

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Village Hall Auditorium
9915 39th Avenue
Pleasant Prairie, WI
August 26, 2015
5:00 p.m.**

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Community Development Authority was held on Wednesday, August 26, 2015. Meeting called to order at 5:00 p.m. Present were John Steinbrink, Larry Nelson, Gary Hutchins, Jill Sikorski, Mike Serpe, Tom Reiherzer, and Kate Jerome. Phil Godin was excused. Also present were Mike Pollocoff, Executive Director; Tom Shircel, Assistant Village Administrator; Kathy Goessl, Treasurer and Jane Romanowski, Secretary.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. MINUTES OF MEETINGS – JULY 15, 2015

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE THE JULY 15, 2015 MINUTES OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AS PRESENTED IN THEIR WRITTEN FORM; SECONDED BY NELSON; MOTION CARRIED 7-0.

4. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Jerry Franke:

Jerry Franke, WisPark, 301 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53406. For those of you that don't know, I have been with Mike since the beginning of LakeView Corporate Park, although there are a number of people in this room that forgot that WisPark started that project.

I am here today to first and foremost start on a positive note and that is to lend support for the Community Development Authority to positively consider selling its land located north of our land at the northeast corner of the interchange of the STH 165 and I-94 for multi-family purposes. We have asked for 20 years to pursue that kind of development at that location and have been deterred by staff in doing that.

Some of the things I am going to talk about tonight are not meant to point fingers at anybody but it's meant to be the beginning of a conversation that needs to be had about this interchange. It needs to be had with the Community Development Authority which owns land which directly competes with us. It has to be dealt with the Planning Commission so that we can, once and for all, proceed with a formal approval or disapproval of some of the uses we are pursuing there; and ultimately, of course in some instances, particularly the Village Zoning Ordinance and the Village Board. So this is the beginning of a conversation but it is one that we have to have.

For 20 years, we have marketed the land at the northeast corner of I-94 and STH 165 for office use as directed and limited by Village ordinances and staff. The ordinance requires these spaces to be developed with office buildings of at least two floors which means you have to put in an elevator. The bottom line is it was too costly to build spec office space there and there was no demand for it to begin with. Now don't just take my word for it. I mean I think the market has spoken loud and clear by the fact that there is very few office buildings there, and those that are, mainly the old Snap-On Tools Corporate Headquarters, they cannot even sell that and they are wanting to sell it. Given what is going on in Lake County, Illinois, this is not an office location. Uline has located here. By the way, WisPark bought that land and ultimately was part of transferring that to Uline as well. That is great. Corporate users like that come across once in a generation. That too has been stated in your own report prepared by S.B. Friedman. They recently have announced they are going to add another 1,000 jobs. That is great news but it is also bad news, and I hate to be the "Debbie Downer" but every time somebody brings another 1,000 jobs into this location, it makes it more difficult to attract a comparable user who is going to need the same kind of employees.

So we have challenges for this being office space which is what everybody wanted it to be 25 years ago when we all had rose-colored glasses on and things were all meant to be rosy. The S.B. Friedman report goes so far as to say that the Village should be careful as to how it zones WisPark's property so that we don't indirectly or directly compete with you. I mean, that is just a little unnerving to me to have a publicly prepared document saying watch how you zone your competition's property because it will reduce the demand potentially for your property.

We think to optimize development in this location we need residential uses. We believe that there is a good demand for a combined site of your parcel north of our land and our parcel one. Those two parcels are identified right now as M-5 zoning which is meant for manufacturing. If you take a look at the physical constraints and the wetlands and the topography of those sites, it is going to be very difficult if not impossible to do any kind of any an industrial building there. Yeah, you might find an office in an R & D Center that would go there – highly unlikely they will given the conditions I mentioned to you.

We had a meeting earlier this summer with a developer who finally got the Village staff to see the value of a potentially or at least considering the sale of your land for apartment development. We suggested co-marketing our properties because again we believe the way you optimize your value and ours is to put them together. On either parcel you can't do a project large enough that it is necessarily going to pencil out. I was shocked within a week later to find an email go out that just ignored our request to co-market it.

Last year, fortunately the Village Board did allow us to rezone part of our land to B-4. For that we are very thankful. We have a prospective user though and recently we submitted a conceptual site plan for the land use owned at that northeast corner of the interchange. It showed a small retail building, and the Village Administrator directed us to remove it, which we did. Yet, when I take a look at a Village plan that is out there, there is a small retail building on your land immediately to the southwest of this interchange. The land, if you hold it up, it looks just like ours only it is on the southwest corner versus the northeast corner.

We have also approached the Village with a very high-quality operator to develop an auto and truck service facility. Not a truck stop. I was here in 1988. I traveled to St. Louis, Missouri in a snow storm to see a Flying J operation because we were part of stopping a 40 acre or 30 acre truck stop. We did not want that there. However, if you have been out to the intersection of STH 165 and I-94 recently, the truck traffic that is coming in here is unbelievable. I don't know what the objective is to not have services for those truck drivers but we have trucks going to what, at least eight distribution centers of a large size in the park. Our companies would like to see some of the services here. We have tried to keep it to a small amount of trucks. I believe the one proposal was eight fueling pumps and 12 parking spaces for semis. We think there is some room there to negotiate. That is not your job but I am giving you background. We have to go to the Plan Commission for that. I understand that.

This property is zoned B-4 which I quote directly from the Village's Zoning Ordinance "Purpose and Characteristics. The B-4 Freeway Service Business District is intended to provide for a cluster of hotel, restaurant, gasoline station and freeway convenience store uses to serve the needs of freeway travelers as well as the community. The B-4 District shall be located near freeway interchanges" that we have continually been stifled on our ability to try and attract a user there because of the, I think, unreasonable standards that we are being held to. There is a station out there that the Village has spent one ton of money on trying to get it to comply with environmental violations as well as operating conditions that are less than ideal. I would offer to you that the best way to get that station to clean up is to give it some competition. We believe we have an outstanding user that would like to go on the land we own and that we can make the BP station a better location as well.

Just so you know. Since 2004, WisPark has paid \$2 million plus of real estate taxes on vacant land at that interchange. There hasn't been a fire there to the best of my knowledge. There hasn't been any crime there. There hasn't been anything that needs municipal services. What's happened to the \$2 million? It has paid for the street improvements to your land which, by the way, is tax exempt, while we're paying \$200,000 a year for our vacant land. The Village's land by virtue of the fact that you are a public entity doesn't have to pay that. We have anecdotal evidence that times when people come in to talk about our land they are steered to Village opportunities as well. This

competition is one thing but a one hand tied behind their back having to compete with a regulating body – just a little uncomfortable and we have put up with it long enough. We want to work with the Village. I think we have had a great partnership but 20 years of land siting there vacant because the market conditions that the Village has based its land use plans just don't bear out. We want to see this parcel developed for multi-family that the Village is proposing at looking at. We would hope that we would be able to get the similar zoning to accommodate that. We would like to work with the Village, we've tried, and we will continue to try but we have to have this conversation and for us to be able to go to whatever the next power is to say we've actually been turned down we need to go through the process and we are about to start that process now. I'd be happy to answer any questions you have but this is a serious matter from our perspective. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you. Any other speakers under Citizen Comments?

Abby Brzezinski:

Hi, I'm Abby Brzezinski. I'm principal of Red Sky Partners, N16W23217 in Waukesha, Wisconsin, Stoneridge Drive. Red Sky Partners along with Interstate Partners submitted an Offer to Purchase on the land that Jerry just referenced on the northeast corner of 94 and 165 and I just want to reiterate our interest in the project and subject to a rezoning of that parcel along with the WisPark site. We are very excited about the prospect if the Village is willing to consider it. I'd be happy to answer any questions or meet with anyone at a later date but I hope you will consider our offer. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you. Anyone else wishing to speak under Citizen Comments? If not, I am going to close Citizen Comments and move onto Item 5.

5. COMMISSION COMMENTS – None.

6. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Consider entering into Executive Session pursuant to Section 19.85(1)(e) Wis. Stats. to discuss, deliberate or negotiate the purchase of public property, investing of public funds, or conduct other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session.**

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. Chairman. We are working with consultants on the properties that we have listed. I would also request at this time that Ms. Brzezinski be included in the Executive Session based on her proposal for the development that they have indicated to basically allow her to present some information concerning that, not for the entire Executive Session, but just to make the Authority aware of it. Inasmuch as this has been listed and the last direction from the Authority was to get a competitive bid on lands out there, we are not at that point yet. I'd rather see that discussion occur in Executive Session to facilitate future negotiations should those arise.

REIHERZER MOVED TO ENTER INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION AND TO INCLUDE MS. BRZEZINSKI AS REQUESTED; SECONDED BY NELSON; ROLL CALL VOTE: STEINBRINK – YES; NELSON – YES; HUTCHINS – YES; SIKORSKI; SERPE – YES; REIHERZER – YES; JEROME – YES; MOTION CARRIED.

John Steinbrink:

The Authority will return to open session for the purpose of adjournment only. No other business will be conducted.

7. RETURN TO OPEN SESSION AND ADJOURNMENT

After discussion took place, **REIHERZER MOVED TO RETURN TO OPEN SESSION AND ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY JEROME; ROLL CALL VOTE: STEINBRINK – YES; NELSON – YES; HUTCHINS – YES; SIKORSKI; SERPE – YES; REIHERZER – YES; JEROME – YES; MOTION CARRIED AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 6:30 P.M.**