



CITY OF ST. FRANCIS
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE

June 11, 2019
5:30PM

NOTICE

There will be an Economic Development Committee meeting on Tuesday, June 11, 2019 at 5:30pm in the West Committee Room at the St. Francis City Civic Center located at 3400 E. Howard Avenue.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Minutes of the meeting held May 14, 2019.
3. Discussion and Possible Action Items
 - A. Ayres Presentation – KK Corners Design/Marketing Plan
 - B. Report from Business of the Year Subcommittee
4. Correspondence
5. Adjourn.

Upon reasonable notice, a good faith effort will be made to accommodate the needs of individuals to participate in public meetings, who have a qualifying disability under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Request should be made as far in advance as possible, preferably a minimum of 48 hours. For additional information or to request this service, contact the St. Francis City Clerk at 481-2300. The meeting room is wheelchair accessible from the East and West entrances.

Note: There is the potential that a quorum of the Common Council and/or any other Committee, Commission or Board may be present.

MINUTES FOR THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD MAY 14, 2019, 5:30PM

Members present: Chairman Brian McManus, Charles Buechel, Tom Bilot, Caryle Babcock, Sandy Jaskulski, Bryan Kamm, Jay Iverson, Mayor Ken Tutaj, City Administrator Mark Johnsrud, , and City Engineer/ Director of Public Works Melinda Dejewski.

Excused: Committee Members: Rick Wier, Tom Dillon, Greg Schlecht.

Also present: – Alderwoman Janis Schandel, City Attorney Paul Alexy, Jay Blue of Ayres and Associates, Sheila Semrou and Bob Roberts.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 5:32pm by Chairman McManus.

2. Minutes

A motion was made by Committee Member Bilot, seconded by Mayor Tutaj to approve the minutes. Motion carried.

3. Discussion and Possible Action Items

A. Ayres Presentation – KK Corners Design/Marketing Plan

Mr. Blue presented a packet with the revised plan incorporating the comments from the committee at the previous meeting and staff. Some changes of note are:

On the northeast corner, a few homes would need to be acquired to accomplish what was shown. Scaled back versions of the concept could be developed. The take away is that the development should be multiple 2-3 story mixed use buildings with underground parking and surface parking in the rear of the development.

On the southwest corner, the concept stayed the same except the building was shifted to be more along E Howard Avenue. The concept for this corner is strictly office and/or retail but no housing. The development could be 2 smaller buildings but still more along E. Howard Avenue. Again, the parking is in the rear of the development. There will be only one access from this site.

On the southeast corner, the arbors were reduced to be only over the patios of the proposed buildings adjacent to the entrance driveway. The development was located as far south as it could considering the restrictions of the existing easements on the site. While some of the buildings are shown as larger buildings, they could be broken into smaller buildings. All the buildings should be 2-3 stories and could be a mix of retail, office and possibly residential although the focus for this corner is primarily retail. This corner is also the location of a gateway structure and plaza to attract pedestrians.

On E. Norwich Avenue, the multi-family was removed and updated with a single family cul-du-sac. The proposed lots are approximately 75 feet by 120 feet trying to be consistent with the surrounding single family lots. The subdivision would be traditional homes with similar characteristics as the existing neighborhoods. Also along E. Norwich Avenue closer to S. Kinnickinnic Avenue is the proposed St. Francis Animal Hospital that is currently being worked on. Staff reported that the design shown was being updated and would be sent to Ayres when completed.

In addition to the proposed concepts for each corner, it was noted that an additional lane of traffic was recommended by staff and Ayres concurred with the recommendation. There is enough right-of-way to accommodate the additional lane without impeding on any of the proposed concepts.

Chairman McManus then opened the discussion on the concepts presented by Ayres.

City Administrator Johnsrud stated that staff had requested that some stormwater areas be shown so that developers and the committee would understand that stormwater has to be a component of the developments. Also, these developments would probably need shared parking agreements. Mr. Blue added that each corner would probably

be developed by one developer who would then lease the spaces making shared parking an easier item to accomplish.

Vice Chairman Kamm asked about patio space at the intersection of S. Kinnickinnic and E. Howard Avenues being incorporated to activate the area. Mr. Blue stated that one could be there. The concepts do not preclude a developer from bringing that idea forward.

There was some discussion on pedestrian access with the widening of S. Kinnickinnic Avenue and the existing width of E. Howard Avenue. A possible mid-block crossing was discussed but discarded because of the impact to traffic and the proximity to the intersection.

Mr. Blue then went through the rest of the packet that was presented to the committee. The packet includes some design standards. One key component is a “build to” line compared to a “set back” line. The difference is that a “set back” line tells developers how far away from the right-of-way they have to build or be “set back”. Conversely, the “build to” line tells developers where the City wants them to build up to. This is helpful in getting buildings closer to the sidewalks and creating that feeling of walkability in a community. Another key component is that the buildings are to be 70% glass along the street. This equates to big windows and doors so the retail or dining can be seen by people passing through the area which makes the area look inviting and busy. In addition, the windows need a minimum of 12 feet tall but no taller than 16 feet. The doors should be inset so that the sweep out does not hit people on the sidewalk. Pictures of all these requirements are included for developers to look at and understand what the City is visioning.

There was discussion on a pedestrian’s view of the corridors being presented at the next meeting.

Mr. Roberts stated that he thought the proposed single family lots were too small for larger homes with attached garages.

Ms. Semrou stated that the proposal needed to be more pedestrian friendly and ways to slow down traffic needed to be incorporated. She also was concerned about accessible routes and the businesses need to have 2 entrances and therefore 2 hostesses.

Mr. Blue will be attending the next meeting with some corridor views for the committee and further refinement of the concepts. No action was taken on this item.

B. Report from Business of the Year Subcommittee

Committee Member/Subcommittee Chairperson Babcock provided an update for the committee. She stated that she had received 4 quotes and the Subcommittee had decided on a caterer – Carls. They would be requesting pictures of some of the dinners they did so the Subcommittee would have a visual on how it was presented. Also, “Save the Date” cards were decided upon and would be sent out in the next couple of weeks. The Subcommittee also discussed commemorative items for the guests to have. Still working on speakers. No action was taken on this item. No action was taken on this item.

C. City Attorney Information Discussion

Chairman McManus stated that some of the members of the committee had questions about the duties of the committee after the previous meeting and City Attorney’s comments.

Chairman McManus then inquired at to the process of the approval of the plan by the City and what the role of the EDC would be in the process. City Administrator Johnsrud stated that the EDC recommends the plan to the Common Council. The Common Council would hold a public meeting for input and then the Council could approve the plan if they were satisfied with it. He continued that the EDC is a sounding board for the business community. If the committee wants to do something different, it would need to request changes to their duties from the Common Council. Chairman McManus then asked how would the EDC would utilize the plan for marketing. City Attorney Alexy stated that the EDC duties are defined in Chapter 17, Section 14 of the City Code. 2 of the duties are to work with the Common Council or CDA on items that have been referred. Also the EDC works on strategies for communications with the businesses and makes recommendations to the Common Council. The

Ayres plan does not define how to implement the plan. City Administrator Johnsrud stated that once the plan is done, the City will contact the Biz Times and other outlets to let them know about the plan to start to communicate with developers.

Committee Member Iverson stated that he has relationships with developers and he would like to show them the plan but his understanding from the previous meeting was that if he showed the plan to his colleagues, that it was a violation of the City Ethics Policy. City Attorney Alexy responded that his comments at the previous meeting were directed at a statement that had been made by Ayres that the EDC could go out basically door to door with developers which would not be allowed. If a EDC member happens to know a developer and wants to show them the plans, that is fine. The EDC member should then refer the developer to City Administrator Johnsrud for any further conversation and questions.

There was further discussion on how the plan was going to be communicated to developers. No action was taken on this item.

D. Business Survey

Chairman McManus stated that Alderman Damon had discussed a business survey and had developed some questions. He is considering creating a small task force to work on the survey and collect the data which might be presented at the Business of the Year Dinner. There was some general discussion on what would be included in the questions. No action was taken on this item.

5. Correspondence

None.

6. Adjourn

A motion was made by Committee Member Jaskulski, seconded by Committee Member Iverson to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 7:08pm.