



CITY OF WAUWATOSA
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MINUTES • FEBRUARY 11, 2014

Regular Meeting

Committee Room #1

8:00 PM

7725 West North Avenue, Wauwatosa, WI 53213

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE ITEMS

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
James Moldenhauer	Alderman	Present	
Kathleen Causier	Aldерwoman	Present	
Jeffrey Roznowski	Alderman	Present	
Gregory Walz-Chojnacki	Alderman	Present	
Dennis McBride	Alderman	Present	
Bobby Pantuso	Alderman	Present	
Cheryl Berdan	Aldерwoman	Present	
Jason Wilke	Alderman	Present	
Paulette Enders	Development Director	Present	
Alan Kesner	City Attorney	Present	

1. Request by Matthew Luckow for Land Combination at 6629 Hillside Lane

The committee reviewed a memo from the City Planner regarding a request by Matthew Luckow for a Land Combination at 6629 Hillside Lane.

Ms. Enders said the applicant would like to combine two adjacent parcels that he owns. The request meets applicable zoning regulations. Plan Commission reviewed this and recommended approval.

Mr. Luckow explained that his home and his garage are on two separate parcels and he would like to combine them. Mr. Luckow said he'd like the parcels combined so there is only one tax bill received.

Moved by Ald. McBride, seconded by Ald. Pantuso
to recommend approval of the land combination - Ayes: 8

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL [UNANIMOUS] Next: 2/18/2014 7:30 PM
TO:	Common Council
MOVER:	Dennis McBride, Alderman
SECONDER:	Bobby Pantuso, Alderman
AYES:	Moldenhauer, Causier, Roznowski, Walz-Chojnacki, McBride, Pantuso, Berdan, Wilke

2. Request by Becky Berger, Yo Mama! and Curt Wiebelhaus, Sustainable Properties, Inc., for a Conditional Use in the C1 District at 7505 Harwood Avenue to expand Yo Mama!

The committee reviewed a memo from the City Planner regarding a request by Becky Berger, Yo Mama! and Curt Wiebelhaus, Sustainable Properties Inc., for a Conditional Use in the C1 District at 7505 Harwood Avenue to expand Yo Mama!

Ms. Enders said that the applicant wants to expand Yo Mama! into the adjacent vacant storefront for special events and an office. The seasonal outdoor seating would also be expanded to the sidewalk space along this storefront (plans are forthcoming). The applicant is aware they should contact both the building and fire

inspector and will also need Board of Public Works approval of an encroachment agreement for the outdoor seating. The operating hours are Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 11 p.m. and Sunday 11 a.m. to 10 p.m. from Memorial Day to Labor Day; and Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 10 p.m. and Sunday 11 a.m. to 9 p.m. the rest of the year.

The Plan Commission reviewed this on February 10 and recommended 5-0 with the following conditions: establish hours of operation, Board of Public Works approval for encroachment, and obtaining any additional licenses or permits.

Becky Berger, 19280 Edmonton Drive, Brookfield, said that the business has had many requests for parties and showers and that their space is limited. When the neighboring space became available next door they felt it would be a perfect opportunity for their use to hold parties and showers. Ms. Berger said that the back portion of the area will be used for office space and for an overflow kitchen prep area.

Moved by Ald. Causier, seconded by Ald. Pantuso to recommend approval of the Conditional Use contingent upon the operating hours of Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 11 p.m. and Sunday 11 a.m. to 10 p.m. from Memorial Day to Labor Day; and Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 10 p.m. and Sunday 11 a.m. to 9 p.m. the rest of the year, encroachment approval from the Board of Publics Works for the expanded outdoor seating, and obtaining any additional licenses and permits - Ayes: 8

Ald. Wilke questioned the outdoor seating and expressed safety concerns due to the grading and missing pavers. He wondered if any repair work was planned.

Mayor Ehley responded that she wasn't aware of any complaints and said that the entire village is on a slope.

Ms. Berger explained that she was not aware of any issues but noted that the area in front of their expansion will be better suited for tables and chairs.

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL [UNANIMOUS] Next: 2/18/2014 7:30 PM
TO:	Common Council
MOVER:	Kathleen Causier, Alderwoman
SECONDER:	Bobby Pantuso, Alderman
AYES:	Moldenhauer, Causier, Roznowski, Walz-Chojnacki, McBride, Pantuso, Berdan, Wilke

3. Recommendation for adoption of the Bike and Pedestrian Plan by ordinance as an amendment to the City's Comprehensive Plan (set public hearing date)

Ms. Enders said that the Plan Commission reviewed the edited and revised bike plan with input from the Steering Committee and elected officials.

The plan provides recommendations for building on existing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, in addition to providing education, encouragement, evaluation, and enforcement efforts that will make Wauwatosa a better place to walk and ride a bike. Recommendations include providing additional bicycle facilities throughout the City and installing approximately 22 miles of pedestrian facilities. The Plan Commission recommended approval 5-0 to move forward and to set a public hearing date.

Ms. Enders said staff recommendation is to set a public hearing date of March 18, 2014.

Ald. Berdan publicly thanked all the people who worked so hard at the Plan Commission but inadvertently omitted Jennifer Ferguson and she wanted to publicly thank her for all of her work.

Moved by Ald. Berdan, seconded by Ald. Causier to recommend introduction of an ordinance as an amendment to the City's Comprehensive Plan and setting a public hearing date of March 18 for the Bike and Pedestrian Plan - Ayes: 8

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED FOR INTRODUCTION [UNANIMOUS] Next: 2/18/2014 7:30 PM
TO:	Common Council
MOVER:	Cheryl Berdan, Alderwoman
SECONDER:	Kathleen Causier, Alderwoman
AYES:	Moldenhauer, Causier, Roznowski, Walz-Chojnacki, McBride, Pantuso, Berdan, Wilke

4. Request by John Czarnecki, The 2100 LLC, for a Change of Zoning from C2 District to C2 District/Planned Unit Development overlay at 2050 North Mayfair Road and 2100 North Mayfair Road (set public hearing date)

Ms. Enders said that the applicant is requesting a Change of Zoning from C2 District to C2 District/Planned Unit Development Overlay on the parcels located at 2050 and 2100 N. Mayfair Road to construct a multifamily housing development.

The Plan Commission reviewed this item on February 10 and recommended approval 4 -1. They also recommended setting a public hearing date of March 18, 2014.

Ms. Enders noted that the approval had many conditions attached to it and that there was a lengthy discussion on this.

Moved by Ald. Causier, seconded by Ald. Walz-Chojnacki to recommend introduction of an ordinance and setting a public hearing date of March 18 - Ayes: 8

RESULT:	RECOMMENDED FOR INTRODUCTION [UNANIMOUS] Next: 2/18/2014 7:30 PM
TO:	Common Council
MOVER:	Kathleen Causier, Alderwoman
SECONDER:	Gregory Walz-Chojnacki, Alderman
AYES:	Moldenhauer, Causier, Roznowski, Walz-Chojnacki, McBride, Pantuso, Berdan, Wilke

5. Memo from Ald. Craig Wilson regarding Common Council review and approval of Plan Commission items

Ald. Roznowski opened this discussion saying that Ald. Wilson, as a representative of the Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC), had prepared a memo with recommendations for further discussion.

This item was previously discussed last summer; the discussion was spurred by EDAC with recommendations that would be beneficial to improving economic development and/or the development process in Wauwatosa from both an efficiency standpoint and improved customer service.

Ald. Roznowski suggested that tonight's discussion is to especially look at and address how the EDAC recommendations on Plan Commission and Community Development Committee (CDC) relationships concur. Continued discussions were anticipated after the July 2013 meeting and didn't happen. Tonight's discussion will be a continuation of that for as long as disposition takes.

Craig Wilson, 8th District Alderman, provided some background information to offer a starting point for this discussion as follows.

Today, items reviewed by the Plan Commission are typically reviewed by the Common Council at least twice before an action is final: once by the Committee on Community Development (CDC), then again by the full Council.

This process is at odds with common municipal practice, leads to inconsistent application of our planning and development standards, and demands inefficient use of resources for all involved.

The Wauwatosa Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC) communicated to the CDC several recommendations for improving development processes in July 2013. Here is the EDAC's recommendation regarding Plan Commission items:

- *Eliminate the requirement that Plan Commission items go before the Community Development Committee for additional review and approval. This is a common practice and model used throughout most Wisconsin communities. In most cases, applicants are presenting the same information to multiple committees - adding time to the approval process, as well as additional costs to the applicants if consultants are being utilized, etc. As done in the past, if an issue is brought forward to the Common Council and the Council feels more discussion is warranted, the item could be referred back to the Committee on Community Development. Videotaping of Plan Commission meetings is also recommended for the benefit of Alderpersons, as well as residents.*

The Zoning Ordinance of the City of Wauwatosa ("Zoning Code") indicates the Common Council has final decision-making authority over each of the following activities reviewed by the Plan Commission: zoning text and map (rezoning) amendments, conditional use permits, preliminary review of development plans for planned unit developments, historic designation, and historic overlay zoning map amendment. While the Council maintains ultimate authority and approval over these activities, the Zoning Code quite effectively establishes a framework by which the Plan Commission is tasked with reviewing proposals and recommending action. After its review, the Plan Commission forwards its recommendation to the Council. For zoning changes and planned unit development plan review, the Council is required to conduct a public hearing on the matter. For conditional use permits, it is not.

The double-review process unique to Wauwatosa is the result of a set of 1970s era City ordinances, not specific to zoning, which require (i) business not be considered by the common council unless presented by a member of the common council, the mayor, a standing committee of the common council, the board of public works, or the city administrator; and (ii) resolutions not be finally acted upon or adopted at the same session of the common council at which they are introduced, unless emanating from a committee. While the Zoning Code is full of requirements that matters to be forwarded to the Common Council, there is no requirement in the Zoning Code that the CDC review a matter.

The process discussed above owes its existence largely to a set of Council procedure ordinances that predate the ordinances establishing the current Zoning Code (2013), the Plan Commission (2000), and the CDC (1998).

Ald. Wilson's overview on his proposal for change is that the process will be improved greatly if we allow the Plan Commission to recommend items it reviews directly to the full Council for a final decision, without an automatic stop (re-review) by the CDC. In doing so, the Common Council will foster the expectation that primary review of any project or proposal occurs at Plan Commission, which is consistent with the our current Zoning Code and provided some examples.

Ald. Wilson explained that four years ago when he was first elected as an alderman he was appointed to the Economic Development Advisory Committee and now also sits on the Community Development Authority (CDA). Ald. Wilson explained that early on in his tenure with the city he was trying to figure out how the committee processes worked while understanding the importance of economic development and business friendly policies and how that could be enhanced. When he started working with other community members very early on and consistently, he has heard about the convoluted process in Wauwatosa.

The EDAC chair, Robert Simi, was here last July talking about a number of the recommendations being made to improve the process. One in particular was the Plan Commission and how items automatically go to Community Development and then on to Council for final approval. He felt that this is a unique process, not seen anywhere else as far he knows in the Milwaukee area. Although developers haven't said this is a crazy process and they are happy with the end result, it is a convoluted process. Even if the process works well enough there are ways to make this better. Ald. Wilson asked that as policy makers in charge of the policy to work on making the process better.

Ald. Wilson said that as he was reviewing this and preparing his memo he focused on conditional use permits, not the only area that can be improved, but the easiest to get data for and a good place to start.

Ald. Wilson noted that although the city has a new zoning code updated in the spring of 2013, there are still some old ordinances that need addressing. For instance there is an ordinance from the 1970's that require anything going to the common council has to either go through two cycles of the full council or if it comes from council committees, the administrator, mayor, or Board of Public Works it can come directly to full council. What is missing or failed to be recognized since the 1970's, is that there has been developed a sophisticated and capable Plan Commission and a process around that. We don't give the Plan Commission the deference that is given to the BPW.

Ald. Wilson felt that there should be trust in the Plan Commission without sending everything through another committee. He felt that a high majority of the time the decisions made at Plan Commission get rubber stamped from Community Development Committee and Council. There has been a few instances where the CDC has reversed the decision of the Plan Commission. He felt if there was a situation where the Council felt a better decision could be made to push the item back to Plan Commission or the Community Development Committee, he preferred it would be the Plan Commission. He suggested that the ordinance language could be cleaned up for conditional uses so that these don't have to go somewhere else first before council. It has been vetted and reviewed at the Plan Commission.

Ald. Wilson suggested that a change should also be necessary for setting public hearings to be heard in front of the Council. He felt that the Plan Commission recommendations on such matters be submitted directly to the full council.

Ald. Wilson felt if the conditional use permits went right from the Plan Commission to Council, there would be a week in between for alderpersons to check with staff on any questions they or their constituents have before it is heard at council. This would require cleaning up of the parliamentary rules. He mentioned that there are other things as well in addition to conditional uses that should be reviewed for efficiencies.

Ald. Wilson reviewed with the committee a memo from Ms. Enders regarding a list of 27 Plan Commission action items dating from March - November 2013. These 27 items went before Plan Commission and then to Community Development Committee and the Common Council. Of these 27 items listed 15 of these were conditional uses. Based on these numbers Ald. Wilson compiled some graphs as follows, regarding conditional uses, although a small sampling but representative.

Cycle time - period of time from which an item goes to Plan Commission until Council hears it

- 26.7% takes less than a week
- 66.7% takes 3 weeks
- 6.7% takes 30 or greater days

Number of days to Plan Commission to Community Development Committee

- 33.3% went in less than 7 days - the next night
- 40% of that sample is between two and three weeks
- 26.7% of the items are taking three weeks or more

Flow

Of the 15 conditional uses, 86.7% sailed right through the process and only two items (13.3%) looped back to Plan Commission for additional review.

Ms. Enders' memo had a consideration for the committee that in order to streamline the planning and development process, all items could move directly to the Common Council from Plan Commission. If the Common Council determines there is a need for additional input at the Committee level, an item could be referred back to Committee on Community Development.

Ald. Wilson said it is not his desire to eliminate council oversight but the Plan Commission should be relied on to make the right decisions.

Ald. Wilson felt the CDC could better spend their time on big picture items and deeper policy setting. The committee should look at how they interact with the Plan Commission. Is there enough aldermanic presence on the commission? He noted that state statute allows the city to have more alderpersons on the commission.

Ald. Wilke thanked Ald. Wilson for his leadership in bringing this back to committee for further discussion and appreciated the information presented. He felt the committee would be able to move forward in discussions with this information. Ald. Wilke explained that some generalizations made that items were rubber stamping or sailed through were not accurate. Not being able to hear all of the discussion since Ald. Wilson sits on another important committee, Ald. Wilke shared that some of things done in committee do represent expertise and input and constituents' input of which there is value.

Ald. Wilke agreed that CDC does need to spend more time on developing and refining policy and expectations and requirements so the code can be updated. The process needs to be streamlined. The CDC could provide more of a blueprint for Plan Commission members.

Comments and other discussion suggestions included:

- Policy level discussion is energizing and the committee needs to have more of this
- Plan Commission function could happen more in CDC
- Part of a bigger discussion on reform of how committees work
- City not required to have to have a Plan Commission - the Plan Commission is to administer the comprehensive plan
- Don't hold public hearings at Plan Commission - original approval only at Plan Commission
- Streamlining the process is necessary

Ald. McBride said Ald. Wilson's proposal is a good one although not the only option. He noted that work will be taken away from CDC which is not necessarily a bad thing. He said there is too much overlapping in city government. The same people are asked over and over to volunteer their time to fill all of our commissions. If more responsibility is put on the Plan Commission there will be more time in CDC for policy issues.

Ald. McBride suggested that maybe there is not a need for an Employee Relations committee anymore. Maybe this could be merged with the Legislation, Licensing and Communications committee. There needs to be a restructuring of all committees to make the council the most effective it can be. He felt the current committee structure is rickety and archaic.

Ald. Causier was asked to react in her unique perspective as an alderperson as well as a Plan Commission member. Ald. Causier felt it is apparent that the council needs to become a lot more efficient and this discussion has been put off for a long time. She was not opposed to giving the Plan Commission final approval on conditional uses. She supported Ald. Wilson's proposal and felt it is sensible.

Mayor Ehley said more attention needs to be placed on how and why people are brought on board to serve on committees. She felt there is a lack of connectivity with the Plan Commission. The Plan Commission has not been receiving any feedback from their decisions so it seems like there is disconnect there. Mayor Ehley felt the recruitment of volunteers needs to be done in a more deliberate and purposeful way. Professional expertise is important for Plan Commission members. They need to feel empowered.

Mayor Ehley suggested that alderpersons could provide feedback to Plan Commission members before a decision is made if necessary. The committee structures are too confusing to the general public. Mayor Ehley announced that Alderman Wilke has been asked to sit on the Plan Commission as a member with landscaping architect expertise as well as an elected official is an added bonus. The Mayor cautioned against overloading the Plan Commission with elected officials who don't have the appropriate professional expertise.

Ald. Moldenhauer said during the strategic planning process he spoke about best practices and the leaning of our operations. He felt there needs to be a broad discussion of better ways to do things. The ordinance referenced on Plan Commission and which items can go directly to council from committee, go way back to possibly the 1940's or 1950's. Ald. Moldenhauer felt that the council should be mindful of the ordinance history and why it has stood for so many years. Ald. Moldenhauer commented that elected officials are responsible for accountability of different issues to their constituents. Constituents come looking to the alderperson for assistance and accountability. Regardless of our background when it comes to conditional uses, the alderpersons were elected by their constituents and they expect accountability of them.

Ald. Wilson clarified and said he didn't want to get into a debate on this, as he felt the committee was on the same page that the process needs to be streamlined. He reiterated that he never suggested getting rid of final council approval on conditional uses.

Ald. McBride recommended an Ad Hoc committee be formed regarding committee restructuring with no more than 3-5 people. The Mayor would have a roll in assigning one member. These individuals would have to express willingness to do this quickly and take some action before the new council gets sworn in. He said if this is not done along these lines this debate will go on and on.

Ald. McBride moved, seconded by Ald. Pantuso to recommend forming an Ad Hoc committee consisting of five members, one being appointed by the Mayor, to review the current committee structure and make recommendations to the Community Development Committee.

Ald. McBride suggested that Ald. Wilson serve on this Ad Hoc committee. Ald. Pantuso suggested maybe a chair from each current committee sit on the Ad Hoc committee.

Ald. Pantuso questioned how this will all fit together. He suggested that we hear from developers how our convoluted process stopped them from bringing a development into the city. He felt the City must be doing something right as development is hot in the city currently. If the system isn't broken why fix it? He felt it applaudable that our current Mayor places people on the Plan Commission with expertise; he worried that if slots are carved out, this would make it more and more difficult to find people. He wondered if the next Mayor would be so interested in expertise. The Ad Hoc committee needs to be extremely broad. He wondered how many council members would be needed for the new committee make-up. It is a very big conversation to have in a short period of time if this is requested to be done before the new council is sat.

The committee looked at the charts prepared by Ald. Wilson on the length of time it takes to go through the approval process. It was suggested that for a small business to wait three weeks for approval is a long time, but not necessarily a long time for large developers.

The mission statement of each committee was discussed. It was suggested that if a new committee structure is formed that appropriate names of the committee are formed. The committee name should tell someone what the committee does. The council size was mentioned in that maybe 16 members aren't necessary. There is lengthy conversations to have on this.

Ald. Wilson agreed that a broader discussion needs to be done. He is in favor of an Ad Hoc committee but expressed disappointment that the two issues would be combined. He asked that the committee address what was on the agenda and continue to review the development process. He didn't feel that these items are one and the same and he noted that it has taken a long time to get the development process back on the agenda. He asked the committee to continue to look at what the process is and would appreciate if they took an honest and earnest look at the process. He didn't feel the issues of policy and structure are one and the same.

Ald. McBride said he felt that there were many questions in the room that needed answers, which is why he suggested the formation of an Ad Hoc committee. He suggested that the development process could be the first item raised in the process. He was not hearing a consensus in the room or a vote being called for on the development process. Ald. McBride said he made a suggestion to the committee on what they wanted the committee on committees to look like. He didn't feel a committee of 16 would be the place to take this on. A committee of 3-5 would be more efficient.

Ald. Walz-Chojnacki felt there is great tension between accountability and efficiency. He was concerned that when you eliminate the review by CDC there will be suspicion by the public that these commission can be captured by the interests that come to them. This is a concern he has heard. He didn't want to rush into a vote.

Ald. Wilke said we were talking about the development process and then moved along to another committee formation. Since there is one-half of the council representation present the discussion should continue. He felt the discussion should remain in CDC to be fully vetted.

Ald. Mc Bride said that Ald. Wilson presented a very clear memo and he felt the committee structure could be addressed along with this via an Ad Hoc committee. To make things happen you need something in writing expressing where you want to go or with several options. Ald. McBride felt that 16 people is too many for clear discussion.

Ald. Wilson clarified that his memo was a concept from an EDAC proposal, not his personal request as has been suggested this evening. Ald. Wilson read from an email he sent to Ald. McBride, and Ald. Roznowski requesting to bring this discussion forward to be placed on the agenda. The emphasis in coming up with one proposal was at the request of the common council president. Ald. Wilson expressed disappointment that this discussion has now been referenced as a launching pad to this other discussion. He chose on his own a very specific aspect of the development process to tackle and hoped to keep on track and on point. He has no issue tabling this but asked that the development process be continued to be discussed. He agreed that the committee structure is important and needs to be discussed as well, but not to combine the two.

Ald. Roznowski emphasized that this is an EDAC driven recommendation that was discussed last July. He agreed with the need for a broader discussion of our committee structure, but just to form committee for that will take a long time. He didn't see that this could be done in six weeks before the new council starts. He didn't feel that there would be time for discussion and council approval in that short of time frame.

Ald. Roznowski agreed from the streamlining and efficiency point that there is a need for committee restructuring and how do we go about this? We should look at this again in two weeks. He felt strongly that we need to come to grips on what we need to move this discussion forward. Specific discussion on this item needs to be addressed. What information is needed from ourselves and our staff to move this discussion forward?

He commented on the Plan Commission structure and what the elected officials are accountable for. He agreed that the alderpersons are accountable to their constituents as elected officials. Council members can develop expertise on the job, but most don't know the law or public works division or design review board, etc. The expertise coming out of Plan Commission is the level of detail necessary. There is not that level of expertise at the council level. Whether accountable or not, the expertise may not always be there.

Ald. Roznowski suggested that we owe it to EDAC to get the information to move forward.

Ald. McBride said he is trying to find a way to move this item forward. If it is the consensus of the committee to discuss this every two weeks, then that should happen. If the committee wants to discuss the committee structure they should do that. His concern is that too often things are discussed but left hanging with no answers. There is a need for more proposals, someone to sit down and suggest a structure on various things coming out of Plan Commission.

Ald. McBride felt that the Plan Commission needs to be honored and respected. If not it needs to be done away with. It is not working in its present state. Ald. McBride said he would withdraw his motion for an Ad Hoc committee if someone else has some other ideas.

Ald. Causier noted that this committee has the power to act on the recommendation. She felt that the Plan Commission would find it helpful to know they have the final authority to make final decisions rather than being trapped in the loop of committees. Mayor Ehley has been working hard by bringing knowledge back to them and the City Attorney is available for his expertise. She felt that the committee could make the decision to give the authority to the Plan Commission. She felt it made good sense to remove these things from CDC. Ald. Causier noted that the council has danced around the committee structure and council size for a long time; she felt you need to talk about policy before size. Ald. Causier felt these are separate issues and should be handled independently.

Ald. Pantuso expressed concern that if this were passed tonight, that a lot of items will get kicked back to CDC. He said if they have a constituent that isn't in favor of what is being recommended at council, there is not the aldermanic representation expected before it goes to council. There has been a lot of discussion on items that come from Plan Commission before they are approved. What if a Mayor down the road is not as diligent in putting expertise on the Plan Commission as our present Mayor? He felt there is a lot of different components that need vetting before a decision can be made. He suggested that there could be other options out there and had many concerns. Regarding expertise, Ald. Pantuso said the city has great staff with expertise and if they tell him something won't work he takes that into consideration. What we have right now isn't perfect but it is working now at some level. He needs to be convinced that there is a problem. There is a perceived problem in the room that we have a problem and he wasn't ready to make a decision tonight.

Ald. Pantuso said there are a lot of marbles on the floor and we need to start picking them up and figure out where they need to go.

Ald. Berdan called for point of order in that the discussion has moved away from the agenda item.

Ald. Walz-Chojnacki agreed with Ald. Wilke's view that this committee can do the work of an Ad Hoc committee. He felt that this item might be killed hastily without further discussion and that there may be some unattended consequences here if voted on tonight. He felt that this item should be tabled and continued at the next meeting.

Moved by Ald. Walz-Chojnacki, seconded by Ald. Wilke
to hold this item for two weeks subject to consideration
of other proposals in addition to the EDAC proposal.

Ald. Wilke expressed disappointment that the rest of the council didn't join in this meeting when the Budget & Finance meeting was finished. He encouraged that they attend the next scheduled meeting if time permits with their agenda.

Ald. McBride said he would withdraw his motion as it appears the committee is serious that streamlining the development process is necessary. The restructuring of council committees is complementary to this. Committee members should gather their thoughts on this and come up with some alternate options to discuss.

The City Attorney offered up his help as well as other staff members to flush out any ideas or help with any proposals you may have.

Ald. McBride withdrew his motion to form an Ad hoc committee which was approved by the seconder.

Ald. Wilson was disappointed that the motion for an Ad Hoc committee formation be withdrawn without acting on the proposal in front of the committee. There are two important issues that should be bifurcated.

We need to get the ball rolling on this discussion. Looking at the alternate proposals makes sense. The council is let down by not having a better process. He encouraged that staff be contacted for additional information as needed.

Vote on the motion to hold- Ayes: 8

Carla A. Ledesma, CMC, City Clerk