site, Building, & Landscaping Review/Special Uses (gas/convenience store, alcohol product sales in the grocery store, pharmacy drive-up, & outdoor display/sales), with modifications as discussed tonight that will be presented in time for the public hearing, in conjunction with the proposed construction of a 193K s.f. grocery/general merchandise structure with a 22K s.f. attached garden center, and a separate 2,500 s.f. gas/convenience building at the former Mt. Carmel site, 5700 W. Layton Avenue. Tax Key #602-9947-003 & 602-9945-001. Motion carried unanimously.

5. **Scott Yauck, Cobalt Partners, 207 N. Milwaukee Street, Milwaukee, WI 53202 requests a Comprehensive Land Use Plan revision and a rezoning for a proposed mixed use development – commercial/office/retail/residential – for an approx. 42 acre area between Layton Avenue, S. 84th Street, I-894, and S. 92nd Street (aka: 'Chapman School area'):**
 - **Comprehensive Land Use Plan:** Revise the 'Planned Mixed Use' designation along the northern edge to reflect the land swap the GF School District did with WisDOT last year, and extend the 'Planned Mixed Use' designation both to 84th St./Layton Ave. (instead of 'Planned Business') and to 92nd St./Layton Ave. (instead of 'Community Facilities' and 'Neighborhood Business/Office').
 - **Rezoning:** change existing combination of 'C-2 Commercial/R-2 Residential/I-Institutional/O-Office' to all 'PUD-Mixed Use'.

For the parcels which Cobalt currently does not have under control/secured, the City of Greenfield is including/initiating the proposed rezoning changes per ZC 21.08.0202 – Initiation and the proposed Comprehensive Land Use Plan changes per Chapter 9 – Plan Amendments (Ord. 2629).

Tax Key #'s Range: 606-0034 to 606-0037; 606-0048-001 to 606-0053-001; 606-0059 to 606-0085-007; 606-9980-002 to 606-9983-002. [[Follow-up to discussion at the January PC meeting.]]

1. Background: As a follow up to the Conceptual Review in January, Cobalt Partners (CP) is initiating the rezoning and Land Use Plan change process for their potential mixed use development concept for the Chapman School area (+40 acre area between Layton Avenue, S. 84th Street, I-894, and S. 92nd Street) that could include a wide-range of uses such as commercial, office, retail, medical, hospitality, and residential in various dimensions, scale, and density. See attached PC application and Land Use Plan summary, along with a preliminary 'mapping' layout.

As noted on the PC agenda, in conjunction with the CP proposal the City is initiating the same proposed changes for both the rezoning and Land Use Plan for the parcels which CP does not have under control/secured. Part of the reason for proposing to take this action at the same time is that in the future it may be possible for sale/purchase agreements to be entered into between CP and these respective property owners. To handle potential future similar changes for rezoning and Land Use Plan for these individual parcels which may or may not be sold/purchased, or if these transactions did occur but at likely what would be on an irregular and unpredictable time-frame, would create an unworkable, unmanageable piece-meal effect on the overall redevelopment potential.

- Comprehensive Land Use Plan: Revise the 'Planned Mixed Use' designation along the northern edge to reflect the land swap the GF School District did with WisDOT last year, and extend the 'Planned Mixed Use' designation both to 84th St./Layton Ave. (instead of 'Planned Business') and to 92nd St./Layton Ave. (instead of 'Community Facilities' and 'Neighborhood Business/Office').
- Rezoning: change existing combination of 'C-2 Commercial/R-2 Residential/ I-Institutional/ O-Office' to all 'PUD-Mixed Use'.

This past October, Cobalt entered into an agreement with the GF School District regarding their proposed offer-to-purchase of the 10 acre Chapman School parcel, and then in November the City approved a Memo of Understanding (see attached) with Cobalt to work together in evaluating/analyzing/creating a positive, long-term redevelopment plan.

Compared with past development efforts, there are very positive signs here beyond just their dealings for the 10 acre school district land and with the City:

- They have been able to get an agreement with the 'farmers field' owner for that 10 acres -- east of 92nd Street & south of 894 -- to be included in the proposed development area.
 - They have an agreement with Steinhafels for their corner lot and the seven single family lots they own to the north and west of their store. In very general terms, Cobalt would construct a new building for them in exchange for the land, and likely other considerations.
 - A neighborhood informational meeting will be held at Steinhafels on January 7th and a number of offers-to-purchase have been sent to a number of property owners within this 'Chapman' area.
 - A copy of the Business Journal article from Nov. 9th is attached.
2. Parking/Traffic Flow/Access/Curbed Parking Lot: A traffic study will be needed to determine access to/from 84th, 92nd and Layton Avenue. As everyone is aware, the proximity of the I-894 off-ramp onto 84th Street will need to be addressed, particularly given the holiday season traffic flow in that area.
 3. Utilities: Once more development details are known, there will be an analysis of the MMSD sewer-shed allocation to ensure that sufficient utility capacity is available for the range of proposed uses.
 4. Signage: Possible future sign waiver for a larger monument/electronic reader board style.
 5. Outside Agencies: GF School District, Milwaukee County, MMSD, Milwaukee Water Utility, DNR, WisDOT, etc.

6. PUD Requirements: All details/specifications/plans/requirements associated with a large-scale, phased development of this nature will be incorporated into a developer's agreement.

Recommendation: Approve subject to Plan Commission and staff comments, and authorize the public hearing process to proceed.

Scott Yauck and Dan Roskopf with Cobalt Partners were present to answer questions. Mr. Erickson gave a brief power-point presentation of the proposal.

Cobalt Partners then gave a brief recap of the January Plan Commission presentation and provided a status update of their timeline and the action they are seeking tonight, which is an amendment to the Land Use Plan and Rezoning.

They are currently under contract with 34 of the houses they hope to acquire which leaves less than 5 remaining, in two separate clusters that don't affect the site plan too much overall; also under contract are the Sura property (the 10 acre vacant parcel), and several Steinhafels parcels. Discussions continue with Layton Avenue Baptist Church.

The feedback they've received from the Greenfield School District and the neighborhood has been positive. They've tried to be very fair in their negotiations, keeping true to their approach with the affected homeowners. Mixed use development is the goal for the site, a combination of retail, office, housing, restaurant and fitness uses. The tax base increment over the existing \$8 million is expected to be about \$90-95 million, with creation of about 250 jobs.

Mr. Yauck stated that the market analysis shows that it is a good site. He then went over changes made to the plans since the last Plan Commission meeting. The plans show two areas of zoning: Zone A and Zone B. Zone B is closer to the existing neighborhood and in this Zone they've made modifications and now show a 3-story office building rather than a 5-story. Zone A is more dense, and they are currently looking at the possibility of putting an electronic reader board/billboard at this site, with perhaps some shared revenue with the School District. Also, there is a possibility of perhaps hospitality in Zone B.

Mr. Yauck stated that soil borings will begin tomorrow.

Ms. Hallen questioned the location of the homes not interested in selling yet or at all, to which Mr. Yauck said they wanted to be sensitive about pointing out individual homes publically, but those which remain are located in two areas as noted earlier. Mayor Neitzke said they don't want to get too specific when people are going thru the negotiation process. If someone chooses not to sell and to stay that is their right and the City would not take a stance to initiate legal processes to acquire these properties. Mr. Yauck said they run what they consider a very fair process and in turn have had nothing but positive comments.

Motion by Ald. Kastner, seconded by Ms. Collins to recommend approval of a Comprehensive Land Use Plan revision and a rezoning for a proposed mixed use development – commercial/office/retail/residential – for an approx. 42 acre area between Layton Avenue, S. 84th Street, I-894, and S. 92nd Street (aka: 'Chapman School area'), subject to Plan Commission and staff comments, and authorize the public hearing process to begin. Motion carried unanimously.

6. **Joan Farrell, Goodwill Retail Services, 5300 N. 118th Court, Milwaukee, WI 53225, represented by Paula Mitchell, Berengaria Development, 301 N. Broadway, Suite 300, Milwaukee, WI 53202 requests a Conceptual Project Review to discuss a proposed Goodwill Retail Store/Donation Center**

at 4940 S. 76th Street, for a 22K s.f. leased tenant space that is currently occupied by Office Depot; Special Use needed for ‘used merchandise stores’. Tax Key #617-9977-004.

1. Background: Goodwill (GW) requests a Conceptual Project Review to discuss a proposed Goodwill Retail Store/Donation Center, for a 22K s.f. tenant space that is currently occupied by Office Depot. GW would lease the space. A ‘Special Use’ is needed for ‘used merchandise stores’ in any Commercial zoned district throughout GF – see attached ZC excerpt.

Attached are the detailed Project Narrative, Site Plan, and Concept Building Rendering regarding the proposed operation at this S. 76th Street location. In addition, there is a detailed attachment called ‘GF Project Portfolio’ providing further background on GW in SE Wisconsin and metro Chicago.

2. Architectural Review/Exterior Materials: Office Depot shares a building with Petco, which each have slightly different colored exteriors. As proposed, the west façade will be updated with a new entrance, signage, and window openings. The north façade would feature 2-3 new windows with blue metal awnings and accent lights. Based upon this preliminary submittal, it is staff’s presumption the exterior changes apply only to the proposed GW portion of the building, and that nothing would change for the Petco portion. There would be a separate donation entrance and canopy on the north side of the building that will protect donors from the elements and enhance the donation experience.

The staff perspective is that this site has an older building which has a façade in need of some updating that needs a lot more than a few windows/awnings that GW is proposing for their proposed ‘side’ of the building (i.e. the renovation/conversion of an existing building into the GW in Grafton is but one architectural example). Part of the likely GW interest in this site – as is the case with other commercial entities -- is the success/attractiveness/vibrancy of this S. 76th Street business corridor. Accordingly, an enhancement to the overall building and site by the owner (and maybe the tenant/s) should occur if there is true interest by GW in investing into this area.

3. Parking/Traffic Flow/Access/Curbed Parking Lot: The proposed parking lot changes for the northeast lot, to accommodate the drop-off donations, involve creating two driving paths separated by landscaping (one for main traffic and one for donations only). The donations lanes also feature landscape screening to the east. The main parking for the GW operation would remain on the west side of the parcel, although numerous stalls remain north of the building.
4. Signage: GW will install new signage where existing Office Depot signs are located.
5. Dumpster/Screening/Gated (materials used): A new compactor will be added on the north side of the building adjacent to the existing recessed loading dock. With the addition of the compactor, GW will eliminate the need for an outdoor trash enclosure.
6. Landscaping/Buffer Yard: Could use more landscaping along the far eastern portion of the lot by S. 74th St. to hide/screen the loading dock.
7. Hours of Operation: Mon-Sat: 9 A.M. – 9 P.M.
Sun: 10 A.M. – 8 P.M. (Per their Project Portfolio submittal)

In addition, each day the donation entrance opens one hour earlier and stays open one hour later to accept donations for the convenience of their donors. Each evening the lighting associated with the donation entrance and canopy is powered down when the donation entrance closes.

8. Miscellaneous: Per their proposal, GW installs interior and exterior web-based 24 hour surveillance cameras at all sites. Along with posting signs and providing a clean, maintained site, these cameras deter any donors from dropping off items outside of normal business hours.

Recommendation: No formal action needed at this time.

Staff is split on if this is the best use and/or location for another 'used merchandise store'. A majority believe that given the number of second-hand stores already in GF, much less similar types of uses relatively close-by in nearby communities, that yet another used-merchandise store in GF, is too many.

This perspective doesn't change regardless of the company, or the positive mission, and whether or not there is a property tax payment aspect (directly/indirectly).

- St. Vincent de Paul – Hwy. 100 & Layton (Greenfield)
- Thrift Mart – Hwy 100 & Layton (Greenfield)
- GW – 27th & College (Franklin)
- GW - 109th & Oklahoma (West Allis)
- Bethesda – Hwy. 100 & Grange (Hales Corners)

However, should this project go forward, some staff did raise the question or the alternative possibility of "...What about branding/marketing this location similarly as was done in their Milwaukee '3rd Ward' location (190 N. Broadway) as a vintage/resale boutique, which apparently is known to sell more upscale items under the name of 'Retique' ..."?

Joan Farrell with Goodwill Retail Services and Paula Mitchell, Berengaria Development were present to answer questions.

Ms. Farrell gave a review of Goodwill's mission. Their mission is to provide training, employment and supportive services for people with disabilities and disadvantages who seek greater independence. Goodwill runs training programs and provides services to help people accomplish that goal. The retail store is critical to that mission as it is the economic engine to fund their services. Last year Goodwill earned revenue of \$280 million, and served over 70,000 with employment and life skills.

Ms. Farrell showed a listing of Wisconsin stores and the dates they opened. Currently, there are 57 stores in this territory; which encompasses southeastern Wisconsin and metropolitan Chicago.

Goodwill is also committed to being green and is one of the largest recyclers in the community. The average store recycles over 2 million pounds of goods. As they would be leasing this property they would not be under a tax-exempt status. They pay taxes just like any other retailer would. Retailers located around Goodwill are happy for their presence as they draw a lot of traffic to their stores.

They estimate this store will have approximately 67,000 donor transactions and 200,000 retail transactions annually, equating to about 5,000 visits to this location per week and employing 40-50 people. They work hard to integrate themselves into a community via civic events, and also have voucher programs to help area families. They operate as any other retailer, and take steps to ensure that drop-off donations are collected immediately and put inside the store. To control this they do not allow after hours drop-offs. Donations made at a store are sold at that store. They also have a Club Goodwill program which offers shopping perks and discounts. An analysis of this area's zip code shows there are over 7,000 Club Goodwill members in this area.

Paula Mitchell spoke next on how this site was selected for their needs. One factor is the area and the donations that they would receive from the community. Greenfield is very attractive to Goodwill in that aspect. She spoke on their uniform branding and landscaping styles, and showed renderings of other store's canopy areas where drive-up donations are collected. Also shown were before and after photos of stores to show the end result of their renovations into their typical store model. She then detailed the elements they'd be altering at this site and also the parking layout. They are different than other retailers, who are now shifting to more online sales, while Goodwill is expanding their brick and mortar stores, proof of that is that they've added 35 stores to this region in the last 7 years. They have recently

opened a corporate office/training center at 60th & Grange in Greendale, to which Ald. Kastner questioned if they could have a retail operation there. Ms. Mitchell replied that that was not feasible at that site due to space availability in that building for retail.

Mayor Neitzke questioned if a similar second-hand establishment just started in the area would it have an impact on their success financially, to which Ms. Mitchell replied that Goodwill offers a distinctive shopping experience and they feel they can hold and retain their customer base and profit margin regardless of other resale establishments.

Mayor Neitzke stated that his concerns are that while they are not a religious based organization and will be paying property taxes, he is still concerned about property values. Also it is an old and tired site overall so this is the time to get some substantial improvements made, plus he has concerns about putting a resale shop in the City's major commercial corridor going thru some exciting redevelopment.

Ms. Mitchell said they invest in façade improvements in the stores they go into as they intend to be a long-term neighbor, however, they would need to consult with the property owner on what he would allow as far as altering the façade.

Ms. Mitchell then spoke on their upscale boutique shop, Retique, in downtown Milwaukee's Third Ward, which carries high-end merchandise and is a specialized offshoot. It is housed in a 5,000 sq. ft. space and has been in business for 7-8 years but it is a retail model then won't ever do again.

Mayor Neitzke said this is the time to pressure the property owner to do something with the building as this site is an incredibly valuable property. If the proposal comes forward with minimal modifications it would not be enough to meet expectations. If the entire building is improved (including the Petco side) with elements similar to what were shown in tonight's presentations at the Sheboygan and Pewaukee stores than he maybe would be able to support it; if lesser than that then it does not meet our desire for the potential this site holds, based on the nationally known, top performing restaurants nearby and the extremely high traffic counts. Mayor Neitzke said he supports all that Goodwill does but is not excited about them at this location due to the future potential development that could occur in this area. Ald. Kastner said that while it's a great organization the difference between it and other retailers is that they sell second-hand merchandise and the "stigma" that is often times associated with that. Mr. Rogers stated that there are many people who rely on Goodwill, from all walks of life, and there is truly a need for it.

Mr. Carlson said based on tonight's presentation he sees this as no different than any other retailer who wants to move into this space. Mr. Sponholz said as there is no effect on the tax base he doesn't have a problem with it but would like to see the site look better. Mr. Hess stated that he feels this would be better located at the Spring Mall site rather than the 76th Street corridor, and also noted that the parking lot layout needs work also. Mr. Rogers agreed that Spring Mall might be a better option. Ms. Mitchell noted that they've looked at the Spring Mall site and it did not meet their requirements for a donation canopy area.

Conceptual review. No action required.

7. Community Development Manager Report.

Mayor Neitzke spoke on how the City has been trying for the past several years to get an amphitheater at Konkel Park and how he has now received a major private donor commitment for \$150,000 towards that goal. This helps with the overall City Center plan, and improves the presence of Konkel Park and its Farmers Market. There will be more on the City Center Concept and the potential amphitheater at a future Plan Commission meeting.

- 8. Motion by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Ms. Hallen, to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,

Alison J. Meyer
Administrative Assistant

Distributed February 23, 2015