

**PLEASANT PRAIRIE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
VILLAGE HALL AUDITORIUM
9915 39TH AVENUE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE, WISCONSIN
5:00 P.M.
February 12, 2007**

A regular meeting for the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission convened at 5:00 p.m. on February 12, 2007. Those in attendance were Thomas Terwall; Michael Serpe; Donald Hackbarth; Wayne Koessler; Andrea Rode; Jim Bandura; John Braig; and Larry Zarletti. Judy Juliana was excused. Also in attendance were Michael Pollocoff-Village Administrator; Jean Werbie, Community Development Director; Peggy Herrick-Asst. Planner/Zoning Administrator and Tom Shircel-Asst. Planner/Zoning Administrator.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER.**
- 2. ROLL CALL.**
- 3. CORRESPONDENCE.**
- 4. CONSIDER THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2007 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING.**

Donald Hackbarth:

So moved.

Wayne Koessler:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

**MOTION BY DON HACKBARTH AND A SECOND BY WAYNE KOESSL TO
APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 8, 2007 MEETING AS PRESENTED IN
WRITTEN FORM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.**

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

- 5. CITIZEN COMMENTS.**

Thomas Terwall:

If you're here for an item that appears on the agenda tonight as a matter for public hearing, we would ask that you hold your comments until a public hearing is held so we can include your comments as a part of the official record. However, if you're here for an item that either is not on the agenda or is not a matter for public hearing now would be your opportunity to speak. We would ask that you step to the microphone and begin by giving us your name and address. Is there anybody wishing to speak under citizens' comments?

Rhonda Wasurick:

Hi, Rhonda Wasurick, 11917 28th Avenue. I'm not sure if anyone is aware of the smell that we're having, and I think it's due to the BFI plant in Zion, but I live right off of 116th, and it seems like it starts at 9th Street in the harbor and it runs all the way to 116th Street. It is a terrible smell. I know Winthrop Harbor has filed ordinances against Zion for this dumpster, but I don't know if anyone lives in that area but, man, you can sure smell it strong. So it's something I think we need to look at. Thank you.

Thomas Terwall:

Bob, have you heard anything? No? Steve?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

(Inaudible)

Thomas Terwall:

This is a letter to Pleasant Prairie from the Kenosha County Health Sanitarian. Enclosed is the information provided by Lake County Health Department in reference to the landfills located in Zion, Illinois. The letters explain the corrective actions the facility will take to control odors. Any questions regarding this letter please contact me. Have you seen this yet, Jean?

Jean Werbie:

No.

Thomas Terwall:

It will be addressed. Anybody else wishing to speak under citizens' comments? If not, we'll move ahead. I'm going to take liberty and change the agenda of the meeting a little bit and take Item A under New Business out of order which is the Wisconsin Department of Transportation presentation because they have another meeting they need to go to. With that, Jean?

7. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. Wisconsin Department of Transportation presentation of STH 50 Access Management Plan and consideration of Plan Commission #07-07 to support the STH 50 Access Management Plan.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission, the Village of Pleasant Prairie, through the Wisconsin Statutes, is under an obligation to update our Comprehensive Planning as it pertains to transportation systems when transportation information becomes available to us. The Village has been working with the Wisconsin DOT, the City of Kenosha, Kenosha County and some other agencies in putting together some updates and some highway improvements to the Highway 50 cross-section and sections from the Interstate to 43rd Avenue that's in the City of Kenosha. Highway 50 is a primary urban arterial that serves the Village of Pleasant Prairie as well as the City of Kenosha, so we find that this arterial is quite significant to the future growth development and the capacity of this system to service our particular area.

In September of 1986 the Wisconsin DOT adopted a Highway Access and Development Plan for the Highway 50 Corridor. This was published and adopted by the Town in 1987. It was cooperatively prepared by the Town of Pleasant Prairie, the City and County of Kenosha and the DOT. At that time it went from I-94 to 64th Avenue.

Since that time the DOT has requested and the Village and the City and the DOT cooperatively have worked together to update this access management plan and functional plan. And in 1998 the Wisconsin DOT held the first of many public informational meetings to update this 1987 access and management plan. The updated plan evaluates the need for increased number of travel lanes to new intersections, closing of other intersections and driveways and just takes a look at the entire profile of Highway 50 and how it's going to serve our area into the future.

There have been a total of four public informational meetings held by the Wisconsin DOT on this plan. The fourth meeting was held last summer in August of 2006. And each plan modification was based on subsequent or previous comments and modifications made as a result of comments presented by commercial and residential dwellers as well as the adjacent municipalities.

I have asked Vida Shaffer and her team, Bob Anderson and others from the DOT, to present this plan to the Village's Plan Commission and Board members that were able to attend in order for all of the officials here in Pleasant Prairie to get a good idea of exactly what they are proposing as part of their updates to this plan. Again, if you attended any of these hearings, especially the last hearing that was held late last summer, you would have a good understanding of exactly what they are proposing on this stretch of highway between, again, I-94 and about 43rd Avenue.

With that, I'd like to turn it over to Vida Shaffer with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation. You do have copies of the D size plans of the Highway 50 widening and improvement project, but I'd like to have her walk us through this particular project, update us on its status and timing, as well as to answer any questions that we may have with respect to this improvement project. Again, I'm hoping that there's nothing brand new that's going to be coming to our community this evening, but this is just another opportunity for our community to see what the DOT is proposing on Highway 50.

Vida Shaffer:

Good evening and thank you for inviting us. We started this project in 1996 so we're very eager to complete it and we are about 95 percent complete. This was a very challenging corridor. It

starts at I-94 to 43rd Avenue and there's really two parts to this corridor study. The first part is what we call a functional plan. That's can we fit additional capacity along this corridor and what we need to happen. The second part that we decided to do was to update that 1987 access management plan that Jean had brought up earlier.

This first part I'm going to talk about what are the changes on Highway 50. But why did we feel this was important to do a corridor with all the needs in the State? When we took a look at traffic for the last ten years and how it was growing every two years, then we took a look at the land use around and there's still some areas that can still be developed, we developed a forecast. And this map here which you may have a handout. We don't have that one, okay. But right now we're experiencing 25,000 cars and it increases as you get to 31 and then it slightly decreases as you go east up 31. Our 2030 forecast nearly doubles, nearly doubles the volumes that you are experiencing today, so we see a very big need out here on Highway 50.

Also, we've asked SEWRPC, the Southeastern Regional Planning Commission to take a look at traffic patterns in the area. And what they came up with was over 65 percent of the traffic that's driving on Highway 50 is going to a destination on Highway 50. So although improving alternate routes is very important it's not going to solve your problems on Highway 50.

Starting from the west end we basically tried to fit a six lane section through there. Now, as you can see, we have these slotted left turns. They're restricted turns at some of these median locations. In general there's 22 median openings right now, and we propose to close 9 of those. The 9 that we're closing are currently very close to signalized intersections. It was an old design because Wisconsin still doesn't allow U-turns at traffic signals. Earlier we built in these median openings and what we found they're causing more and more problems. So of the 9 those are the ones that we're removing, the ones that are very close to the intersections either on one side or the other, and they seem to conflict with the left turn lanes. As traffic is growing our turn lanes need to get longer, and in some of the intersection locations we actually have dual left turn lanes where we don't have the spacing.

So in general a big part of this plan is a lot of median modification. So we're going to be leaving 13 median openings. Ten of the 13 openings will only allow left turns, and the right turns, the driver would have to make a right turn, slowly weave to the next U-turn opportunity and then make a U-turn instead of a left out of the driveways.

This is a similar design as to what we're doing on Blue Mound Road today. Blue Mound Road, as you know, is a very high volume intersection and it has a lot of commercial access. And even though it's been retrofit in the '80s and the early '90s, what we're finding is a big problem with these left outs with fatalities and severe accidents, so that's the design that's occurring for these high volume urban corridors is putting in these slotted left turn lanes and making people—our traffic engineers are saying making a U-turn is a lot safer than trying to make a left out of a driveway and speed across three lanes and then stop on a button to sit at the median.

So as we move along, for the most part we fit our six lanes within the existing right of way. When we get to the intersections we do anticipate right of way acquisition on all four quadrants. Now, for the most part we fit it within existing but there are some strip locations that we may need some additional right of way from the property owners, and this was all shown to them at the last several public meetings. But most of the acquisition is around these intersections. So we

took a long hard look at all of these and they are expanding quite a bit with dual left turns. Some of them have dual left turn lanes. Some of them have duals off of the side roads. So maybe if there's time afterwards you could take a look at these, or I know there's copies if you had any particular question about any one intersection.

But overall we did a signal spacing analysis and we do have signals in addition to the ones that are out there right now. We have signals proposed at 110th Street and at 99th Street. So I believe the one at 99th will be in the next few years, but the one at 110th Street will probably occur as we get closer to the threshold of traffic.

Jean Werbie:

It is 99th Avenue.

Vida Shaffer:

99th Avenue, sorry. Another reason why we came out to do the corridor is the crashes at these intersections are very high compared to our State average. 31 is twice the average. I want to talk a little bit about schedule, too. We wanted to come out and identify a footprint where the six lanes is going to go and what the intersection improvements are, so as the area develops next to the corridor that we have buildings moved out of the way and we have room to build the final improvement. But this has not been scheduled for construction yet, and our earliest anticipation is that it wouldn't be for at least ten years.

In the meantime there is going to be a safety project on 50 and 31. We're going to try to make some improvements within the existing right of way, so that project would not purchase any additional right of way. But they're working on it right now, possibly some signal timing changes, lengthening some turn lanes and putting a right turn in here. So as we move along basically intersection improvements, median modifications.

Then we get to 50 and 31. 50 and 31 is probably the number one location that caused the greatest—we just had a hard time with this intersection. We looked at four or five different alternatives. We've spend the money to model them with existing traffic, and what we're finding is—we were hard pressed to find a solution that's going to work. When we looked at just expanding the intersection, adding the turn lanes, we got a level of service E which is very, very poor. From a scale of A to F it's kind of discerning to have a proposed alternative that's an E. So early on we did propose a great separation alternative that wasn't very well liked by the business owners in the area so those alternatives were scratched.

It led us to this one. We call it the tight jug handle alternative. We've also looked at other alternatives where the jug handle on the southwest side was actually extended down and would loop around down here. That did not model very well so we eliminated that option. We also looked at an alternative with having 31 go under 50 with raising 50 minimally, maybe four or five feet. There's a similar intersection in Milwaukee on Teutonia and Silver Spring, so we felt it's been built in other areas. Would it fit in this environment? That one yielded a better level of service, however it was very costly. We'd have some very substantial drainage and pumping issues. Basically this one was operating just as well as the tunnel alternative.

The key to this jug handle is you could not make a left turn if you're on 31. You have to go through the intersection, make the loop around and go straight.

Jean Werbie:

Excuse me, Vida. Maybe if you use this map then the audience and the Plan Commission can see. It's a little bit bigger for the Highway 31 and 50 intersection.

Vida Shaffer:

Sure. What we found, and one of our biggest problems at 50 and 31, is there's a high left turn if you're going eastbound to north, and there's a high left turn going south on 31 to east. And as you can see those left turns are next to each other. They're not opposing, so it's not a matter of adding just a little bit of time to the left turn signal. When we looked at just expanding the intersection, you'd be sitting at that light about four to six minutes just to wait to make a left turn.

So this jug handle alternative you'd have to go through the intersection if you're on 31 and make the loop around and make the left. And the idea is to make it in one signal cycle to the tighter the jug the better. If you're on 50 there's no changes. You'd be making a left the same way you're making it now except your right turns you'd be making a right on the jug handle instead of at the intersection. Now, east of 31 it's six lanes but then we soon start transitioning to match back into the exist four lane roadway. There are some median adjustments that we've made here same as on the west side.

We've also tried to close some driveways. What we did was we looked at every single parcel and we looked at how many driveways do they have and we left them a reasonable number. If they had three maybe we tried to take one out, or if they had two next to each other like a U driveway we tried to take that one out. But if they were a corner property like a tight gas station, some of their tankers need that second driveway on the crossroad to pull out. So our proposal is to remove some driveways when this is built. Are there any questions while we're on the functional plan now?

Donald Hackbarth:

Vida, on the jug handle going north, as you loop around that, you're right, that's awfully tight. Would there be a backup of traffic because that flow going north sometimes is pretty hefty. Not only that, if a train backs the traffic up going north it just backs it up and backs it up so you might have an awful lot of traffic trying to go west who would fill into that jug handle and maybe back the jug handle up.

Vida Shaffer:

When we modeled it cleared that queue because you're right that southern portion of the 31 the problem is you're backing up through those intersections. With our model it cleared that queue so everybody was able to go through that intersection and make the loop around in one signal cycle.

Donald Hackbarth:

But I'm just saying, for instance, at rush hour at night, four o'clock or four thirty, if a train backs that traffic up going south you may have—I don't know.

Vida Shaffer:

It's possible if there's a train right at peak hour. It's hard to anticipate but we ran it for peak hour volumes. The volumes that you're experiencing now we expanded them out to 2030 and we used those higher volumes to see if these alternatives work. Now, there may be an instance where if a train crosses—are they on a consistent schedule during rush hour?

Donald Hackbarth:

(Inaudible)

Vida Shaffer:

Unfortunately the State has no jurisdiction over the railroads. We wish we could.

Donald Hackbarth:

(Inaudible)

Vida Shaffer:

Right. Things could be modified, too. Sometimes the lights once those gates are left open they're interconnected so we could look later on when we get into final design there might be a way to interconnect the signals that once that gate is open that you allow more green time to clear the queues that had backed up. So it's a possibility we could look into if it's a big problem.

Mike Serpe:

Vida, I commend you and the State for taking on this project. I think for all the people that live in this area we wish it was underway already because it's crowded. I-94 is going to be reconstructed or added to Highway 50. Obviously it's going to be reconstructed and widened. That's really the only main thoroughfare leaving the City of Kenosha and the northern part of Pleasant Prairie. The southern part of Pleasant Prairie has 165 which is easy access to the I. Has any thought been given in the event that the County would run 60th Street in an expanded road, four lanes, similar to what Highway 50 is now, to the I and if that were to ever happen is there any way to tie in 60th Street once it gets to the interstate to an access to the interstate? Has any thought been given to that at all?

Bob Anderson:

Currently I believe there are no plans to expand K between 31 and the interstate. At the interstate we are going to make accommodations for it to be four lanes from frontage road to frontage road. It would just connect to the frontage road. It would not interchange or have a split diamond at least in the studies as it exists today.

Mike Serpe:

But the frontage would be added two lanes on the side?

Bob Anderson:

No, K would be built to a four lane configuration between—

Mike Serpe:

To the frontage road?

Bob Anderson:

Between the frontage roads.

Mike Serpe:

And no additions to the frontage roads at this point?

Bob Anderson:

In all likelihood if the development in the Kenosha Towne Center takes place that will be a four lane frontage road.

Mike Serpe:

I just think that eventually the people in this area, in the City especially and the northern part of Pleasant Prairie, need another main access to get out to the interstate. And the only one I can see, the logical one, is 60th Street and 158 eventually.

Bob Anderson:

Right. I think you'll see that 158 will have four lanes into 31 probably before K would have four lanes.

Donald Hackbarth:

I don't know if we're stuck on 31 here or what, but when this thing was viewed last summer I asked about going east, sliding off into that turnoff into Menards, because you're coming over that bridge and all of a sudden you come over that bridge and you have to make a left hand turn and it gets kind of hairy. Is that going to be addressed to make that a little more visible?

Vida Shaffer:

Yes, our proposal is to improve the profile coming off of that bridge so you don't have that hump coming off. I just wanted to mention that we have submitted our environmental document. We're waiting for approval from our own central office. It will then go to FHWA. Once they

have their comments we'll make those changes and once they sign it we will have a public availability period which we will put it on our website and it will be for public knowledge. But I believe you have a copy of our environmental document as it is right now, and we hoping to complete the project in the next six months.

The second part of the plan is the access management plan. What we decided to do is since we were going to do a corridor study let's update that 1987 plan. I'm going to pass it on to Dan Dupees here with CH2M Hill. What the access management plan is it's a vision. So when a developer is interested in developing next to Highway 50 that the DOT and both communities open up the same vision and let's try to implement this if at all possible. From 1987 were we 100 percent? No. But we were about 75 percent in implementation which I think is a lot better than doing nothing. So reducing the number of direct access driveways. As small parcels combine into one, well, they might have had ten driveways but we don't want to give them ten driveways back so it's a lot of combining.

Thomas Terwall:

Before you turn it over one last question on the implementation. Am I to understand that the jug handle at 31 and 50 will not occur until the rest of the development occurs?

Vida Shaffer:

No. That jug handle will be built once the construction date is set.

Thomas Terwall:

So we're looking at maybe ten years?

Vida Shaffer:

Maybe ten years but we're not waiting for development, everything to fill up or anything like that.

Dan Dupees:

Good evening. My name is Dan Dupees and I'm with CH2M Hill. A bit of background on the access management plan before we step through the four sheets. As Jean noted at the start of the meeting it is an update of the 1987 plan. It has a longer geography that we cover this time, so the earlier plan terminating at 64th Avenue. This plan we take to our east limit at 43rd Avenue. And also we were looking at the issue of additional signals as well as median opening changes with this plan which is different than the past plan.

To, again, provide a bit of background information the red that one sees on both the screen and the hard copy here represents exactly the same treatment that is on the functional plan. The access management component of these exhibits is what we call the candy striped or the blue areas labeled here. So you have functional plans that DOT would build in the year we don't know, but that's what they would construct. The blue areas noted on the plan are really I guess a recommendation for the communities, the Village, the City, potentially the County as ideas that have engineering merit, could make some contribution to more efficient use of Highway 50. But

they will be a suggestion to you if you desire to build them. And what they're aimed at is trying to maximize use of off system roadways to carry traffic that really doesn't have to be on State Trunk Highway 50.

So if we move from west to east we have the first sheet with us on the wall and I'll refer to that. You'll see three areas that have been developed thus far at the far west end of the project. The first is located here. This is really looking at the potential for what are currently residential properties, perhaps redeveloping in the future to a larger use and the ability to access those properties then off the back access road rather than individual driveways off of 50. So an idea that probably has the most merit if these parcels redevelop.

Jean Werbie:

The question I'd like to ask now and maybe I can ask it to Vida is how flexible is the access management plan insofar as a development sets forth a detailed traffic study and there's cooperation by the landowners and the City of Kenosha on the north side to moving that 110th Avenue access location back to what the '87 plan showed us which was two points of connection to Highway 50 as public road connections at least to the south?

Vida Shaffer:

The 1987 plan also assumed that there would be low density residential to the south and some different type of land use to the north. So I guess that's why instead of having two access points it was changed to one. And we have a nicer spacing to the first 104th Street intersection. As the area to the south develops we feel that if the TIA shows that two access points would not be a major detriment to Highway 50 and how it operates we feel that that can get changed. But at this point in time until we know a little bit more about the type of development to the south we'd just as soon leave it the way it is.

Now, the plan we're going to be done in three months. And we're going to use this plan for the next 20 years. We're lucky if we build every candy striped road. It's not going to happen. But if we're 90 percent successful or 80 percent successful we're going to have a good system on our hands. So right now these are suggested locations. They can change as we know more about the land use on the north and to the south. Are you okay with that? I mean for now we have no reason to really change it to two access points. I think your suggestion was to actually move the intersection to the east and add another access point to the west of where 110th Street is. We would like a TIA from that development to the south to show us that that would not harm the traffic on Highway 50.

Most of this is because we have to come to the realization that Highway 50 we can't fix all the problems with traffic if we keep putting driveways onto Highway 50. So we need our partners, we need the City of Kenosha and the Village of Pleasant Prairie to work with us to make some of these local road connections in the future, because we're not going to be able to solve 50 by ourselves by just taking out the few little driveways. So we need to work together that when these driveways and parcels combine that we don't give them ten driveways back, that we take a look at some back access or local connections. You'll see them both on the City side and on the Village side.

So we hear you and we're reluctant to change it now until we know a little bit more about the development. But we feel that it's a very feasible option, but we just reserve the right to change this until we've actually reviewed the TIA. But it's changeable. I think it's just a vision. I don't feel that every candy striped road will be built in 20 years, but if we get pretty close we'll be in good shape.

Mike Pollocoff:

Vida, since that land to the south is in question, you've got two uses. One is the large vacant piece is going to be single family residential. That plat exists. What's probably more unknown is how that property along 50 between the single family residential and Highway 50 develops. So at least in the preliminary cut you guys thing based on having single family in the vacant and then some level of commercial in that one strip that one point should handle it? The reason I bring that up, I think there's some level of confusion that that land to the south, the single family, is going to convert over to residential and right now that would be out of whack with the Village's Master Comprehensive Land Use Plan for that area. So maybe one access point gets us where we need to be assuming that the Commission stays with the Master Plan.

Vida Shaffer:

At this point will what we show work with what you have planned? I don't know. I guess it's really up to the TIA. And, like I said, we're open to change that. We want what works best for both and we have the same interest in mind. We want to keep Highway 50 clear and open and safe so it just stays viable. So I see this area being the number one area to change. But without having data and some engineering study done.

Larry Zarletti:

Are there any areas along 50 where you can cross Highway 50 that is not controlled by a traffic light in this plan?

Vida Shaffer:

I believe there are two median openings that we left open.

Larry Zarletti:

And where are those?

Vida Shaffer:

I think closer—I'd have to look.

Larry Zarletti:

Maybe better yet, I don't need to know where they are, but what was the criteria for leaving those open?

Vida Shaffer:

I think it was access on both sides. I'd have to check into that on why we left those particular two. You can make U-turns in those slotted lefts.

Larry Zarletti:

I'm looking particularly in the area, and I know I'm probably getting a segment ahead of you, but 104th west and where First Assembly of God you have listed here, what's not listed is there's Christian Life School there also. There's a substantial amount of traffic that comes out of there on a regular basis. I guess my concern is as I see vehicles that are going to want to go east there that are going to be forced to only go west, and once they reach where they can legally turn around, I don't know that there's enough space to accommodate the flow of cars that would come out of there and would want to immediately want to make a U-turn to go back east. I guess I'm wondering if anywhere in the study if someone figured out how many cars come out of that area on a regular basis.

Vida Shaffer:

We were contacted by First Assembly and they gave us some traffic data as to how much volume they have in the morning and on Sundays. We did have our traffic engineers review that, and most of the traffic, besides the school traffic, but the other volumes of traffic were evenings and off peak periods and on Sundays. So our traffic engineer said that it wouldn't—there was no warranting to have a light at their driveway location.

Larry Zarletti:

I guess I'm talking about a light. I'm just talking about the ability to be able to cross the road and go east. So as far as you're concerned on your study it is safer to allow them to go west and then turn around to go east?

Vida Shaffer:

A U-turn, yes.

Larry Zarletti:

I mean is that typical – is there some data to back not that area but other places in the State where it makes more sense to send them down and turn them around versus letting them cross?

Vida Shaffer:

I don't know if there's any specific data. But our traffic engineers are telling us now it's actually safer to make a right turn and weave. Even though it's a shorter distance, it's still a lot longer than stopping in the middle of that median. Just on Blue Mound Road we had a fatality of a lady coming out of a K-Mart and it was the same case. That's a higher volume driveway.

Larry Zarletti:

Can you tell me how much distance there is between just east of 110th Avenue coming out of First Assembly of God going west to that first turnaround where you start the area where you'd kind of be in a waiting pattern to go ahead and make your turn? How many vehicles would you suspect you could fit in there? I think it's an important thing to look at so that we don't back them up across the highway.

Vida Shaffer:

It's approximately 700 feet from the First Assembly to that first turnover, and approximately four cars fit in that lane.

Larry Zarletti:

Even though it only happens a few times a week, I don't know, I think you should really take another look at that. Four cars at any given time when either the school has a function, the church has a function, if you see the size of the parking lots that are there and you can actually come out of Aurora if you wanted to. In that area there's a shared access between the church and Aurora so you could potentially get Aurora traffic coming out of that same area and if you're going to funnel them west and they want to turn around to go east and only four cars fit there.

Vida Shaffer:

I can see where you're coming from. If you have a lot of volume they could all be using that same turnaround and cause backups. I guess at this point it's working the way we feel, but this project isn't going to be built for a long time, and it still has several years of final design. I guess I just want to say we will look at that in more detail. In ten years maybe we do have a development interested in the south and we decide to signalize that driveway and then this is a moot point. We will definitely note it that we will take a look at this area west of 104th Street and consider First Assembly and the Village's request for a signal there.

Dan Dupees:

Back to the access management and actually an issue that can address some of your concerns, on the north side of 50 you see what is a connection between, as you pointed out, Aurora here, Assembly of God Church and their school. And this north/south piece was meant to be, has the potential to be a new 110th Avenue. The idea is that there is the potential at least for it to serve not only the church and Aurora but also the apartments to the west. And that point, as we show it here, would line up with the development to the south. Now, the question that has been raised more than once tonight is ultimately where does this go? I mean would it be at the church driveway, for example, rather than here? Vida's point is let the traffic impact analysis sort of drive that decision. So a signal is planned for in this area. It's currently shown at 110th. Ultimately it might be in a different location. But the idea is to serve both sides of State Trunk Highway 50 at that point with a signal to allow the volumes that at some point will be generated both north and south of State Trunk Highway 50.

Let's go to the next sheet please. A point of note here there has been a recent development that we sort of dubbed in white here at 91st Avenue so it was at one time candy striping before that

development became a reality. Now it's simply to reflect a condition on the ground today. So not access management, that is meant to be part of the local road network. What we're showing as potential is for a back access road to provide service to the northeast quadrant, and the issue I guess worth point out is that we are at this point on that back access road at a boundary between communities. And so there would have to be some sort of consensus between the communities to make something like that a possibility. Not only does this road have the ability to clean up access along 50 but also to facilitate that northbound movement on 88th Avenue.

If there's no questions on that the next sheet. A little more color here. The first let's take the area west of 70th Avenue. In discussions with Jean recently we have learned about a larger development potential there. Certainly the Village's vision is not for that to remain a residential area. And what we are pointing out, again, is a connection to a signalized side road. This is 70th Avenue and an existing signal there. This road providing access to allowing driveway closures along 50 ultimately connecting to 70th Avenue and then the ability to make both east and westbound movements at that signal.

Also, when you see this large box and smaller box what it signals is the change that would take place in the median treatment along State Trunk Highway to facilitate movements to and from that access point. But what we're trying to show here is just serving this development in some manner to get some of the traffic to 70th Avenue. Might the configuration of that roadway change? Sure, as the development plans for that quadrant become better known.

Moving to the east side of 31, we have a roadway in the City of Kenosha that would provide connection between the jug handle in the northeast quadrant and 60th Avenue. That road is not without some issues. It's worth noting that we're aware of that. It is in a tight area with the apartments to the north. There is now I think at least one detention facility that might run afoul of that line, but the concept was, again, to allow people to make movements from this quadrant which are going to be challenging in the eastbound direction to get them to 60th Avenue and a signal to allow them to go any way they want to go. So whether that road happens, again, would be at this time a City of Kenosha desire and I'll leave that at that.

In the southeast quadrant, an area with a fair bit of open space and an intense issue on what might happen there in the future, there are a few lines. Let's take this one first. It's a continuation of 76th Avenue that I think may actually be a committed project by the City of Kenosha. We have left it on as simply a good access management idea. It would, again, allow the driveways along 50 to be cleaned up, provide access between two facilities that are signalized, so it's just a good transportation move to complete that connection to 60th Avenue.

And then you'll see some additional lines that we have here. This north/south piece is somewhat similar in function to this in that it allows what will be some problematic southbound moves from let's say Walgreen in the future. It gets traffic down to what has been discussed by DOT in the past as a likely future signal at 78th Avenue, and then this proposed facility providing a connection between a signal at 78th Avenue and 60th Avenue which is signaled. So all of the connections here will be looked at by the community, by developers and the community when that development becomes a little bit better known. And one hopes that this kind of movement, getting traffic to the signal to allow freer northbound and southbound access, will take place. It is going to be difficult without it and I think the timing of it is probably going to be driven by development in the area. Any questions on that sheet?

The last sheet then is not many ideas really that benefit 50. We're in a dense urban area. The open space really is very, very limited and perhaps only to what might redevelop. But we've simply put in a connection to a piece here that would allow some neighborhood access that doesn't exist today. So a little bit less grand scale than some of the other potentials to the west. But that is the access management plan.

I would point out in closing that you're seeing the picture today. There is an access management plan text document that's going to accompany the picture that we'll be sending by the Village for approval and we'll be doing that in the near future. So this is the picture and you'll get the words that go with it a bit later. Any questions?

Jean Werbie:

Dan, can we go back to segment number 2 map? My concern here is at the intersection of 88th Avenue and Highway 50 at that southeast quadrant. Is there anything to prevent the DOT from acknowledging that a similar type of reverse frontage road or reverse segment cannot be provided at this location if, in fact, the commercial users in that vicinity agree to close their driveways or if there's a change in land use or a change in conditions at that particular location in order to bring connection down to 76th Street and then out to Highway 50 in proximity to that same location on the north end?

Dan Dupees:

Sure. I'm going to pass to Vida at some point to let DOT comment, but let me kind of lay out the scenario, Jean. The project team has been talking about a connection between uses such as Willow Point and Truesdell and adjacent development that would in some form, whether it is something that runs along 50 and then south to get to this intersection with 76th, or a more difficult back access because of the wetlands to serve those properties as a potential solution. The traffic situation that we have is that we have solved for auto traffic the ability to go west from this point by a median opening that will allow them to essentially come out, store in the median, turn and go west. That same potential doesn't exist for a big truck that would be, let's say, a tanker truck pulling into Truesdell who also wants to get west. That truck is going to make a movement as you follow the red here that's going to take them around and then bring them back out to 50. So there's this loop that they follow to get out to 50. Clearly, Truesdell, among others, has some issues with that movement.

This type of a frontage road, again whether in front or in back, has the potential to take that traffic and get them to 88th Avenue in a signal and going west in another manner that may have some upsides. So it is something that we are aware the Village is interested in, and I'll turn it over to Vida to talk about the potential for that to happen.

Vida Shaffer:

Jean, I like your suggestion. I think if those properties in this quadrant combine we could have a candy striped road showing that. Now, when we first started this project we said we'll build this road, we'll build these connections, but we're only going to build them if the department can take off the driveways. In this particular quadrant these owners do not want their driveways removed off of Highway 50. So we, in turn, are not going to build that frontage road. But I think we

should add it as a potential for in the future if those parcels should combine, so I totally agree with your suggestion.

Truesdell here had a full opening and we came into the public meeting and we closed him up and he was not very happy. So we've been working with Truesdell and his neighbor and we moved the driveway out of the left turn lane. We gave him a full opening which doesn't accommodate his trucks, but with this Texas U-turn here we feel that he has reasonable access east and west and he's happy at this time. But I agree we should add a future road.

This is a good slide because this white line that's success. That used to be candy striped. When this got put in we removed I think it's two driveways off of Highway 50, and this third one once it develops will have access to this road. That's three driveways and that's the goal. So this is success.

Could we go to the 50 and 31 intersection? The 50 and 31 intersection is a good example of the DOT with the use of Highway 50 and 31 not being able to solve all the problems. We love this alternative. We think it will operate fine except we do acknowledge that there's two problems with access. If you're in the northeast quadrant you have a very indirect way of going eastbound again. You have to exit here, go up to a U-turn, make a left, so it's a very indirect way of going eastbound. So this connection up here is a local road connection that could be made to help that move.

On the south if you're in the Walgreen's quadrant you have a very difficult time going south because this median is closed. It's too close to this intersection so there's no way. You have to go through, make a U-turn somewhere and come back south again or make a left and loop around. It's a very indirect way of going south. So this local road connection will be very beneficial. These are high volume intersections that are going to take just a combination of everybody helping because we can't fix it with just 50.

Jean Werbie:

Vida, do you know what the timing is to bring back the access management plan and the written narrative for the project?

Vida Shaffer:

Dan, any idea when the final might be on their desk?

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

The staff had put on the agenda a resolution for the Plan Commission to consider with respect to these plans. What I'm going to be asking is that actually be tabled this evening until we have all of the pieces of the puzzle put together by the DOT. We had already scheduled this presentation by the DOT and so I wanted to make sure they were given that opportunity to present it to the community. So if there aren't any other further questions, what I'd like to do is I would like to table it this evening and then I will make a presentation of the entire written narrative with the balance of the plans the next time.

Vida Shaffer:

I just want to mention with the narrative these four sheets are inserted behind the narrative. That's the 98 percent of the meat of that. There is text that explains what is access management, a little history, and that's the text that we'll be giving to Jean in the coming weeks. So you have these and you're able to take a look at these. This is the majority of the plan itself. If there's any other questions?

Mike Serpe:

I move to table.

Larry Zarletti:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

MOTION BY MIKE SERPE AND A SECOND BY LARRY ZARLETTI TO TABLE THIS UNTIL RECEIPT OF THE WRITTEN DOCUMENTATION. YOU THINK THREE WEEKS, JEAN, OR A MONTH AT THE LONGEST? OKAY. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed?

Wayne Koessl:

No, I'm against it.

Thomas Terwall:

Thank you very much. Let's return back to the normal agenda then.

6. OLD BUSINESS

A. TABLED PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF PLAN COMMISSION RESOLUTION #06-20 FOR AN AMENDMENT TO A PORTION OF THE SHERIDAN WOODS NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN for the request of JM Squared LLC, owner, for the approximate 15.3 acre property generally located on the west side of 28th Avenue, south of 116th Street, at the approximate 11900 Block, to accommodate the proposed 19 lot single-family subdivision to be known as The Orchard Subdivision.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman, I would ask that both Items A and B be discussed at the same time and both items be removed from the table.

Wayne Koessl:

So moved.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

MOVED BY WAYNE KOESSL AND SECONDED BY MIKE SERPE TO REMOVE ITEMS A AND B FROM THE TABLE AND TO DISCUSS THEM JOINTLY WITH TWO SEPARATE MOTIONS. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

B. TABLED PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A CONCEPTUAL PLAN for the request of JM Squared LLC, owner, for the approximate 15.3 acre property generally located on the west side of 28th Avenue, south of 116th Street, at the approximate 11900 Block, for the proposed 19 lot single family subdivision to be known as The Orchard Subdivision.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission and the audience, there are two items that we will be discussing this evening. The first is Item A, which is a tabled public hearing and consideration of Plan Commission Resolution 06-20, and this is for an amendment to a portion of the Sheridan Woods Neighborhood Plan at the request of JM Squared LLC. They're the owner of a 16 acre property generally located on the west side of 28th Avenue, south of 116th Street

The second item is a tabled public hearing and consideration of a conceptual plan also at the request of JM Squared LLC, owner, for the approximate 16 acre property generally located on the west side of 28th Avenue, south of 116th Street, at the approximate 11900 Block. They are proposing a 19 lot single family subdivision known as the Orchard.

The petitioner is requesting approval of an amendment to a portion of the Sheridan Woods Neighborhood Plan and approval of a Conceptual Plan for the proposed single-family residential

development to be known as the Orchard Subdivision generally located on the west side of 28th Avenue, south of 116th Street within the Sheridan Road Neighborhood.

On November 13, 2006, the Plan Commission tabled the proposed Sheridan Woods Neighborhood Plan amendment and Conceptual Plan due to several concerns brought forth by neighbors and from the Plan Commission members. The concerns of the neighbors and the Plan Commissioners had included: construction traffic on 28th Avenue; density of the subdivision and conformance with the Village's Comprehensive Plan and Sheridan Woods Neighborhood Plan; location of storm water drainage; payment of impact fees; extension of municipal water service; and placement of street lighting and street subdivision signage.

The next few slides that we're going to be showing specifically outline part of their proposal and what they're proposing, and then specifically we'll be presenting comments in response to the concerns that were raised.

The first slide here is the portion of the current Sheridan Woods Neighborhood was originally approved by the Village Plan Commission on August 13, 2001. As you can see, the Orchard Subdivision is identified as being located between 28th Avenue and the Kenosha County bike Trail. At that time this portion of the neighborhood plan had identified that the Orchard development would contain 26 single family lots and that there would be an interconnecting loop road from 28th Avenue looping around to the west, to the south and then connecting back to 28th Avenue. The average density in the neighborhood as proposed in the Comprehensive Plan stated that the lots needed to be between 12,000 and just under 19,000 square feet per dwelling unit.

The proposed neighborhood plan amendment identified a number of changes that they wanted to make to the neighborhood plan. The first was a minor shift to the north, the cul-de-sac, Orchard Drive, extending east from 28th Avenue as a result of adjustments made to the subdivision layout. In other words, there would just be one connection, a 1,300 foot long cul-de-sac extending to the south, bending to the south, not any longer going to the north. The longer cul-de-sac that bends to the south would provide access to the west portion of the subject property.

The currently proposed horseshoe-shaped road that looped to the north as well was to be eliminated. A minor reconfiguration of the single family lots as a result of the alteration of the road layout was being proposed. And an actual slight decrease in the number of single family lots within the amended portion of the neighborhood plan, again going from 26 down to actually 18. One of the lots is existing on 26th Avenue that they're propose to raze, so they would be going from 26 down to 18.

The neighborhood amendment provides for a slight decrease within the entire Sheridan Woods neighborhood from 1,031 to 1,025, thus decreasing the net density from 21,108 to 21,232. So, again, the average density within the neighborhood area would be just over 21,000 square feet per lot.

The Orchard Subdivision as proposed is just under 16 acres. Again, they are proposing 19 total lots within the subdivision or 18 new single family lots and two outlots. The two outlots would contain the storm water management retention basin. One would be located on 28th Avenue and the other one would be located on the west side of the subdivision adjacent to the Kenosha County Bike Trail.

The new proposed lot sizes range from 20,066 square feet to 36,438, so anywhere from half acre to just short of an acre in size. The average lot size being proposed is 23,616 square feet. All of the lots that are being proposed meet or exceed now the R-3 minimum district requirements. The neighborhood plan and the original zoning on the property was R-4. R-4 is 90 feet in lot width, 15,000 square feet in area. Now all of their lots due to their shifts meet the minimum R-3 or a minimum of 20,000 square feet with 100 feet of lot frontage. The only exception is their lot 3 which does not meet the minimum depth requirement as stated by the Land Division and Development Control Ordinance. The ordinance says all lots need to have a minimum depth of 125, and I believe that particular lot has only a depth of 107 feet. So it would need to have a variance.

Population projections based on the 18 new single family lots would be 49 persons, 11 school age children or 8 public school age children. That is based on the projection information as provided to us by Kenosha Unified School District.

The current zoning of the property is A-2, General Agricultural zoning. The proposed zoning would now be R-3, Urban Single Family Residential District. The field delineated wetlands would be rezoned into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, on the property. And the non wetland areas within outlots 1 and 2 would be put into the PR-1, Park and Recreational District.

As I mentioned previously, there would be two variances that would need to be granted by the Village Board for this development, the first of which is the depth of lot 3 is proposed to be less than the 125 feet which is the minimum required by the Land Division Ordinance. An 18 foot variance would be required in order for that lot to be considered buildable.

The second is that the Land Division Ordinance currently has an 800 foot maximum for an intersection of another roadway. In other words, there cannot be a dead ended roadway more than 800 feet without another alternative access out of the development. We have granted similar variances when the number of lots is below 20, and this is something that they are considering because there is no opportunity to make any connections over the bike trail and no other opportunities to connect back to the east, either to the south or to the north back to 28th Avenue.

With respect to open space 13 percent of the site is identified as being open space. .51 acre or 3 percent of the site has been delineated as wetlands. There are woodlands to be preserved on this site and other open space is 1.46 acres again, again, that's located within outlots 1 and 2.

The development as proposed would have one public street access point onto 28th Avenue. However, 28th Avenue would extend to the north as well as to the south towards 128th Street. The conceptual plan allows for a potential future road connection to the north near the bend in the proposed Orchard Drive. This road stub would afford that property owner to the north an opportunity to connect to the roadway should that property owner ever wish to further subdivide that property. Again, this is an option. It's not a requirement and it's not going to be on the neighborhood plan any longer. It's just something that since that's a large tract of land if he chooses to subdivide, maybe create one more additional parcel, you'd have that option to do that.

On November 13th there were specific questions that were raised by the audience and by the Plan Commission, and the developer has put together some responses specifically to each of those questions and the staff has also added some additional information.

The first concern that was raised is concerns related to construction traffic. As shown on the slide, all public improvement and home construction traffic will be routed from the south through the Prairie Trails East development onto 28th Avenue to the Orchard Subdivision. So what we're recommending is that construction traffic for the building of the required public improvements as well as home construction for the 18 homes that this come from the south into the subdivision as opposed to traveling all the way north to 116th Street.

The concern that we have is that 28th Avenue is not currently constructed down to 128th Street. So one of the conditions that the staff is recommending be placed is that no construction of the Orchard Subdivision public improvements can commence until the phase 1 required public improvements, which includes mass grading and all the underground improvements for Prairie Trails East, are completed, inspected, dedicated and accepted by the Village. So their development cannot commence until the adjacent development is far enough along so that it provides that access to them. The Village and its inspectors will monitor the construction vehicle activities and roadway conditions for the segment of 28th Avenue north of the Prairie Trails East Subdivision. The developers of the Orchard Subdivision shall be responsible for any roadway replacement for heavy equipment damages which occur in 28th Avenue.

The Prairie Trails East developers are required to bring 28th Avenue north of their subdivision for some distance in order to transition it back into 28th Avenue. But then that segment is going to be monitored between there and the entrance to the Orchard. We will videotape it and we will monitor it so that if there's any damages that are done, and likely there will be some, that that segment of roadway would be reconstructed by the developers.

The next concern that was raised had to do with the safety of the school age kids walking to the bus stop on 116th. Prior to construction, the developers and contractors shall meet with the residents along 28th Avenue, from 116th Street to the Prairie Trails East north subdivision line. All school age children will be identified along with the times that they walk to and from the bus so that we will minimize any and all construction traffic during the times that kids are going to and from the bus. The other thing is we will sit down with Kenosha Unified to talk to them about any potential conflicts within their schedule.

And the other big aspect of this is that when that connection is made down to 128th Street, Kenosha Unified should be able to travel from 116th all the way down to 128th and that connection should be able to be made so that the bus should be able to somehow pick up kids on 28th Avenue as opposed to having them walk up to a half a mile north to 116th Street. There will be a through street, one mile straight connection straight through, so they should not have to pick them up way at 116th Street and we can have those discussions with them to alter their bus routes to be able to accomplish that.

The next concern was the condition of 28th Avenue roadway. Again, 28th Avenue will be evaluated by the developer and the Village before, during and after construction. Any damage to the road will be repaired/restored by the developer at the developer's cost. Going north on 28th Avenue to 116th Street there should be no construction equipment from public improvement construction or for home building construction. So there should be no heavy equipment traffic going up and down that street. The Village will still need to evaluate that street but, again, it will result to just some car traffic from that subdivision from the 18 lots.

The next concern related to density and conformance with the Village's Comprehensive Plan. The area for the proposed Orchard Subdivision is shown as lower-medium density, which means between 12,000 and 19,000 square per dwelling unit. The original plan showed 26 units with an R-4 zoning. The revised plan shows 18 new single family lots with a minimum of half acre lots going up to almost 40,000 square feet per lot.

Several neighbors suggested that the developers only construct four dwellings on the development for their own homes. The developers would consider this option if it were economically feasible. The Village ordinances require that a public road, public sewer and public water service this development and even if only four lots were developed they still need to have all those public infrastructure requirements be placed to service those homes. The cost of these improvements makes it economically unfeasible with any less density than what's being proposed. Not only because they have to make some improvements to 28th Avenue, but as we get further into our discussion they also have to do some looping of the water main and they need to do some other improvements to this particular development site.

The Village staff felt that the original proposal at 26 or 27 lots was higher than what we anticipated and we didn't think that the neighborhood would accept that type of density. So prior to it even being presented to the Plan Commission and to the audience, we already had indicated to them that they needed to reduce the density from 26 down to 18. So we had already eliminated 8 lots from their original proposal.

With respect to storm water and flooding concerns, as a part of this project the storm water runoff will be collected and drained to one of two storm water retention ponds. Again, there's one on 28th Avenue just south of their entrance and then one adjacent to the Kenosha County Bike Trail just to the east of the wetlands at that location. The ponds will significantly reduce the peak runoff rate exiting the site. Storm sewer, swales and berms will be installed to protect all the property downstream of the development by safely directing the runoff to the retention ponds. The storm water management practices are required both by the Village as well as the DNR's storm water management regulations. The Village Engineers will review the site drainage and storm water plans for this development to ensure that the site conforms to the requirements and that there is no negative drainage impacts as result of this development.

Concerns about Tobin Creek flooding, the developer has completed a detailed, field topographic survey of the site. The engineers have examined the regional topographic maps in great detail and the area draining to the retention ponds and the discharge from the ponds does not drain to Tobin Creek. This area drains to the south to the Prairie Trails East.

There were some concerns regarding storm water pond safety. The storm water drainage ponds are required by the Village and by the Wisconsin DNR, and they're in the location where they are because of the topography of the site. And it's important to locate these where they're best suited as to put them at the top of the hill. There will be a 10 foot wide safety shelf so that the water level is 12 inches or less for the first 10 feet of the pond. This has been a requirement and it provides an added amount of safety if someone happens to get into that area where the ponds are. Along 28th Avenue the developers are proposing a 30 foot wide landscaped berm. The landscape plan has been revised so that there are trees planted between the road and the pond and signage will be posted to discourage trespassing in the area.

With respect to impact fees and the costs of the development to the Village, the developers have agreed to make a donation to the Village to cover what costs the Village used to collect for impact fees to offset the cost on the Village for the Development. As is the case with other developments they have agreed to sign a pre-development agreement and they are paying for all the costs associated with any review time being spent or any time spent with the staff in reviewing this project.

The water main connection, this was a concern of the Village's utility as well as the fire department, and it does add a significant cost to the development, but it's something that we do require with new developments. The municipal water main will be connected at two locations to serve the development. It's important to loop the water main system, and both connections will be made from the public road and easements from the Prairie Trails East development. As you can see, we've had some discussions with the Prairie Trails East developers to the south, and they have agreed to grant a water main access and management easement to bring water main easement areas between lots 40 and 41 from the end of their cul-de-sac to the north, and then this will connect between their lots 7 and 8 and then the system will be looped so that it will have greater pressure for water fire protection.

The last is street lighting and entry signage. There were some questions and concerns about how many street lights would be in this particular area. Some of the neighbors were concerned about light pollution. There will be two residential, which is the lower standard streetlights, to be located one at the entrance and one at that first entrance of the cul-de-sac and their main entrance road. Again, these are at a height of 25 feet. They're not the shoe box fixtures that had been a previous standard in the Village that generate a great deal more light. These are going to be much more low volume but will be identifying the entrance to this subdivision. The street signs will be located on that and then at the next intersection in order to provide some light at that intersection. The neighbors had asked that there not be a monument entry sign at this subdivision or this development, and the developers have also agreed not to place any type of monument entry sign. The sign had been previously shown on some other plans and they have decided that they would not place one at the entrance of this subdivision.

With that, the developer's representatives are in the audience if they would like to add to this presentation or add some additional information. We have not eliminated this particular subdivision. I think that we've addressed most of the concerns if not all the concerns of the residents for this particular area. We don't want new subdivisions to have a dramatic negative impact on the existing residents and their quality of life, so for that reason we have tried to work as much as we can to bring the focus of any activity that's going to occur here from the south and to minimize the disturbance. Again, it's only an 18 lot subdivision so it will be completed in a much more timely manner than a large lot subdivision would.

Thomas Terwall:

Before I open it up to the public hearing does the developer want to add anything?

Fouad Saab:

Good evening. My name is Fouad Saab from Saab design, 1630 Church Street, Milwaukee. I want to allude to what Jean has said and emphasize more we've gone to the actual length to make sure we can satisfy the concerns of the neighbors from our previous public hearing and to come

up with some solution and compromise on all the issues. We've gone the extra length for the water to go through the other subdivision, to work with other developers, go through the hoops to make sure we're not impacting 28th Avenue, as well as trying to for future purpose indicate on our site plan for a future access for the neighbor to the north. The pond issue we've send out diagrams to show it's in your packet and to the neighbors as well to show the safety shelf in the diagram so it's not just people running into it. These ponds have been constructed in the Village and throughout the County in every single subdivision so we are not creating a new concept here.

We try to be as sensitive as possible trying to eliminate the signage that we had on 28th Avenue to see if we can blend within the neighborhood and we tried to do that. We're trying every effort to go further to make sure we make all the concessions we can. We reach a point where it's really not feasible for the development to continue with all the other impact we may have. I'll be available for comments. Thank you.

Thomas Terwall:

Thank you. This is a matter for public hearing. Is anybody wishing to speak in this matter?

Mike Willkom:

My name is Mike Willkom. My address is 11904 28th Avenue, Pleasant Prairie. I'm against this for three main reasons. First of all the retention ponds that we're talking about. This proposal calls for two new retention ponds. I have three children under 12 years old. There are two natural magnets for humans, fire and water. My children are naturally going to be drawn to this. The closest park we have is Carol Beach Park. It's down 116th across Sheridan Road. It's over two miles away so my kids are going to be drawn to the water.

Our neighborhood is already--could you put up the slide that shows the neighborhood plan with the retention pond that's already there? There's a retention pond currently right here. Less than two years ago we had a fatality in that pond. Just today on MSNBC's website they ran an article that read, two brothers ages 8 and 12 died yesterday after the younger boy fell through a sheet of ice covering a pond and his brother tried to rescue him, authorities said. Jeris Robinson, 8, Aaron Robinson, 12, were pronounced dead after they fell through a sheet of ice covering a shallow pond at the housing development where they lived. This preventable story runs in local newspapers an average of nine times every day in this country. This is according to the National Center of Injury Prevention and Control. The leading cause of death for children ages 1 through 4 is motor vehicle accidents. The second leading cause of death is drowning. This does not even include boating accidents. 45 times every day children are involved in non fatal accidents that require ER and most of them are hospitalized.

The second reason I'm against this is it's not consistent with the Village Plan of 2001. This Village Plan of 2001 called for the whole area of 28th Avenue to be divided up into these half acre to third acre lots. What we're talking about now is taking just a piece of that. We're talking about taking this piece and dividing it up and making these small half to third acre lots. This is not consistent with what we have. What we have today, all of the surrounding neighbors have lots that are 3 acres, 2.9 acres. Could you put up the current slide, Jean? That would work. The area to the south is 3.2 acres, this lot; the area next to them is a 2.9 acre lot; my lot is a 8.2 acre lot; then you've got just north of it Stenholz at a 6 acre lot; and then right here we've got another 2.2 acre lot. So what we're really doing is we're taking the Village Plan and we're saying we

can't get the whole plan and my neighbors around me don't want to develop where I could obtain that property, so we want to just get this sliver of it and we want to develop that and make it inconsistent with what we have currently.

If you had an industrial park and it was half full of office buildings, you wouldn't allow someone to put heavy manufacturing in that same office part because it isn't consistent. Well, that's in a sense what we're trying to do here. We're trying to take part of it and make it small but we're going to keep the other remaining lots and keep it large. To me that isn't proper planning. The density and the character of our neighborhood will be changed forever. Once it's up it's up.

Third, we have a substandard road in 28th Avenue. We all know that. We all understand that. We have no sidewalks. We have no shoulders. We have front doors that are 20 feet away from the road. When Prairie Trails East comes in this is only going to make this real problem even worse. You've addressed some of the issues with the construction traffic and I applaud you for that. But the problem is still once this additional subdivision goes in it's not 18 new, it's a total of 19. There's one existing. So we're going to have 19 new homes there. One has been abandoned for years. 19 new families in this. That traffic every day is going to be going up and down 28th Avenue. I haven't heard anything tonight that addresses how is 28th Avenue going to accommodate this much more traffic.

I'm not against the development. If somebody has land and they want to develop it God bless them. What I'm asking here is that these homes be built in a size that is consistent with the surrounding parcels. This would allow for natural water runoff and we could eliminate these needless retention ponds. Something else I heard here tonight on the 28th Avenue retention pond there's going to be a 30 foot wide landscaping berm. Well, in my eyes that's going to make this hazard even worse because people across the street that might be able to see if a child gets into that pond might be able to help. Now with this landscaping berm they're not going to be able to. I understand you're trying to hide it, but in another token you're making it even more unsafe..

We all know what the developers pay for their land and, again, no offense to them. If they can make money at it great. They say they wouldn't get—they wouldn't get hurt if they sold larger lots. They just wouldn't make as much money and we would all have a better, more consistent and safer neighborhood. Thank you.

Thomas Terwall:

Is there anybody else wishing to speak?

John Roscioli:

John Roscioli. I'm one of the four partners of JM Squared, 11545 14th Avenue, Pleasant Prairie, as are the other three owners of JM Squared with myself. We've jumped through several hoops and done the due diligence to make this in accordance with what the Village asked us to do as well as the neighbors after their initial voices of concerns. We're not without care for them. We want to be good neighbors and they said they wanted to be good neighbors with us. To quote Mike Willkom, we are putting 26 pounds of groceries into a 15 pound bag. Well, we've cut that back and he says we can still make money. He's not familiar with what we're doing and I'm not telling him how to deal with his money and I would prefer him not to tell us how to deal with our money. We're trying to do this so we can have a nice home for our four families.

We're not William Ryan. We're not Neuman homes. We're just four guys who wanted a better life for your families and we were told by the Village that this was a feasible plan. We purchased the property with that in mind. We've done our due diligence. I would appreciate everybody here doing theirs. Thank you very much for your time.

Thomas Terwall:

Anybody else?

Susan Runnan:

I'm Susan Runnan, 11800 20th Avenue. You went over how the water is going to run really quickly. I don't know if you can go back to that and explain it one more time because I didn't catch how it's supposed to go.'

Mike Pollocoff:

The municipal water?

Susan Runnan:

Yeah. Will that go all the way down 28th Avenue?

Mike Pollocoff:

Not all the way. It will go--

Susan Runnan:

Will it come up from 26th?

Mike Pollocoff:

No. If you look at the map there you can see where this street called the Orchard is. It will come out to 28th and from there it will go straight south into Prairie Trails East, and then that east/west street is 121st Street, that east/west street, and then it will come up through easements, not on streets, back into the Orchard. So it won't connect directly to 26th. It won't connect to 116th Street up 28th. This water main loop here will tie in with the Prairie Trails East loop.

Susan Runnan:

Okay, thank you very much.

Mike Renner:

My name is Mike Renner. I live at 3211 122nd Street in Prairie Trails West. There was some concern about the ponds. They are a magnet for the kids. They will be fishing there. You'll get people from Illinois fishing there. We do in our pond. I'm a little concerned about the berm

because you're creating a hill that the kids will slide down and you won't know how safe the ice is. So that's something you should consider as far as the design.

Thomas Terwall:

Thank you.

Cindy Godbold:

Hi, my name is Cindy Godbold. I live at 12011 28th Avenue directly across the street from the subdivision. I also have over an acre of land. I know he didn't address the east side but we all have over an acre of land. And, you know what, I'm really upset at a couple different things. For one, Mr. Zarletti at the last meeting looked up at that sign and said, oh, Village of excellence. I thought you were actually looking at the sign of the Village of Pleasant Prairie with in mind the Village and the prairie in mind. Mr. Braig, you're sitting there rolling your eyes up. That's very professional you know. You people don't live where we live. I know maybe you have subdivisions going on by your neighborhood which is fine for you. We, and thank you for bending over backwards for us, don't want this type of subdivision. We bought this property on the block because we have land. We wanted land. If we wanted to move into a subdivision we would have. It really upsets me. I'm nervous and I'm really getting upset. I don't appreciate you, Mr. Braig, rolling your eyes up at me. I really don't.

John Braig:

I'm sorry.

Cindy Godbold:

Well, you should be. I'm really sorry because you know this is our land, ours. You guys could all be mad at me if you want because I really don't care because it's not fair. I would like to know actually the question has this property been rezoned yet?

—:

No.

Cindy Godbold:

No, it has not been rezoned. So according to when I was reading through the ordinance it's possible 20 percent of us could protest the rezoning. Is that correct?

Jean Werbie:

That is correct, and that could force a super majority of the Village Board. Because the Plan Commission makes the recommendation but the Board takes final action.

Cindy Godbold:

So we would have to talk to the Board.

Jean Werbie:

You'd file a written petition and then it would come before the Village Board.

Cindy Godbold:

Okay, that's all I wanted to know. Thank you.

Thomas Terwall:

Anybody else?

Ron Godbold:

My name is Ron Godbold. I live at the same house as the wife does, 12011 28th Avenue. We came up here from Illinois with the aspect of a little bit of country living. We bought a foreclosed place down the street on the north side of 116th that was a HUD closure that was an embarrassment to the Village that was slated to be torn down eventually. I went in there and within a year and a half eventually with the aspect of either renting or selling this property, decided that I liked that area and that. It took a year and a half to rebuild that thing. I found out later that I was more likely—it was more economical to tear the place down. But I revised that and since then it has sold twice with profitable margins. With the profit that I made off of it, which wasn't much, I bought the property down the street which allowed me an acre and a quarter.

Considering I have an acre and a quarter and all the surrounding areas have more than that. Within that area that you have there these 19 homes is not in connection with the surrounding homes with at least acre lots, at least. And they're trying to stick in 19 homes and become a conglomerate right there. The developers I don't have no problem with developers because I'm a tradesman myself. But when it comes to a rural area like this when they come in and they decide that they want to do and they work with the Village and they jump loopholes and that there's no loopholes that I see that was sufficient for the neighborhood.

So I'm totally against this and I hope that within the logic of this Board here that recommends the proposals of development that they consider asking these people to create, they said that they can do it to where they have an acre or acre and a half per dwelling or more to fit in with the rural setting that you have there. So that's it.

Thomas Terwall:

Thank you. Anybody else?

Earl Owens:

My name is Earl Owens. The address is 11637 28th Avenue. I had a question about the municipal water. When you do that are we going to tear the road up again to do that loop for that subdivision?

Mike Pollocoff:

This is a conceptual phase. It hasn't been--

Earl Owens:

I'm saying will they do that.

Mike Pollocoff:

What we've done is it really depends on the road. My suspicion is the road isn't going to tolerate the construction very well. In other subdivisions where that's been the case and the developer has been required to restore the road back and resurface it, the water main would be constructed out of the pavement off to the shoulder and then that shoulder would be restored. Now, the real issue with doing that, even though the backhoe won't be digging a trench in the asphalt, that's heavy construction. You're going to have a heavy truck bringing the pipe there. You're going to have a heavy truck bringing the backhoe there, heavy truck delivering the stone. So if that road gives way under that then that section of road has to be replaced.

Earl Owens:

That was my concern.

Mike Pollocoff:

Sometimes you can do that with patch. When we did 26th from 116th Street down to 119th Street that was restored with a patch. But we've had other areas, and I think this one here on 28th is really marginal down on that end. It could just give way and it would have to be redone.

Earl Owens:

I remember when we did the sewers. That's why my question. What a mess.

Mike Pollocoff:

This is about 7 feet deep. The sewer was a lot deeper. So the deeper you go the more the trench spreads out and in that case we repaved the roads back when that happened. But this isn't nearly as deep. But that's usually not what gets it in the case of sewer or water. It's what's putting in the water, the equipment, the trucks, things like that.

Earl Owens:

Right. And it's my understanding that the construction trucks won't use 28th Avenue?

Mike Pollocoff:

No. If they do they'd be cited and we'd appreciate the donation to the municipal court.

Earl Owens:

Because, like I said, you already had one home moved in and when they did use 28th they collapsed that big culvert in Tobin Creek.

Mike Pollocoff:

That was an older culvert to begin with. There's still going to be homes that are built between 116th Street and the entrance to the Orchard because there's lots there where people could divide their lot and build. And that's true in every neighborhood that there's going to be a big truck bring in trusses or delivering cement or stone for a new home being built. But the concern here is there's going to be more than that in this area so they have to come up from the south with the construction of Prairie Trails. We'll monitor that. We have that in every subdivision that's next to existing subdivisions where we put up signs that say no construction traffic. Now and then someone will do a transgression and they'll go through there but we'll cite them and word gets out.

Earl Owens:

Yeah, I'll call.

Mike Pollocoff:

And they quit doing it.

Earl Owens:

Thanks.

Thomas Terwall:

Thank you. Anybody else?

Glen Erickson:

Glen Erickson, 11710 28th Avenue. I live right next to Barnes Creek. I've lived there for close to 40 years. It was called Barnes Creek when I moved there. The more building that goes on the more water comes gushing down Tobin Creek. And my concern is I'm in touch with my lawyer in case the day comes when I have to prove that these retention ponds are flooding my property. He told me to stay in touch with him. I'm just covering my property, my butt, because that Tobin Creek looks like the Niagara Falls when we get a heavy rain.. So my concern is still where is this water going that's released from the retention ponds? I think I'm getting water from Prairie West coming underneath the bike trail under that culvert, down by the apple orchard and into Barnes Creek and it gushes. So I'm just covering my butt now and I'm telling you that if the time comes when I have to prove this I'm ready for it.

Thomas Terwall:

Thank you.

Mike Kim:

Good evening. My name is Mike Kim. I'm at 12030 28th Avenue. My property will be just south and east of the proposed construction site. I'm opposed to this because I believe the plan proposal still doesn't address some of our concerns, namely water runoff, and proposed rezoning. It doesn't fit into the character of our neighborhood. I'm wondering how they came up with the calculation to determine the proper size of the retention pond, because if they increase the size of the pond now, what happened to the first data? Wasn't it correct then? Are they going to keep changing the size to accommodate whatever changes there are. I'm kind of concerned as to the accuracy of all the data they're getting. What methodology did they use? Also, I'm concerned with the kids with the pond like several other people stated with the water being a very big magnet for kids.

Another concern I had was the easement along our north side and our west side. What's going to happen to the trees and plants that are already there when they have to put in the utilities along that side? The proposal was that there's going to be existing trees that's going to remain there, but I can't see how when the construction equipment goes through and starts cutting their roots that the trees are going to remain alive. They may be there standing for five or ten years, but once the roots are cut it's going to be dead within 20 years, especially the big trees. They'll last standing for a long time.

Most of the other concerns were addressed, but it's a wait and see type of thing. Proposals are out there that we'll do this and we'll do that, but it remains to be seen whether it actually gets done. Thank you.

Jean Werbie:

I would like to have Chris Jackson who is the engineer for the developer come up and address any questions and concerns that have come up as it relates to the storm water retention basins. I've also got two questions for Chris, the first one of which is can you achieve water quality certification under the new DNR regulations by making these dry detention basins as opposed to wet basins? And then, secondly, what was the methodology that you used in determining the size of the basins and location of the basins?

Chris Jackson:

My name is Chris Jackson. I work for CJ Engineering. That is 13005 West Blue Mound Road, Brookfield. The storm water ponds as been a common way of mitigating our daily flooding for large storm events. It's been around for 10 or 15 years within the Village with many ponds that are currently constructed. The idea behind it, of course, is to handle the large amount of water that comes during a storm and allow it to drain out over a slow period of time. The soil conservation, the DNR has set up several methods for analyzing the sites and sizing the ponds.

The most common one which was used for this and most sites in Pleasant Prairie since it's required by ordinance is the TR-55 method. We prepared a grading plan, preliminary drainage plan and we've submitted that as part of this submittal and it was reviewed by the engineering department, and their findings was that it conforms with all the latest current requirements.

The other question is about the water quality certification. As part of the DNR rules and regulations 80 percent of total suspended sediment needs to be removed prior to discharge off of the site. That's a State law. That's not kind of a variance process that you can even go through. The soils out here are silty clay soils. If you had a sandy soil site it's possible to be able to handle some of your storm water with basins that infiltrate down. But here we have to store the runoff from that. So if you put even in a dry basin you're not getting the water quality. The DNR, after doing studies, has looked and said that dry basins that don't allow for infiltration or the water to kind of filter out and take the sediment with it don't provide the water quality that's required. And because of the soils on this site, as with probably many of the sites in Pleasant Prairie, it's just not feasible to do a dry infiltration and meet the DNR requirements. I'd be happy to answer any additional questions. Like I said we have submitted the calculations to the Village. The engineering department has reviewed it and found conformance.

Thomas Terwall:

Thank you. Anybody else? Jean, go ahead.

Jean Werbie:

Chris, could the basins have been placed someplace else, like not right at 28th Avenue but further back on the site?

Chris Jackson:

The problem with that is because of the grades on the site. Really if you place the basin half way up the hill everything below that can't get to the basins. And, therefore, because of the strict storm water release requirements that are now currently in place these don't meet what the current ordinance is but what the ordinance is going to be revised to meet. You're letting 20 or 30 percent of the runoff bypass the pond and you're just not going to be able to get the water to flow uphill. Also, the water quality from those sections of the roads all that stuff bypasses directly and doesn't get into the pond. The ponds were located and the reason why there's two ponds versus one pond is there's a drainage summit kind of where the curve of the road is, and then the land naturally drains to those two spots.

Jean Werbie:

I have one more quick question. With respect to the berm that is being proposed along the east side of the eastern basin, any idea of how high or what that would have been—I mean I think it for aesthetics that it was going to be placed there. You don't have that much room to put a high berm there.

Chris Jackson:

No, and the slopes are four to one. It's going to have a ten or fifteen foot top to it. And really the developers are flexible with that. That's one of the requirements that the Village wanted us to place in there. There was talk and concern before over trucks driving into the pond. This would allow—you have the cross-section, and I'm going to grab a plan real quick. This is a cross-section of lot 1 and the area adjacent where this berm would be at. You have the existing 20th Avenue and there's the roadside ditch. From that it comes back to the right of way, and then you're going

to have a gradual four to one, really broad berm. This is an item that's typical for subdivisions that adjoin to a public road that they don't have direct access to. It provides landscape screening, an aesthetic feature, as the neighborhood across the street.

The berm is really a requirement of the Village and we're flexible with that. If it's the consensus of the Village that the berm goes away and that becomes a flat area, how the landscaping is, I mean that's an area that we are considerably flexible on.

Fouad Saab:

I would like to add to that berm since the last public hearing the West Trails Subdivision Homeowners Association President have suggested because of the action that they had to create a little berm I believe part of the comments to add a berm in front of that pond. So we added this minimal berm and if it needs to be taken out we'll take it out. It's not a problem for us, instead of a fence because they were looking for a fence or some other thing.

Thomas Terwall:

With that, I'm going to open it up to comments and questions from the Commissioners and staff.

John Braig:

There's an awful lot of nice features about this development, but there's a concern I had at the last hearing and I'm not sure it's been fully resolved, and that is—

Thomas Terwall:

Go ahead.

Jackie Kim:

I'm sorry, I didn't make it up. He started to talk before I got going. I'm Jackie Kim. I live just to the south of the proposed subdivision at 12030 28th Avenue. You can see my house sitting up, coming up from the street. It sits and it overlooks that nice retention pond. I have filed two formal complaints to the Village of Pleasant Prairie about the natural sludge pond that has been there for the nine years that I have lived there. In lot 1 and lot 2 there used to be an old storage water vesicle that the original orchard owner utilized to water his trees. That has been left there all these years. And what happens is when it rains within two hours that whole big pond is filled up. And the smell and the mosquitoes that we've had to endure for the last nine years has been unbelievable. My legs are just bit up. Why I never got—my husband filed the complaint and I filed the complaint and why it was never addressed with the Village I don't know.

So my house sits right up on the top of that hill that's going to overlook that pond. My husband and I have a new driveway that's on that side. All the topo has been done. The water coming down the side between there is uncontrollable. I can't see if this retention pond if it's going to take it all because our pumps are running all the time when it rains, and I'm really concerned about that. My children are all grown but I love this neighborhood and I love the people and we want it to remain that way. But I don't want to be sitting in my front yard worrying about the kids because all the kids come up my driveway. I like that, but I'm really worried about the

safety. And I like the fact that Jean addressed the part about being able to move that someplace else. I don't know where it can be done.

I understand what the contractors have to go through, but my lot is over three acres, and one of the things I'm really concerned about is the size. I have enough property that I could subdivide off my property in the back. If they put that in there's that substandard sized lot back there that's too small. If at some time I want to will that property to my son who has an interest in building on that lot I won't be able to do that because he's going to land lock me in. I bought the property so I could live that type of life.

I also have a lot of natural things there. We have animals, we have bees. There's a natural country fence that's all around the property and between the subdivision and mine. I'm worried about my orchard because mine is the last standing working orchard right now. I have 65 trees back there and I'm worried about having access in there, because we do have farm equipment in our barn. There's one big area of oak trees there, and if those trees go down during construction there's going to be a huge bill to pay for the equipment that's in that barn. So that's a concern of mine. I don't know what rights I have as far as access to my property but I'm worried about the safety there as well. So that's something to consider. Thank you.

Thomas Terwall:

Thank you.

Mike Pollocoff:

We've got some responses to some of the issues before the Commission starts. One question to Mrs. Kim before she gets away. You have the flag lot that goes right along the south side?

Jackie Kim:'

Yes, I have the

Mike Pollocoff:

I just want to make sure I've got you placed where you're at. With respect to retention ponds, we have a lot of them in the Village, and we've had one person who became impaired and drove into a basin. I don't know how you stop that. That's going to happen. There are drownings that occur. One of the methods or standards that we've adopted is for a long time basins were built and the perfect example is the one on 39th Avenue and 89th where there is no shelf. That one is dry but when it gets wet it will stay wet for a while. And some of the older basins that exist throughout the country there is no shelf for somebody to get in the water and then be able to get back out.

Some communities, and Milwaukee is an example where they've fenced them. They found out with that when the kid scales the fence, which the kid is going to do, then it's harder for the rescue personnel to—they're going to have to scale the fence and get their equipment in the fence. The best practice on these has been to keep them as open as possible so when somebody needs to get in there or you can visually see what's going on in the basin.

Had we been in a different area, and I think their engineer described it pretty well, we can't have dry basins. The same reason we can't have septic systems. The soils around here do not percolate for that and you can't make the water get away other than holding it and releasing it. I do think that although typically ponds visually are okay, screening it provides another opportunity for mischief to go unnoticed and it probably would not be in the best interest of everybody.

One of Mrs. Kim's comments was about an existing water source there. I'm not aware of any complaints. We'll take a look at it, but it does bring to mind that when you have standing water it can get scummy and you can get insects. We recommend all basins have aeration or a fountain in there to keep the water moving and keep the insects down to a controllable level rather than letting it sit.

Mr. Willkom made a comment about this plan not being consistent with the 2001 Comprehensive Land Use Plan. When the Village developed that Comprehensive Land Use Plan we're a community that's developed incrementally, and the plan shows us where we're going to get to eventually. But we don't make people to all the way to the end of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan in the first shot. In this area here, as we developed this plan, the first modification occurred from a neighborhood plan standpoint in 1986. As we contemplated putting sanitary sewers into this area, it was a significant financial burden on everybody in that neighborhood. One of the ways that some people are going to be able to deal with it was putting forth a plan, and that's really been the basis for the Comprehensive Land Use Plan in this area, so that people had the opportunity to be able to divide or split off their lots so that they would be able to not have as much frontage on the road that would have such a large sanitary sewer assessment and when water eventually came through. That was the driving force behind providing lots up and down 28th and 26th so that the Comprehensive Plan anticipated that there would be further subdivisions as people dealt with the expenses of urbanization of that area.

The area is not conducive to sanitary sewer. There were numerous failing septic systems in the Tobin Creek area. I know back in '85 on a wet day you could smell sewage. You could see the suds going into the ditches. The sewers there needed to be replaced and we did that, and that in turn is what drove the Comp. Plan to say let's provide a method so that what is a larger rural residential area now can get a little bit smaller and people can deal with the cost of sanitary sewer. So it makes perfect sense over the long haul, when you take the long view of the Comprehensive Plan that not everybody is going to develop those lots at the same time. In this case the Zelly Orchard is developing. At some point it would be another property. Maybe two properties combine together to develop within the confines of that plan. So it wasn't intended to happen all at once, and it will happen slowly because there's a lot of owners there that aren't ready to sell and some do want to sell.

The berm on the pond that's an option. My preference and recommendation to the Village Board will be not to have the berm there. I think it's more of an annoyance and I think it inhibits people seeing what's going on there.

Tobin Creek, some of the grades there are subtle but the engineer from the developer as well as our own engineer they've proved to us and we've evaluated. Our own storm water management plan shows that this area drains to the east and to the south. It doesn't drain to the north. Tobin Creek doesn't get water from this area. It will go south. That being said, one of the problems in this area is that there are very few storm water improvements. Right now water releases and it free flows cross-country which is one of the reasons there's drainage problems in there. One of the other reasons is there's a high groundwater table in that area. This development at the end of

the day will, one, account for the homes that are being put in there, but secondly it will account for the upstream water that's coming into this area and it's going to hold that. So the net gain is going to be more than if it didn't happen. The water is going to be handled whereas without this it's not going to be handled. The only way the Village can make storm water improvements in there is if we go in on a special assessment basis and create storm water improvements to convey the storm water that's collecting along the bike path and finding it's way cross-country to 28th Avenue.

One of the questions that was brought up was moving the basin. Again, the same soils that make it tough for you to have a septic system, why we don't have septic systems work there, are going to be releasing into the drainage way so we won't be able to—by moving that basin away from the homes on 28th you're really going to be impacting them even more with drainage problems and along with turbidity in the water that will occur because of that development. By having the basin at the bottom of the development will serve to manage the flooding plus clean up the storm water to the levels that it needs to be cleaned up to. And this happens in a few areas of the Village where a developer comes in and in order for them to be able to handle their storm water they, in effect, take care of some drainage problems that exist in the subdivision that couldn't have been taken care of otherwise.

With respect to easements for private utilities, gas, electric, cable TV, that was a good point that was brought up. I think that we over the years have been burned a couple times where an electric easement is going through the back yards and they do either cut roots or clear out the trees or tree line, even if it's not big trees but it might be some brush to put that in. We've gotten a lot more sophisticated about it. Just as a matter of economics I think the developer wants to be able to sell lots that have trees on them rather than have dead trees on them. We'll look to move those easements father into the lot away from the tree line so that doesn't happen. I think that's just for the good of everybody. We've done that in some subdivisions like Tobin Creek and on the north side of 50 where they're maybe not oaks, because they're the most sensitive, but even any kind of trees you want to be able to keep that stock up there and I think that's good for everybody. A matter of feet I don't think it really affects anything. That's one thing that we would encourage as they go to final design and go to final plat it to take that easement and make it adjust for the tree line that's there as well as the other trees on the site which I believe they've done.

A lot of times when we see something at conceptual this is the first run at something. We don't see as much storm water engineering as you see at the final plat, but in this case we have seen quite a bit. There's been a lot of storm water work that's been done on this. Aside from the emotional issue of having a development there and having more lots, from just the storm water aspect this is an improvement to the entire area. It will help the developer and help the residents there because there's nothing there managing the storm water right now. Nothing. It's free flow. That's why we have some of the problems we have.

Mike Serpe:

Mike, while you have the floor, could you explain the takings law and how it could affect in this area?

Mike Pollocoff:

One of the obligations of a municipal government in Wisconsin and in any State is if you as a community have developed a Comprehensive Plan that says we're going to have residential in

certain areas, we're going to have manufacturing or whatever the uses are, and that plan has been adopted by the local government, property owners have a right on their property to be able to develop that property within the plan. And that plan is in this case the Village's commitment to the current property owners that you have a certain amount of vested value in your property that you know that you can sell your land to somebody else for residential use. You know that the land that abuts you that's next to your land or in your neighborhood is for residential use and that right can't be taken away unless you go through a process to amend the Comprehensive Land Use Plan which is not the easiest thing to do.

If we've adopted the plan as we have, we owe it to the property owner who owns that property, not to the exclusion of everybody else's rights but to give that property owner a fair evaluation of a development proposal to develop that land. That doesn't mean that the property owner gets to develop at the full expense of the Village. That doesn't mean the property owner gets to develop it at the expense of his neighbors. That doesn't mean the property owner can do it any way he wants. The property owner has a right to develop in this case, as an example, residential lots that comply with the adopted and existing Comprehensive Land Use Plan, develop lots that will be in compliance with the zoning districts. In this case it's almost a down zoning. The lots are actually bigger than what the plan calls for. The developer is committed to pay for all the public improvements associated with it.

If the developer is committed to comply with all the laws that exist and committed to comply with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, which is the same Land Use Plan that everybody that's in that neighborhood lives with, if the Village says we don't think we're going to let you develop it, we like it to be more stringent than what the plan calls for, we want you to pay for more things than what the Land Division Ordinance can pay for, in essence what we've done is taken. That's what we call takings. We've taken his rights away to be able to develop their property within the rules that exist.

If the Village does that, in essence then what the Village has to do is buy the land from the developer because we've taken their ability to earn the income that they're entitled to earn. Just like if we told any one of the property owners here we really don't think you should be able to subdivide your lot and split it into two. You've got enough land to do it but we don't think it's a good idea. That's taking somebody's property and you have to be prepared to buy that.

We've been through some negotiations with the developer and we try to make this thing balance so that it's a win/win for everybody, that nobody gets steam rolled in the process but we really can't just say no. And we really can't say we want lots that are double what the Land Use Plan calls for. We're already on the up end of it. And the only way the Village can really say no to developing is if we're prepared to purchase it. Have the taxpayers buy the land and take it that way.

Mike Serpe:

And a follow-up on that as well. Would you explain or give your opinion as to what would happen if 20 percent of the affected property owners signed a petition, brought it to the Board, and a four-fifths majority failed. Would we be in a takings situation again?

Mike Pollocoff:

We could be in a takings position. Again, it comes back to has the property owner who wants to development met all the requirements of the Village? Have they met the requirements for storm water, sewer, water? Have they met the requirements for the size of the lot. Have they met the requirements for adjusting everything? If they've met those things and the Board says no and the property owner wants to take the Village to court, we're in a position at that point, and my recommendation to the Board would be I would not take that action unilaterally. I would say is there anything else that could change, but at some point the property owner takes the Village to court and says I've done everything that the Village has within their laws to do and the Village will not let me develop. They've taken from me the use of my property. And that use isn't defined by the neighbors. The use is defined by the Land Use Plan. It's a document that everybody lives under. At that point the Village would be facing the legal expenses of defending itself plus it could be the ultimate exposure of buying land for being arbitrary with the decision.

Mike Serpe:

Mike, just a couple more things. The land on 28th Avenue from 116th Street to 119th is zoned what?

Mike Pollocoff:

R-4.

Mike Serpe:

Does anything stop any property owner presently there from dividing up some of his land legally?

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, they would be stopped only in the sense that their lot isn't big enough. Assuming they have enough area and they have enough frontage and the lots is big enough, then the Comprehensive Land Use Plan will allow somebody to divide their parcel within the limits of the Land Use Plan.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

Some properties if they don't have enough frontage they wouldn't be able to develop, but that's when sometimes property owners get together and they work together to have a street or some kind of development. The Kim's lot, this Plan Commission hasn't allowed a flag shaped lot like the Kim's since I've been here in over 22 years since it's not good planning.

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

Legally they must have 90 feet of road frontage and that's the minimum required in order to split off a lot along with 15,000 square feet in area so it was allowed by ordinance to do that. Today

what we would not support would be placing one home behind another home that's abutting an adjacent street. But, yes, that was a legal land division because it complied with the ordinance as it existed back then.

John Braig:

As I was saying before, there's one concern I have here and we had it the last time when this was before the Commission, and that is the access or the road to this subdivision in itself is poor, namely 28th Avenue, and then the subdivision ends in a cul-de-sac which in all my experience on this Board we've tried to avoid in every way possible. It seems like we've got two bad situations and it's hanging out on a thin thread. Maybe the staff could clarify one concern I have a little bit. We're speaking of extending 28th Avenue all the way down to the State Line going through Prairie Trails East. What is the time frame on that and what assurance do we have that that is going to happen? If it does not happen within a reasonable period of time I just would have difficulty supporting the road plan here.

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

One of the conditions that the staff is recommending is that the Orchard cannot commence construction until the first phase of required public improvements are completed for Prairie Trails East and they're inspected and approved by the Village. Prairie Trails East has submitted their final plat for our consideration. So they have indicated to us that they intend to move forward this year but there are no guarantees for the Orchard. We need the alternative way in to this development, otherwise 28th Avenue will be beat up and that road cannot handle the construction traffic.

John Braig:

So the Orchard could not commence any construction until Prairie Trails East completes the loop to the State Line?

Jean Werbie:

That's correct, because that would be their access for construction vehicles to service this development.

John Braig:

Thank you.

Donald Hackbarth:

I have a couple comments. When this thing starts to try to attempt to keep the traffic off of 28th on the north side can they put a road limit side on it?

Jean Werbie:

We would put both road limit signs as well as no construction vehicle entrance. And we'd identify where the entrance is into the subdivision and we've done that in other older subdivisions of Pleasant Prairie to avoid any of that traffic. Again, that's not to say that one truck or two trucks don't slip by, but we typically will get a call and we send someone out there, and one citation is usually all it takes to stop the trucks from doing what they're not supposed to do.

Donald Hackbarth:

The other comment I have is we discussed the trees on the east side. We were talking about the oak trees when we did the walkthrough. Where are we on that? We were talking about trying to preserve those trees and not get too close to them in construction.

Fouad Saab:

You mean these trees?

Donald Hackbarth:

Yes, we'll preserve them.

Jean Werbie:

Don, we have a tree preservation and protection easement area that we've identified in our staff comments that they'll need to add to their conceptual plan and to their plats. In fact, the storm water easement as shown had been shifted to the west outside of those areas. And in many other cases in our working with We Energies the easements for utilities for electric will not in this case run along the rear property line but they'll run in the right of way and then they'll come up side lot lines and go only half way so that the boxes or whatever only go half way so that the trees in the rear are protected. And we're doing that with a number of subdivisions.

Donald Hackbarth:

That will actually be an advantage to the Kims I would imagine to preserve those trees rather than saw them down.

Jean Werbie:

And we typically require that the treed areas be fenced not only with silt fence but orange construction fence as a visual barrier and warning, and not just at the trunk but at the drip line in order to prevent contractors from straying into those areas.

Donald Hackbarth:

Then the third comment I have is did we have this discussion before because I see a lot of comments and a lot of negative things going on here that I haven't really heard before.

Jean Werbie:

About what?

Donald Hackbarth:

Well, just the public hearing.

Jean Werbie:

I'm not sure if you were here but they had addressed a number of concerns.

Donald Hackbarth:

That explains it. Excuse me. The last comment I've got and I'll be short here is you're caught between a rock and a hard place here because I've heard two conflicting things here. You know my opinion on retention basins and detention basins that I do not like them. Anyway, that's beside the point. But we're caught between a rock and a hard place here because we had a gentleman come up here talking about the creek swelling. Well, okay, water is an attraction for kids. What do you do with that? A kid is going to run into that water, too, in that respect. On the other hand if there's a basin that collects or mitigates or helps some of that flooding problem it would at least localize where the water is collected instead of having it in areas that a child could fall into near the creek or whatever. You're caught between a rock and a hard place.

(Inaudible)

Mike Serpe:

If this development meets all the criteria by ordinance and State law and we deny them I could not in good conscience make that recommendation to the Board in fear of subjecting all the rest of the taxpayers of Pleasant Prairie to pay the bill if we had to buy that property. That wouldn't be wise. That wouldn't be prudent. It wouldn't be good policy. As much as this could be a change for the neighborhood, we all understand that change is hard to come by, one thing that's not happening is nobody that's living there is losing one foot of their property. Your property is still your property. If you have one acre you still have one acre and you're going to continue to have one acre. If you have five you're going to continue to have five.

The developer coming through and telling us that he will conform to an R-3 zoning that was once R-4 is a benefit to the neighborhood whether you agree with that or not. It's less density. The one thing that keeps on coming back to me is 28th Avenue in its present condition and Prairie Trails East coming in the near future. At one time Prairie Trails East was set to be developed with access to 128th, access to 116th and over the bike trail. The bike trail now is closed and it's a dead issue. But that was another out for some of that traffic. My question to Jean is now that the bike trail is never going to be crossed, could we revisit Prairie Trails East with reference to density or has that boat sailed?

Jean Werbie:

No. The preliminary plat was approved by the Village Plan Commission and the Board and they are entitled to the approval of a final plat by State statute if it substantially conforms to the plat that had been previously approved. So, no.

John Braig:

There was a comment how about a storm sewer in the area. Obviously because of the water table and the level of clay underneath it would be a perfect solution but I think we're dealing with an extreme expense and it would be an assessment against an awful lot of people that aren't even a part of this problem.

Jim Bandura:

Just a quick question to staff. Mike, are there any active septic or wells out there on 28th?

Mike Pollocoff:

There's no active septic. Everybody is on wells. All the septic tanks have been replaced. Just to comment on the storm sewer, we're requiring the developer to put in storm sewers throughout the development so that development will have storm sewers. There won't be any ditches or drainage ways. It will all be piped underground.

Jean Werbie:

And their sump pumps are directly connected to a storm tile so the sump pumps go directly to the storm sewer as well.

John Braig:

Where is the outflow of that storm sewer?

Jean Werbie:

To the basin.

Mike Serpe:

Jean, do you know if the electric services are going to be above ground or below?

Jean Werbie:

They'll be required to be below ground.

Mike Serpe:

Through the entire Orchard?

Jean Werbie:

To the subdivision. That's a requirement of the Village now.

John Braig:

But that will be with transformers at the front property line?

Jean Werbie:

Correct. Well, not in the front but midway on the side.

John Braig:

You mean they're going to put in a transformer for every two houses?'

Jean Werbie:

That's what they've been doing. They don't necessarily put them along the rear property line to cut through the trees and they don't put transformers in the street yard.

(Inaudible)

Mike Serpe:

One other question to the developer, Mr. Roscioli. What time frame are you looking at? We realize this is conceptual.

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

He needs to speak into the microphone.

Larry Zarletti:

Mr. Chairman, I believe the developer has met the criteria set forth by the Village to develop this. I believe the Plan commission is thereby compelled to send it to the Board with a favorable recommendation and I do move Item A.

Donald Hackbarth:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY LARRY ZARLETTI AND SECONDED BY DON HACKBARTH TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN WITHOUT THE BERM?

Wayne Koessl:

I would correct it that the berm would be removed.

Thomas Terwall:

Without the berm along the detention basin. All in favor signify by saying aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. Chairman?

Jean Werbie:

Mrs. Godbold I think had the question regarding the protest petition. The next item on the agenda is the conceptual plan. Now, the protest petition regulations do not apply to a concept plan but apply rather to the rezoning. So, I would probably need to visit with her and the Village Board because typically they bring a concept plan forward first and then a rezoning. But in a situation where the concept plan could be in conflict with the rezoning that could be a problem. So we're going to need to figure out whether or not they—let's take a step back and submit the rezoning with the conceptual plan so they both come in at the same time, because otherwise there could be a problem with the concept plan, for example, being approved and then a protest petition coming in after the fact when we've already sent a different message. So I think that what probably needs to happen is we either need to table this matter or do something to bring it back so that the rezoning comes at the same time. Otherwise their protest petition might not have any validity, because 20 percent of abutting property owners to the property if they protest the rezoning that could force a super majority decision of the Village Board.

Donald Hackbarth:

I'd move to table until the

Mike Serpe:

Second.

John Braig:

What are we tabling? Item B?

Jean Werbie:

The Plan Commission can act on it but I think that it should not be advanced to the Village Board without there being consideration of the zoning at the same time to give some direction to the developer and to give the property owners the opportunity to protest if that's what they choose to do.'

Thomas Terwall:

But are you talking about the amendment to the neighborhood plan or the . . .

Mike Pollocoff:

The conceptual plan because it's tied with the zoning.

Thomas Terwall:

. . . zoning recommendation in that case anyhow, right?

Jean Werbie:

I understand, but if this goes onto the Village Board there's no application at this time for rezoning. So either the Plan Commission can table it or the Village Board may consider tabling it, or we don't bring it to the Board until the rezoning comes up.

Mike Pollocoff:

So you could act on it tonight but hold it until the rezoning application is filed.

Mike Serpe:

Either way tabling—we're okay with tabling.

John Braig:

Wait a minute. If we table it we're going to go through this hearing and this whole thing again.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

You have a hearing anyway for the rezoning.

Jean Werbie:

Both of them require public hearings and we would be notifying the residents that we notified previously.

Thomas Terwall:

With respect to the motion on the neighborhood plan, since we can proceed with that, are you making a motion to table that as well?

Jean Werbie:

My recommendation is that they should all come at the same time because the conceptual plan is based on the neighborhood plan, and the neighborhood and conceptual then will help to direct what the zoning should be on the property.

Mike Serpe:

Are you saying we should rescind our vote on Item A.

Mike Pollocoff:

They've already taken a vote.

Jean Werbie:

I know that they have. I didn't catch it fast enough.

Mike Pollocoff:

That vote stands. I think from a procedural matter your vote on the neighborhood plan stands.

Thomas Terwall:

And then we can just table Item B?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Wayne Koessl:

Is that with the understanding they both would come in together then?

Mike Pollocoff:

As soon as the developer applies to the rezoning then we'll hold the conceptual plan until that time.

John Braig:

Can we make a recommendation that it be held and not forwarded to the Board until?

Jean Werbie:

You can make that recommendation as well.

Mike Pollocoff:

The neighborhood plan?

Thomas Terwall:

(Inaudible)

Wayne Koessl:

Is there motion to Table B?

Mike Serpe:

Somebody did, yes.

Thomas Terwall:

Is there a second?

Mike Serpe:

Yes.

Thomas Terwall:

**IT'S BEEN MOVED BY DON HACKBARTH AND SECONDED BY MIKE SERPE TO
TABLE THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR THE PROPOSED ORCHARD SUBDIVISION.
ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.**

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman, I would recommend that they both come back the first Plan Commission meeting of April, the rezoning and the conceptual plan. We will still send out notices.

7. NEW BUSINESS

- B. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF ZONING MAP AMENDMENT to correct the Zoning Map and rezone the field delineated wetlands into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District and the non-wetland portions of the property would remain in the R-5, Urban Single Family Residential District. The LUSA, Limited Use Service Area Overlay District will remain on the entire property.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman, could I have three minutes and then we'll continue.

Thomas Terwall:

Go ahead, Jean.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman, this item is an item to correct the zoning map and to rezone the field delineated wetlands into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, and the non wetland portions would remain in the R-5, Urban Single Family Residential District. The LUSA District would remain the same on the property.

On July 27, 2006, the Village received an application from Mary Wade, Trustee for Sanetra Family Trust, for a wetland staking to be completed on the property generally on the east side of 1st Court in the 11300 block in the Village of Pleasant Prairie and further identified as Tax Parcel Number 93-4-123-293-0480 identified as Lot 30 Block 14, Carol Beach Estates Subdivision, Unit #2.

The Village received a letter dated November 7, 2006 from the SEWRPC that indicated that the Plat of Survey correctly surveyed and identified the wetlands on said property as field staked on September 7, 2006. On November 6, 2006, the Village received a revised survey with corrected information as noted by Don Reed of SEWRPC.

On November 27, 2006, the Plan Commission approved a resolution to initiate this amendment. Therefore, the field delineated wetlands are proposed to be rezoned into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, and the non-wetland portions would remain in R-5 with the LUSA on the entire property. This is a matter for public hearing.

Thomas Terwall:

Is anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? Hearing none, I'll open it up to comments and questions from Commissioners and staff.

Donald Hackbarth:

Move approval.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY DON HACKBARTH AND SECONDED BY MIKE SERPE TO CORRECT THE ZONING MAP AND REZONE THE FIELD DELINEATED WETLANDS INTO THE C-1, LOWLAND RESOURCE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

C. Consider the request of Mary Pagliaroni, Trustee for the Knudsen Family Revocable Trust, property owner, for a Certified Survey Map to subdivide the property located at 8504 Cooper Road.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman, this is a request by Mary Pagliaroni for a certified survey map to subdivide their property at 8504 Cooper Road. It's known as Parcel 3 of CSM 366. They're requesting two parcels. The property is currently zoned R-5, Urban Single Family Residential District, which requires lots be a minimum of 10,000 square feet with a minimum of 75 feet of frontage on a public road.

Lot A-1 is proposed to be 18,187 square feet with 109.98 feet of frontage on Cooper Road and 165.48 feet of frontage on 85th Street. Lot 1 has an existing home and two detached accessory buildings that will remain on the property.

Lot A-2 is proposed to be 14,056 square feet with 85 feet of frontage on Cooper Road. Lot 2 has an existing accessory building that is proposed to be removed or relocated in order to make it conforming within six months of final approval by the Village Board of the certified survey map.

Additional right-of-way is proposed to be dedicated on 85th Street and Cooper Road and no easements are from We Energies. Village staff recommends approval of the Certified Survey Map subject to the comments and conditions as outlined in the staff memorandum.

John Braig:

Move approval.

Andrea Rode:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY JOHN BRAIG AND SECONDED BY ANDREA RODE TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR A CERTIFIED SURVEY MAP TO SUBDIVIDE THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 8504 COOPER ROAD SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. IS THIS THE HOUSE JUST NORTH OF THE SCHOOL?

Mike Pollocoff:

It's the house on the corner there on 85th. It's the vacant lot between that house and then the house next to the school.

John Braig:

It was all one parcel at one time was it not?

Mike Pollocoff:

It is now.

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

You guys there's two conversations going on.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mary Knudsen was the owner and now her daughter, Mary Pagliaroni.

Thomas Terwall:

There's only one house there now, isn't there?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Jean Werbie:

One house on the corner, vacant lot, and then one more house before you get to the entrance of Whittier School. You can see that on the slide.

Thomas Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY JOHN BRAIG AND SECONDED BY ANDREA RODE TO APPROVE THE REQUEST FOR A CERTIFIED SURVEY MAP TO SUBDIVIDE THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 8504 COOPER ROAD SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

D. Consider the request of Charles Bishop and Ward Parmentier, property owners, for a Lot Line Adjustment between 6452 127th Street, 12702 Timber Ridge Drive and an unimproved lot located in between the two properties.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission, this is a request of Chuck and Sharon Bishop and Ward Parmentier, property owners, for a Lot Line Adjustment between 6452 127th Street, 12702 Timber Ridge Drive and an unimproved lot located in between the two properties.

The petitioners are requesting to adjust the lot lines so it will go from three lots down to two lots. The properties involved are Tax Parcel Numbers 92-4-122-343-1120. It's a .14 acre corner lot, owned by Ward Parmentier, addressed as 12702 Timber Ridge Drive and further identified as Lot 82, Timber Ridge Subdivision. This lot is improved with a 1,032 square foot split-level single-family dwelling constructed in 1977 and an 808 square foot detached garage.

The second parcel identified as 92-4-122-343-1130, a vacant .14 acre lot owned by Charles Bishop and Ward Parmentier and further identified as Lot 83 in the Timber Ridge Subdivision.

Then finally the third Tax Parcel Number 92-4-122-343-1140, a .14 acre lot, owned by Charles and Sharon Bishop, addressed as 6452 127th Street and further identified as Lot 84 in the Timber Ridge Subdivision. This lot is improved with a 1,432 square foot split-level single-family dwelling constructed in 1976 and a 400 square foot detached garage.

All three properties are zoned R-5 (PUD). The R-5 District requires lots to have a minimum frontage of 75 feet on an improved public road with a minimum lot area of 10,000 square feet in

area. As information, the current setback requirements for single-family structures in the R-5 District are 30 feet from street property lines, 10 feet from side property lines, 25 feet from rear property lines. Village Ordinances also require a minimum lot depth of 125 feet.

The proposed lot line adjustment will divide the unimproved tax parcel, the vacant lot, and attach the southwest one-half of the divided lot to one parcel owned by Parmentier and attach the northeast one-half of the divided lot to the Bishop property. The end result of the lot line adjustment will be reduction from three to two lots.

No new nonconformities will be created with this proposed lot line adjust. And in conclusion the proposed lot line adjustment will result in two lots that are less nonconforming, both improved with single family dwellings and detached accessory garages in the R-5 (PUD) zoning district. The staff recommends approval as presented.

John Braig:

Question on the previous illustration, that line around the cul-de-sac is that supposedly the center line of the cul-de-sac?

Jean Werbie:

It's a line segment drawing that was done by the GIS system.

John Braig:

It means nothing?

Jean Werbie:

For our purposes it does not mean anything. It is true.

John Braig:

Alright, thank you.

Thomas Terwall:

(Inaudible)

Donald Hackbarth:

Are these white lines on this drawing actually the property line of the other properties?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes.

Donald Hackbarth:

So you've got rooftops in somebody else's property?

Thomas Terwall:

(Inaudible)

Donald Hackbarth:

How the heck did that happen?

Mike Pollocoff:

Before we were a Village we were a town and then the County zoning.

Jean Werbie:

And the aerial photograph may not be 100 percent accurate, too.

Thomas Terwall:

But there are negative setbacks. I know that for a fact. One guy's overhang extends over the next guy's lot.

Jean Werbie:

There might be. That could be because they actually have some separation spacing from house to house and overhangs were not taken into consideration.

Thomas Terwall:

And this happened at a time when the State of Wisconsin changed the method of refunding money back to the communities. They based it on head count. And the Town Chairman at that time who since became a State Senator said this is one way to gain dollars. Pack them in there like sardines because we'll get so much a head.

(Inaudible)

Mike Serpe:

Can you get a building permit for a nonconforming lot?

Jean Werbie:

Sure.

Donald Hackbarth:

Move approval.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY DON HACKBARTH AND SECONDED BY MIKE SERPE TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM.

Jean Werbie:

I do want to clarify that while these lots may not conform to the R-5 specific regulations, a planned unit development was created as part of this Timber Ridge Subdivision which allowed these lots to be smaller and the setback reductions to be approved. So there were a number of things that were set forth as part of the PUD for this subdivision which allowed the homes to be located where they are.

Donald Hackbarth:

What is this, R-22 or something?

Jean Werbie:

No, this is R-5, and what they're doing is actually making their lots that much larger.

Thomas Terwall:

All in favor signify by saying aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

E. Consider Plan Commission Resolutions #07-04 through #07-06 to initiate several zoning map amendments as a result of wetland stakings being completed.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman, you have before you three Village Plan Commission resolutions to initiate zoning map amendments. The first one is a resolution to initiate a zoning map amendment. On July 25, 2006, the Village received an application from Bonnie Lindstrom for a wetland staking to be completed on a vacant property generally located on the south side of 93rd Street between 8th and 11th Avenues. It was for Tax Parcel Number 93-4-123-191-0105, Lot 6, Block 6, Carol Beach Estates Subdivision, Unit 6.

The Village received a letter dated January 10, 2007 from SEWRPC that indicated that the plat of survey correctly surveyed and identified the wetlands on the property field staked on November 16, 2006. So in accordance with the Village Zoning Ordinance, C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy requirements in effect, the Plan Commission shall initiate the appropriate action to change the zoning map to conform to the wetland delineated plat of survey.

The resolution before you is Resolution 07-05. Again, this is also a resolution to initiate a change in the zoning map boundaries in the Village. On May 12, 2006, the Village received an application from Jolene Hoskins for a wetland staking to be completed on vacant property generally located across the street from 11233 3rd Avenue in the Village on Tax Parcel Number 93-4-123-304-0245, Lot 4, Block 20, Carol Beach Estates Subdivision, Unit 2.

The Village received a letter dated January 17, 2007 from SEWRPC that indicated that the plat of survey correctly surveyed and identified the wetlands as field staked on May 18, 2006. In accordance with the Village's Zoning Ordinance, C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District requirements in effect, again, the Plan Commission shall initiate the appropriate action to change a zoning map to conform to the wetland delineated boundaries.

And, finally, Resolution #07-06. This is also a zoning map amendment resolution. Whereas on August 21, 2006, the Village received an application from William Hosken and Beverly McElmury for a wetland staking to be completed on two adjacent vacant properties generally located on the west side of Lakeshore Drive south of 96th Street and further identified as Tax Parcel Numbers 93-4-123-191-1300 and 93-4-123-191-1305. These are lots 2 and 3 of Block 52 in the Carol Beach Estates Subdivision Unit 5A.

The Village received a letter dated January 19, 2007 from SEWRPC that indicated that the plat of survey correctly surveyed and identified the wetlands on the property as field staked on November 16, 2006. In accordance with the Village of Pleasant Prairie Zoning ordinance C-1 District regulations in effect, the Plan Commission shall initiate the appropriate action to change a zoning map to conform to the wetland delineated plat of survey.

The Village staff recommends approval of all three resolutions and recommends that the Plan Commission direct the Village staff to set public hearings to consider all three of these zoning map amendment requests.

Mike Serpe:

Move approval of 07-04,07-05 and 07-06.

Larry Zarletti:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

MOTION BY MIKE SERPE AND A SECOND BY LARRY ZARLETTI TO APPROVE RESOLUTIONS 07-04, -05 AND -06. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

F. Review and consider the draft Chapter IV of the Comprehensive Plan related to the Inventory of Existing Land Uses and Transportation Facilities and Services.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission, Item F is the review and consideration of the draft Chapter IV of the Comprehensive Plan related to the Inventory of Existing Land Uses and Transportation Facilities and Services. As you know, the Regional Planning Commission, in cooperation with Kenosha County and each of ten total municipalities with the County, are putting together a Comprehensive Plan for the Village of Pleasant Prairie and all of Kenosha County. I will try to be brief. This chapter is actually quite lengthy and quite a bit of information, and I'm sure that you've all had an opportunity to read through the chapter over the last couple of days. So I will highlight some of the points. So I might not be reading verbatim all of the information on the slides, but I will be going through each of them. Again, let me emphasize this is existing facility information. We are not at the point where we are talking about proposed or planned new land uses or new development within Pleasant Prairie.

Chapter IV, this chapter presents an inventory of the built environment and it's divided into two parts: inventories of historical and existing land uses and an inventory of existing transportation facilities and services. Inventories have been conducted for Kenosha County and each local government participating in the planning process. Plan recommendations will be set forth in the land use and transportation elements. Again, those chapters will come later as Chapters X and XI.

Part 1, Land Use: The commission utilizes urban growth ring analysis and land use inventory to monitor urban growth and development within the region. This analysis delineates out limits of concentrations of urban development and depicts urbanization over the last 150 years. The Commission has used land use inventory as a detailed inventory that places all land and water within the region into one of 66 land use categories providing the basis for analyzing urban and

non-urban uses. Urban growth ring and the land use inventory have been updated to the year 2000. Then we have also provided to SEWRPC information for 2000 to 2006 so that it could be included in our projections and our information for planning purposes.

This slide identifies urban growth ring analysis and the historical urban growth. The numbers are very small but we do have the information and we do have maps in your packet that identify the urban growth years for the area from 1940, 1950, 1963, 1975, 1985, 1995 and 2000. They use specific aerial photographs for the region in evaluating the urban growth development.

As you can see just to point out real quickly, there was not a tremendous amount of growth in Pleasant Prairie in the early years. A lot of the growth that you have seen there is some that occurred in the 1900s to 1950 in the south Kenosha area, but then we're starting to see larger growth areas in recent times in the last ten years, 1995 to the present.

This slide identifies some facts for you for general discussion purposes for all of Kenosha County, that urban development in Kenosha County before 1900 was confined to small areas of Wilmot, New Munster, Silver Lake and the City. The City was originally incorporated as the Village of Southport in 1841. It was incorporated as a City in 1850, and they continued to grow between 1900 and 1950. Just as a side note Pleasant Prairie became a Township in 1848, the same year that Wisconsin became a State. And as noted here we became a Village, a municipality, in 1989.

This slide also identifies where some of the urban development occurred on the west end of the County. Development also occurred along the Lake Michigan shoreline and the Town of Somers and in the hamlets of Bristol, Somers, Trevor and Slades Corners between 1900 and 1950. Between 1950 and 1963 the growth started to be a little bit more significant after World War II, and incorporations of the Village of Paddock Lake in 1960, and the lakeshore areas and western Kenosha County really started to urbanize at that point. Between 1963 and 2000 a significant urban growth occurred in scattered locations throughout the County as well as the eastern and southern portions of the County.

Land use trends between 1975 and 2000, land use for urban uses increased by over 10,000 acres or 36 percent. These went into urban use categories from converted agricultural uses. The percentage of land classified as non urban decreased by 7 percent. The numbers of acres in open lands, that is lands that are vacant and apparently unused, increased by 4,200 acres. Much of the increase in open lands category is due to land being taken out of agriculture but not converted to any other use.

Urban service areas. Urban service areas are identified in the Regional Land Use Plan based on sanitary sewer service areas delineated in the regional water quality management plan. Urban service areas are currently served or have capacity or are eventually planned to be served by sanitary sewer system or public sewage treatment plant. These services allow for relatively dense residential, commercial and industrial developments and uses which characterize urban areas. Urban service areas are typically served by public parks, high schools, middle schools and shopping areas. All urban service areas have portions of their areas that do not provide sewer and water services. However, sewer services are planned to be provided to all areas within the sewer service area within a maximum of a 20 year period. These include the City of Kenosha, Pleasant

Prairie, Paddock Lake, Silver Lake, Twin Lakes and portions of Salem, Somers and the Town of Bristol.

The City of Kenosha, Village of Pleasant Prairie and portions of the Town of Bristol sewer service areas are served by public water supply systems. Remaining areas in the County rely on private water supply or private wells for their systems.

This is a map of the existing land uses in the year 2000 in the Village of Pleasant Prairie as well as the rest of Kenosha County. The inventory describes a very precise record of land use, and it's being used for projection of land uses into the future. Again, there's going to be a later map that shows not only this map but what has taken place between 2000 and 2006. Urban land uses encompassed about 38,051 acres or about 21 percent.

Under residential land uses, residential land comprised the largest urban land use category in our County, encompassing about 49 percent of urban land and about 10 percent of the total County in the year 2000. Single family homes encompassed 93 percent, two family dwellings 2 percent, multi-family dwellings approximately 4 percent and mobile homes less than 1 percent.

For commercial land within the County it encompassed about 4 percent of the urban land and less than 1 percent of the total County land in 2000. Commercial development is concentrated in the urban service areas within the City of Kenosha and the Village's of Silver Lake and Twin Lakes each having central business districts. But commercial development is also concentrated along highways and arterial streets. And for Pleasant Prairie currently we have a concentration along Highway 50 and at the northern end of Highway 31 and 32 at the south end. As you know, with our current planning efforts we don't tend to strip commercial development along our major highways but rather to cluster that development at major intersections within our community.

Industrial land encompassed about 1,436 acres or about 4 percent of the urban land and less than 1 percent of the total County land in the year 2000. The large industrial parks in the County include the Bristol Industrial Park, the Business Park of Kenosha, Kenosha Industrial Park and two industrial parks in the Village of Pleasant Prairie, the LakeView Corporate Park which includes the east and west portions as well as the Prairiewood Corporate Park west of I-94.

Thomas Terwall:

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

I don't know off the top of my head but there might be a table in here. I would say over 2,500 acres.

Thomas Terwall:

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

The situation is if you said the total land area identified for the LakeView Corporate Park and Prairiewood I would say close to 2,500 acres. How much is in actual land use of industrial? This number is probably a little bit more accurate. Again, it dates back to the year 2000. From our perspective that was seven years ago and we've had a number of major uses that have come into the Village including U-Line and Yamaha and a number of other spec buildings that have come in which are large land use areas since 2000. So for those two reasons we have to look at actual land use being utilized as well as what has happened in this community in the last six years.

Mike Serpe:

So it's only what the building sits on?

Jean Werbie:

Correct. Under transportation, communication and utilities, land use for these types of facilities comprised the second largest urban land use category in 2000. These uses encompassed about 11,475 acres or 30 percent of the urban land or 6 percent of the County. This includes streets, highways, railways and communication facilities and utilities. One of the largest utility portions or facility portions are the power plants in the County. These include the Pleasant Prairie Power Plant or P4 located in Pleasant Prairie, the Paris Generating Station and the Pheasant Run Recycling and Disposal Facility which is located in the Town of Paris.

Under governmental and institutional land uses, they encompassed about 1,691 acres or 4 percent of the urban land, less than 1 percent of the County. These uses generally accommodate the County Courthouse, County Administration Building, Kenosha County Center, all of the municipal halls, all of the municipal facilities in the towns, villages and cities, the post offices, the schools, libraries, colleges, hospitals, medical centers and cemeteries.

Under recreational, intensively used recreational land encompassed about 3,409 acres or about 9 percent of all urban land and 2 percent of the total County in 2000. Intensive recreational land uses only include parks or portions of parks that have been developed with facilities such as playgrounds, trails, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, soccer fields and other play fields. A complete inventory of park and open space sites in the County including name and total acres as already been presented by the County and by me as part of the Chapter III discussion for this land use plan.

Nonurban land uses for 2000 consist of agricultural lands, natural resource areas, waters, wetlands, woodlands, quarries, landfills and unused land. Nonurban land encompassed about 140,150 acres or about 79 percent of the County in 2000. The pie chart as well as the chart as shown in the slide illustrate the comparison of these uses for the entire County.

Recent developments between 2000 and 2006, Kenosha County Comprehensive Plan and comprehensive plans for each local jurisdiction must look ahead at least 20 years to ensure adequate supplies of land for urban and nonurban land uses. In order to ensure that future planning reflects the existing land use conditions, basically what they have done is take the

existing land use inventory from 2000 and then have approached each municipality to find out what land use changes have occurred between 2000 and 2006.

For the Village of Pleasant Prairie as well as the other municipalities we have then presented to them all of the urban developments that have occurred during those time frames. The charts that you have in your packets in the chapter identify recent residential developments in the Village of Pleasant Prairie. What we did was specifically list them by residential land use type as well as identify where they are located in the Village of Pleasant Prairie. And most of you are familiar because they've all occurred in the last six years.

Several other major non residential development projects have occurred in Kenosha County. There have been a number of them in the City of Kenosha. This listing for the Village of Pleasant Prairie is somewhat incomplete. I've got a list of about 20 of them that I'd like listed. We've had a number of them that are over 100,000 square feet and many others that are at least 25,000 to 75,000 square feet that I'd like to see incorporated in here. This includes a number of new developments in the LakeView Corporate Park as well as the Prairie Ridge development, and we would like to see those included. I do have a listing which I just gave to Peggy of all the specifics, again, to make this more unique to Pleasant Prairie.

Much of the inventory information included in the transportation facilities and services section was drawn from the regional transportation system plan that was recently completed. That design year plan is a 2035 and we spent several years putting that plan together. It was just recently adopted by the Regional Planning Commission in 2006. The regional transportation plan includes four elements, public transportation, systems management bicycle and pedestrian facilities and arterial streets and highways. Inventory information related to each of these areas is presented in this chapter.

Streets and highways. Street and highway systems serves several important functions including the movement of vehicular access and providing vehicular access to abutting land uses, providing for pedestrian and bicycle circulation, and serving as the location for utilities and storm water drainage facilities. Two of these functions, traffic movement and land access, are basically incompatible. As a result, street and highway system design is based on a function grouping or classification of streets and highways based on the primary functions served.

In Pleasant Prairie in our Land Division and Development Control Ordinance we have these same classifications. And when new roads are built we build them per these same types of classifications, arterial streets, collector and land access except we call land access minor streets in our ordinance.

Arterial streets and highways are intended to provide a high degree of travel mobility through movement of traffic between and through urban areas. Arterial streets and highways accounted for 318 miles of total street and highway systems in 2006. State trunk highway systems generally carry the highest volumes of traffic, they have the highest speeds and they have the highest degree of access control. As you can see, we have five different State highways that run through the Village of Pleasant Prairie. County trunk highways are also considered arterial streets and we have an integrated system of arterials for the County that run through our jurisdiction primarily running on the mile, some of which have been transferred back to the Village's jurisdiction in the

early 1990s. County Trunk Highway T came back to the Village's jurisdiction, and County Trunk Highway ML came to the County's jurisdiction from the State, and part of Q went from the County to the State's jurisdiction. So there is typically a transfer amongst the jurisdictions.

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

And then HH which is 104th Avenue came to the Village of Pleasant Prairie. There are also local arterial streets and highways, and at our next Plan Commission meeting we will be talking about some of those local arterials with 93rd Street as well as Cooper Road. So local arterials and highways are very important and we need to study those and be prepared to present traffic improvement plans for those as they serve just as important functions for the Village as well as surrounding areas traveling through our community.

Collector and land access streets. The primary function of land access streets is to provide access to abutting property. Collector streets are intended to serve primarily as connections between arterial streets and land access streets. Working with our engineering department we've taken a much better approach into examining the collector street type system in Pleasant Prairie with the larger developments that we have such as in Prairie Ridge, the Village Green Heights development area and some of the other areas where the roadway systems are going to be conveying a number of vehicular movements to and through larger subdivisions and to different subdivisions. So we have been taking a much more careful review and look at these types of areas, and they are now incorporated into the transportation system plan that's currently in its draft form but it's going to be presented to the Village Plan Commission and the Board in the near future.

County and local street inventories. WisDOT maintains a detailed database of county and local street information. Physical attributes such as right of way and pavement width, number of traffic lanes, types of surface and pavement rating, the presence and type of shoulders or curbs and the presence of sidewalks are available through this database. John, Jr. in our public works department maintains this database for the Village of Pleasant Prairie, as he is responsible on a yearly basis to submit updates to the system information to the Wisconsin DOT. And this information is used to help determine road aids and other type of funding that comes back to the Village of Pleasant prairie.

Systems management. The existing freeway traffic management system in Southeast Wisconsin consists of many elements which are often referred to as intelligent transportation systems. And many of you have seen these on I-94. They're new types of systems that include traffic detectors, ramp metering, high occupancy vehicle bypass ramps although we don't have any right in this area yet, message signs, highway advisory radios, closed circuit television, service patrols, crash investigation sites and enhanced reference markers.

What you will notice as the I-94 main line improvement project starts to come forward, and I'm going to be asking that a presentation be made on that project also to the Plan Commission in the next year or so, you will be noticing a whole bunch more of these new, more high tech freeway management systems that are going to be incorporated into the main line to help the movement of

traffic at least on the south end of the State. I'm not going to go through in detail to explain every one of these. You can read some of these for yourself. Again, they are defined in the chapters.

Under public transportation the public transportation is the transportation of people by publicly operated vehicles between trip origins and destinations and can be divided into service provided to the general public and service provided into special population groups. Public transportation to the general public can be further divided into inner city and interregional public transportation, urban public transportation, public transit, rural and small community public transportation. It's essential that public transportation be provided in metropolitan areas.

What we are seeing is that as new developments are occurring, large developments adjacent to the City of Kenosha, they have been requesting and the Village has been requesting the City of Kenosha for transit services to be brought out further into those more urbanized areas. I think it's doubtful that public transit will be extended throughout the Village of Pleasant Prairie based on the type of development and the density of development. However, there are certain areas in the Village of Pleasant Prairie that I think public transit will continue to expand to, whether it's the hospital areas, the more urbanized commercial areas, possibly the Abbott area west of I-94 where we need to move large amounts of employees to and from their residences.

Interregional public transportation includes rail services, bus services, ferry services and commercial airline services. Again, none of these are strictly defined as being located in Pleasant Prairie, but Pleasant Prairie residents have the availability to use any one of these services. They do have to travel a short distance to get to all of them, even metro downtown Kenosha which will take them to Chicago and to Milwaukee. But these services are available to Kenosha County residents.

Urban public transportation, there's an express transit and local transit. Specialized transportation services include Kenosha Care Van program, volunteer escort services and private for profit providers which are taxi type services.

Bicycle facilities, the Village of Pleasant Prairie provides an additional 2.3 miles of paved multi-use trail that encircles Lake Andrea and the park. The Village has recently adopted a Park and Open Space Plan for the years 2006 to 2011 where we've identified proposed locations for future recreational trails which includes both on street and off street bikeways. And as new residential developments get presented to you, you will notice that these bike trails are now being incorporated into the developments, and in most cases the developer is being required to pay for their portion of the bike trail as it goes through their development.

Under pedestrian facilities, the Village of Pleasant Prairie does not have a detailed comprehensive sidewalk plan in this community. There are certain areas of the community that we have identified such as in our downtown area or in intensive commercial areas, around Lake Andrea where we do encourage sidewalk and pedestrian travel. But for the most part there's not going to be in my estimation an extension of sidewalks throughout this community. Again, bike trails or bike lanes to get you from one area to another on local arterials or local roadways but likely not sidewalks throughout this community.

There is a discussion on rail freight services. As you know, we have three rail lines that travel through the Village of Pleasant Prairie, Union Pacific, Canadian Pacific and Canadian National Railway.

Mike Serpe:

. . . from the ridership of the buses in the City of Kenosha does that include school students being taken to school and from school?

Jean Werbie:

I have no idea but I can check. I would think that that would be considered a specialized transportation. The reason why I say that is that at least initially students that travel, for example, from Tremper to another location they don't necessarily need to get a special bus pass because it's included with their fees with the school. So I'm not sure if they take buses off of regular routes and give them to the schools for them to use for routes. There's two or three for Tremper. There's buses coming from Lakeview Tech, so I'm not sure that they do but I can certainly ask the question.

Under ports and harbors, there are two basic areas where we have ports, Kenosha Harbor which includes Simmons Island Marina, U.S. Coast Guard Station and Southport Marina. And in Pleasant Prairie we have a private area known as the Prairie Harbor Yacht Club Marina. There are no other ports in Kenosha County.

Under airports and heliports, Kenosha Regional Airport is a publicly owned available airport for public use offering chartered air service. We've got the Lesotho Airport, Vincent Airport, Camp Lake Airport and eight privately owned private use airports. There are six private heliports in Kenosha County. We have one in Pleasant Prairie at St. Catherine's Hospital.

In summary, this chapter provides inventory information on existing land uses and transportation facilities and services, and each local unit of government participated in putting together this multi-jurisdictional system plan and will continue to do so as we review these chapters. This chapter in particular as we get into the planning stages is very significant.

Out of all the communities in Kenosha County Pleasant Prairie has to be one of the communities that has the most activity with respect to State highway corridor improvement plans with Highway 165 and Highway 50. We've got transportation planning going on throughout the community with respect to the new developments going in. We got the main line of I-94, we've got new interchanges at C and minor improvements at Q and ML for beautification. We just have a lot of activity going on as it pertains to transportation. And we have also made some significant changes through our neighborhood planning for some of our local arterials which will be incorporated as part of this transportation plan system into the future both at ML, 116th Street, Cooper Road and some other areas as well. With that, any questions?

(Inaudible)

Donald Hackbarth:

So moved.

John Braig:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

We have a motion by Don Hackbarth and a second by John Braig to adopt Chapter IV

Jean Werbie:

Are there any other modifications or inclusions that you'd like. I do have a few that I have edited and I will be bringing to the committee along with some of the things I had mentioned this evening.

Thomas Terwall:

THERE'S A MOTION BY DON HACKBARTH AND A SECOND BY JOHN BRAIG TO APPROVE CHAPTER IV. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

Mike Serpe:

And this is again done by SEWRPC and Kenosha County mostly, is that correct?

Jean Werbie:

And each respective municipality reviews the information, and we've been providing updates of the information in here and then we edit the chapters and get the edited information back to them. But SEWRPC is the primary drafter.

Thomas Terwall:

(Inaudible)

8. ADJOURN

Larry Zarletti:

Mr. Chairman, motion to adjourn.

Wayne Koessl:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

All in favor signify by saying aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.