

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE  
PARK COMMISSION  
Village Hall, Auditorium  
9915 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Pleasant Prairie, Wisconsin 53158  
Tuesday, July 5, 2005  
5:30 p.m.**

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Park Commission was held on Tuesday, July 7, 2005, at 5:30 p.m. Present were Michaeline Day, Kathleen Burns, Michael Russert, and Alex Tiahnybok. Rita Christiansen, Glen Christiansen, William O'Toole and William Mills were excused. Also present were Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Jean Werbie, Community Development Director; John Steinbrink, Jr., Superintendent of Parks; and Judith Baternik, Clerical Secretary.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. MINUTES - JUNE 7, 2005**

Michaeline Day:

Need to approve minutes of June 7, 2005. Motion to accept?

Michael Russert:

Move to approve as written.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Second.

Michaeline Day:

We have a motion and a second to approve the minutes of the June 7, 2005 meeting. Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Opposed? Motion carries.

- 4. CITIZEN COMMENTS**

**None**

**5. NEW BUSINESS**

**a. Consider Park Commission Meeting Time**

Michael Russert:

Rita and Glen Christiansen would like to move the Park Commission meeting time back to 6:30.

Michaeline Day:

Time had be changed to because of citizens attendance.

Kathleen Burns:

The earlier time is better for me.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Earlier is fine with me.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We originally met at 6:00 p.m.

Michaeline Day:

Need motion to move the meeting time back to 6:00 p.m.

Michael Russert:

I move to change meeting time from 7:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Michaeline Day:

I motion to approve.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I second motion.

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Opposed? Motion carries to move meeting time back to 6:00 p.m.

**b. Consider Park Impact Fees Distribution Analysis Report - (Jean Werbie, John Steinbrink, Jr.)**

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

If you look at the documents sent to you regarding the distribution of impact fees, you'll see the map shows neighborhood sections 1-13 in the identified areas of the master park plan, Village Green Park, and then just off to the west of that High Point Park. We also have three elementary school parks identified on here, Pleasant Prairie Park up in area 1. We have Whittier School Park in area 6, and down in area 8 we have Prairie Lane School Park. Those parks aren't completely developed but yet open for the public.

Michael Russert:

John, I have a question. I was just by Whittier Park and it's all fenced off. So does that mean it's only open during school, or is it open to the public?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Maybe Jean can comment on this better.

Jean Werbie:

It is actually open to the public, but there is a sliding fence that's along Cooper Road, and that's primarily to prohibit car traffic and parking in their south parking lot. But actually walking to the school there are three different openings in the fence that kids can actually freely walk through and get to the park and play on the play equipment. They just want to discourage that south parking lot being used by vehicles and parking there.

Michael Russert:

Thank you.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

The next step that staff worked on was we took each of the 13 areas and we calculated the number of proposed units during total build out based on our 2020 comp. plan. We took the number of existing units that we have where there's already homes built in each of those areas, and then we were able to calculate the number of vacant residential properties in each of those areas. That's going to give us a very good indication of how much impact fee money we're going to have coming in from each of the different areas.

Then we did a calculation that had percentage of units yet to be built in the area. That kind of gives you a sense of which of these areas are built out and which of them are relatively open yet. So you can see we have some areas where there's 94 percent yet to

be built in the Pleasant Farms area, and then in other areas, area 12, Carol Beach, the north half, 104<sup>th</sup>, is pretty much built out with only 5 percent left to be built on there. And with those numbers we were able to calculate the total impact fee which was the \$1,075 per unit, and that breaks out to \$443 for a community pool, and then for the park end of it, we worked on splitting up 60 percent of the \$632 would go just to the neighborhood park in those areas. And then the balance of the 40 percent would go to community parks where multiple neighborhoods would use. And then developing a trail system to tie people from community park to community park.

This slide is a summary that shows everything I just talked about with the different areas and the impact fee and then the ratio of the 60 percent in the neighborhood parks and 40 percent into community parks.

Michaeline Day:

Was that part of our minutes? I didn't see that slide in the packet. It wasn't in the packet. I don't have that one.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

There were actually two tabs along the bottom. There were multiple tabs in each of those excel spreadsheets and they were labeled. Maybe next time I'll set them up as individual spreadsheets.

Jean Werbie:

I did the same thing. I called John and said I'm missing the second spread sheet and I didn't scroll across and there were actually two tabs.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I apologize for the confusion.

Michaeline Day:

No, I should have looked. My problem. Thank you.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

One of the next developments that's going to be before the Plan Commission and the Village Board soon is Creekside. Creekside does have a park listed on here. Jean, do you want to talk about some of the development at Creekside and the locations.

Jean Werbie:

I can. It's actually the next item on the agenda. So if you want me to talk about this example and the next item at the same time or we could wait for this example with the next item on the agenda.

Michaeline Day:

However it flows better. If you want to combine them that's great. Whatever flows better for you guys.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

That was the end of the distribution analysis report, so if anyone had any questions on the report on the whole. Then Item C we were going to go specifically into the Creekside development.

Michaeline Day:

So would anyone have any questions on how they determine on how we distribute or how they got the impact fees would be the question?

Jean Werbie:

I just wanted to take a step back. You've seen this staff memo before but it was sent out to you again. This was the report that John and I had put together several months ago regarding the park impact fee analysis information. This was actually the basis for us to determine exactly what type of parks we had in the Village, what type of existing improvements we had, and based on the standards and objectives as set forth in our comprehensive plan, how many elements we needed in order to serve the population as it exists today and projected into the future when we're eventually full built out. In addition, it covers the acreages of park areas that we're looking for in the Village, and that basically we're broken down into community parks and neighborhood parks.

One of the things that John had mentioned was we had done this analysis of the various neighborhoods within the community. We've got about 30 different neighborhoods, but not every single neighborhood has a neighborhood park. So what we try to do is combine the neighborhood so everyone had at least a neighborhood park, and if they didn't have a neighborhood park, that they had a community park. So when he talked about the 60/40 breakdown with respect to the park fees collected, and 60 percent to remain for parks in that respective area so it benefits those who are paying for those impact fees for that particular area, it either is going to the neighborhood park in that area or to the community park in that area to directly benefit them with that 40 percent or that balance Village wide to deal with community parks Village wide like out at Prairie Springs Park or the trail systems that are needed to interconnect and link the neighborhood and community parks. I hope that's clear.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Area 3 has 12 units currently built and, if I'm reading this correctly, no further expectation for residential development. So, therefore, there's no potential for further impact fees to come out of area 3, correct? But, because the nature of the parks in area 3 are community, the funds to pay for those community park developments will come from

that 40 percent that is Village wide?

Jean Werbie:

That's correct.

Alex Tiahnybok:

What about the case of let's say area 12 where you have a relatively fully developed neighborhood with an intention to have a neighborhood park? How are those funds going to be derived? Where are they going to come from if there's only 28 additional units expected? That has to be done by a levy?

Jean Werbie:

There could be up to \$30,000 collected, but then beyond that would be the Village's levy since it's a fully developed area.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So for this entire park impact fee the \$9.7 million total you're showing 60 percent of it will not be co-mingled between areas? Let's take area 1, for example. We can take any area. Area 1 has two neighborhood parks slated, correct? Pleasant Prairie Park already exists, right?

Jean Werbie:

Correct.

Alex Tiahnybok:

And Pleasant Farms School Park does not exist, is that correct?

Jean Werbie:

Correct.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So 60 percent of that \$749,000 is going to fund the development of the new parks and 40 percent of it is going to go into the general kitty for the entire Village?

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, it's going to the interlinking of the parks and to the community parks or state parks. The concept behind the park master plan--the concept behind the comprehensive land use plan that will be refined by the park master plan that's going to be underway is to put our resources into the major . . . a certain level of those, and then provide connectivity between those parks and the neighborhoods, and then have a smaller subset of parks in

the neighborhood.

Alex Tiahnybok:

But in all of these cases 60 percent of the total impact fees are . . .

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I guess what I'd like to clarify is I believe there's 41 percent that goes just for the community pool, and then there's 59 percent out of the total park impact fees that goes for the neighborhood park, community park and the trails tying in together. So then 60 percent of that 59 percent, I know it's a lot of numbers, but that's the portion that just stays in that neighborhood.

Alex Tiahnybok:

In that neighborhood, okay.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

And I guess one thing I should clarify is this afternoon we did find an error when we were going through the numbers. In the handout that you received as part of your packet, we had 60 percent of the \$632 calculated at \$279.20 per unit, but that really should have been \$379.20 per unit, and so that entire column is off \$100 per unit, and I can resend that back out to you after the meeting. We just found it this afternoon about three o'clock when we were double checking, so your numbers that you have in your spreadsheet are going to be a little bit lower compared to what we have. That was just a key punching error.

Michaeline Day:

Good questions, Alex. Anything else?

Alex Tiahnybok:

That's it for now.

Michael Russert:

Jean, when you guys define the standard for a neighborhood park, what did you look at parks wise? What I guess defined a park?

Jean Werbie:

The Village worked with the Regional Planning Commission in Waukesha to put together our comprehensive plan, and they set forth standards that comply with the National Park standards and standards that have been used traditionally in the State of Wisconsin with respect to sizing parks. So the whole basis for land use planning in our community is that neighborhoods are defined as areas that are about a mile or mile and a

half square in area, and they're bounded typically by arterial roadways and they service a certain amount of population. And a neighborhood park to service that ranges in size from 5 to 25 acres in size and then, again, services that radius of about a mile to mile and half square area.

Then according to the objectives and standards as they set forth for us and in this handout, what we did, and then John can further refine, they went through and identified within a neighborhood park how many ball diamonds should you have, how many basketball goals should you have, how many soccer fields should you have? And then that's looked at on a neighborhood by neighborhood basis as well as Village wide to see if we fall within a national or State standard with respect to how many active park amenities that we're providing. It's hard to answer with just one quick answer, but there's a lot of analysis that goes into it, and then what we find is that if some of the amenities cannot be provided in a particular neighborhood just because of the acreage, the lay of the land or trees or something that prohibits it, that's why we have these overlapping community parks that will also service those particular areas that provide a number of additional amenities for someone to go to that's not necessarily driving to another community, but that's why we have certain community parks within the Village as well.

Michaeline Day:

Any other questions? Terrific.

Jean Werbie:

We need to have the Park Commission take some action on this. We'd like to have a recommendation from the Park Commission to bring to the Village Board.

Michaeline Day:

So would anyone consider making a motion then to bring this before the Village Board as presented by Mr. Steinbrink?

Michael Russert:

I motion that it is presented to the Village Board.

Kathleen Burns:

I second.

Michaeline Day:

If there's not any discussion, may we have a call? All in favor?

Voices:



Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Opposed? Motion carries.

**c. Consider Creekside Development Park Plan Report - (Jean Werbie)**

Jean Werbie:

As I mentioned at your last Park Commission meeting, prior to certain concept plans and plats going before the Plan Commission and Board for approval, we'd like to start bringing them now all to the Park Commission for your review and input before they get too far down the process. This particular one we're coming up to final plat already, and it's a project that actually the staff has been working on with this developer and a previous developer for about 11 years. So this is one that's been out there for quite a long time, and even with the previous Park Commission meetings you may have seen it.

The proposed development consists of approximately 120 acres of land. It's located north of 93<sup>rd</sup> Street and it's east of Old Green Bay Road. It's located within the southwest quadrant of the Whittier Creek neighborhood. A branch of the Jerome Creek traverses through the property from the southwest corner down to the southeast corner.

It's a single family development as well as a condominium development, and the single family portion of it is proposed to be developed in two stages, 15 single family lots in stage 1 and 9 single family lots in stage 2. Primarily the single family development is all located on the eastern portion of the development site.

The balance of the site, though, is a condominium development. And the condominium development is proposed to be developed in three different stages. Stage 1 is 116 condominium units, stage two is 124 condo units, and stage 3 is 48 condo units. Within this particular development approximately 27.79 acres or 23 percent of this site is in open space, and we've got open space that's got wetland in it, floodplain, just open space, parkland, so there's a great deal of open space in this particular development. This does not include the open space on individual lots or adjacent to individual units that is also open. It's just open space that's not intended to be developed for any type of purpose of development.

As indicated in the neighborhood plan, an open space corridor will be extended from 93<sup>rd</sup> Street on the south, and that's north to the northwest. There is proposed to be a neighborhood park or a small park on the south end, as well as a park area on the north end. There's going to be a walking trail that is built on the west side of the creek so that could bring the pedestrian traffic from the north to the south. There are pockets of wetlands on the north end on both sides, and then there's a large pocket of floodplain. It's a very shallow floodplain so for most of the time it will just be open green space, but it will be able to retain water during 100 year even storms.

With this particular project there's approximately 2.64 acres of open upland parkland for

park related purposes that you could put some active amenities within without fear of flooding primarily at the south end and then at the north end on the two sites I identified. As indicated in the memo, you can see we've got about 20 additional acres of open space, again, that's intended to be passive. At this point there hasn't been a final discussion as to whether or not this would be dedicated to the Village for permanent open space with a conservation easement, or whether or not the developer will retain it or the condominium association would retain it. And then, again, I would recommend some type of conservation easement so nothing could be built in those particular areas. But that's something I'd be looking for, a recommendation from the Park Commission. I think definitely the Village would like to see the almost three acres of parkland for park amenities.

With respect to the outlots on the particular development site, outlot 1, which is at the north end, is being used for storm water retention. Outlot 2 is being used for a future condominium development. Outlots 3, 4 and 6, again, future condominium development, and outlot 5 is intended to be dedicated to the Village for park purposes.

John is going to go over the numbers with respect to the impact fees, but the recommendation from the staff is that since this is going to be done in phases or stages, that this southern park be developed right with the rest of the first phases of the development, that the whole thing doesn't wait until it develops out. So with the southern portion that there be hard surfaces with basketball goals, playground equipment and a covered pavilion, in addition to the pedestrian walkway that gets constructed on the west side of the creek. The second park would be developed at such time as the later phases are developing.

This particular developer has already received an early mass grading to start mass grading of this site. They're looking to get final plat approval in early August, and they would like to be completed with their construction by spring, and they would like to start units and park development probably by late spring or early summer. So they're in a pretty aggressive time frame. With respect to their project what they would like to do is move from one stage right out to the next. So as soon as the first one starts build out, the next stage will have its infrastructure under construction, and then the next and the next. So it's not their intention that this would be a drawn out project, that this would be completed within a five year window from start to finish.

The one thing I just wanted to mention is they are dedicating the two park areas as well as any additional lands if the Village accepts it, the wetland and floodplain as well, free of charge to the Village. In addition to that we are collecting impact fees.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We took the numbers that Jean just spoke to you about with the different phases of the single family and the condos and total units, then we just applied our formulas that we had for the total impact fee. To use an example, the first stage of the single family was 15 units, so the total impact fee that we bring in is \$1,075 per unit for a total of \$16,125. The 41 percent of that \$1,075 or \$443 per unit that goes towards the community pool, just over \$6,600, and then the balance which would be the 59 percent which is left is the

\$632 per unit. Sixty percent of that goes towards neighborhood parks. So just for that stage 1 single family brings in just under \$5,700, and then 40 percent of that balance that was left is just under \$3,800 that goes towards neighborhood parks.

So by the time you add up all the different stages between the single family and the condos you end up with just over \$118,000 which goes towards development of that neighborhood park and just under \$79,000 that goes towards the community parks and trails. That \$118,000 is just over half of what that park will cost to be development. But keep in mind there are other developments down the road that will be going into that neighborhood park, and then they can expand it or maybe do something on a different phase of that park.

Michaeline Day:

John, our numbers are a little different on the 60 percent.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Right, we had the same problem--

Michaeline Day:

It shows \$4,188.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Once we found out that our key punch error was \$279.20, that was carried over on this spreadsheet also, so our numbers were \$100 per unit off, so it would probably be 312 times \$100, so just under \$3,000 should be the difference. It's kind of hard to get that many numbers up there and it's a lot of data. But that's just for an example, and if you have any questions we have the numbers in front of us.

Michaeline Day:

Anyone have any questions concerning the impact fees or anything about this development as far as its relationship to parks?

Michael Russert:

I have one question. Here it says the parkland is going to be a total of 2.64 acres and previously we discussed it and the standard is going to be 5 acres for a neighborhood park?

Jean Werbie:

That's correct.

Michael Russert:

So we're not meeting the standard?

Jean Werbie:

In this particular case we had taken a look at the large amount of open or passive space that can be dedicated to the Village in this area. And whether it's a neighborhood or a community standard, it doesn't specifically state whether or not it all has to be buildable land area, especially since it's being dedicated free and clear from the developer, or a portion of that could be encumbered by environmental amenities such as wetlands and floodplains and such. So this is approximately 20 plus acres up here, and then this plus this is that 2.64. So it still falls between the 5 and 25 acres for a neighborhood park. So the staff was recommending because of all the environmental features on this particular property that we consider that as part of the donation and consider that as a neighborhood park dedication.

Mike Pollocoff:

Jean, did you factor in the acreage on the trail that connects the two parks?

Jean Werbie:

No, I did not. That would be an addition.

Mike Pollocoff:

That would probably get you there.

Jean Werbie:

And we just need to decide also that we had talked about that the trail would be maintained by the homeowner's association and the condo association, and the Village would have a public easement over it as opposed to it being owned by the Village. So since this is one of our first ones, I guess there's a number of policy decisions that we need to make. But due to the fact that in most situations private parks or trails within a development are maintained by the association, it was our recommendation that the association maintain it but there be a public easement. But that is not calculated into it as well. It's a 15 foot wide easement.

Alex Tiahnybok:

From the previous agenda item, this is the development in area 6, correct?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Alex Tiahnybok:

It was in the body of the memorandum detailing the proposed facility improvements.

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Alex Tiahnybok:

This is kind of related to the gentleman's question, but you have 15 acres indicated here in terms of acquisition. I'm assuming that's some combination of what's being donated by the developer, correct? We have 28 here and it's showing 15 on the previous item. I do realize some of it is floodplain and some of it is other open space so it probably doesn't count as parks, but is that a clear understanding?

Michaeline Day:

One more time. We're getting confused here.

Alex Tiahnybok:

This breakdown of proposed and existing parks, you have 15 acres accounted for area 6 for Creekside.

Jean Werbie:

Right. We anticipated that there is going to be a portion of that 20 some acres, 26 acres, that's going to be identified for a retention basin that the developer is going to be using for that development. My recommendation is that the Village not take that. It still might be considered open space or private park area that someone might want to fish in or something, but I recommend we don't take that, so that's why I was suggesting some of those numbers.

Alex Tiahnybok:

You're showing 17.6 acres of floodplain and some wetlands, and that's obviously subtracted from the 28 total acres?

Jean Werbie:

Right.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Then it gets us closer to that number. Okay. Is the nature of the improvements for the facility, two basketball courts, a playground, pavilion, play field, it looks like that's pretty much a typical goal for a neighborhood park, correct? This is the first go at something like this, right, for the Village?

Jean Werbie:

It is.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So this is going to be a good test in terms of suitability and all that sort of stuff. Okay. Then right above the chart on impact fees in italics you have above noted improvements will not be installed until sufficient funds are obtained. Obviously this is a development that's in the works and the money should get generated pretty quickly. Is that going to be a standard that's going to be applied to any future case, that the money has got to be in the bank before we do it?

Mike Pollocoff:

If there's impact fee money that's funding the improvement it has to do that. Now, in some of these areas, as you think back to that previous item, the impact fees are not going to cover everything. There's existing users or existing residents who are going to benefit from a new park that a development creates, and the Village Board is going to have to pull the trigger through the budget process for whatever share that the Village would have to contribute be it levy or if there's grants that are obtained, whatever the funding source is other than impact fees. In this area here, since there's hardly any development in that area and it's almost exclusively impact fees that's not the question.

Jean Werbie:

The other thing I wanted to mention is that with any development if there is a park, whether it's community or a neighborhood park located within the boundary of that particular development, they will be required to do the grading and the drainage improvements, and they'll need to top soil it and seed it. So they will have to get it ready for it to be developed for a park. And then the funds, whatever funds that we have collected at a certain point, then we'll make the decisions as to when to put in those improvements. But it's not just going to sit as a weed field or something like that. The developer will have to get it ready, so if nothing else it will be a big play area for pickup games and such until the more defined improvements are constructed there.

Michaeline Day:

Any other questions?

Michael Russert:

You mentioned also that the developer will create the pedestrian between outlot 4 and 6. Will the Village have any say in working with them to make sure how it's constructed and it's going to meet our plan?

Jean Werbie:

Yes. Our Engineer, Mike and myself have already reviewed their pedestrian walking trail, identified where it's best to be located. We worked with the DNR on that as well, and the width of it and the easement that's needed, the material and the stone base, so all that is going to be dictated to them and on their engineering plans and on their specs, so it gets built to a certain standard that can be easily maintained.

Michaeline Day:

I could be wrong and I'm just asking, but isn't it along a creek there are some DNR guidelines what you can build there and what can't be built there, so it's not just what we want but what the DNR is instructing to built along a creek area.

Mike Pollocoff:

It's their call.

Jean Werbie:

Yes. In fact, they're channelizing the floodway within this creek, and we don't want the trail in the floodplain either, so we're following those guidelines, that's correct.

Michaeline Day:

If there's no other questions, I'd like to entertain a motion then to accept the staff's recommendation for the final plat of Creekside Crossing Subdivision stage 1 as presented.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I'll motion for approval of the Village staff report on Creekside Crossing Park Development.

Michaeline Day:

Thank you, and could I have a second?

Michael Russert:

Second the motion.

Michaeline Day:

Any more discussion? All in favor say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Opposed? Motion carries. We want to congratulate ourselves because we were told we had to be out of here for the next meeting, and I think we are done.

## **6. ADJOURNMENT**

Michaeline Day:

If there's no other issues before this Commission can I have a motion to adjourn?

Kathleen Burns:

Motion to adjourn.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Second.

Michaeline Day:

All in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

Michaeline Day:

Motion passes. Please note on your calendars then that the next meeting will be at six o'clock the first Tuesday of the month, August 2<sup>nd</sup>. Thank you all very, very much.

Meeting adjourned 6:10 p.m.