

**PLEASANT PRAIRIE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
VILLAGE HALL AUDITORIUM  
9915 39TH AVENUE  
PLEASANT PRAIRIE, WISCONSIN  
5:00 P.M.  
November 26, 2007**

A meeting for the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission convened at 5:00 p.m. on November 26, 2007. Those in attendance were Thomas Terwall; Donald Hackbarth; Wayne Koessl; Andrea Rode; Jim Bandura; John Braig; and Judy Juliana. Michael Serpe and Larry Zarletti were 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.**

Jean Werbie:

I have none this evening.

Thomas Terwall:

Item 4 is Citizen Comments.

- 4. CITIZEN COMMENTS.**

Thomas Terwall:

Given the large number of citizens we have here tonight you'll be limited to a three minute speech. Anybody wishing to speak would now step to the microphone and please begin by giving us your name and address. Seeing none, we'll move onto Item 5, New Business.

- 5. NEW BUSINESS.**
  - A. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT of Section 420-140 E of the Village Zoning Ordinance related to use of existing nonconforming lots in the business districts.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission, this is a public hearing in consideration of a zoning text amendment to Section 420-140 E of the Village Zoning Ordinance, and it relates to the use of existing nonconforming lots in business districts. I'm just going to read the introductory paragraph for you. This section of the Zoning Ordinance refers to specifically nonconforming lots within the business districts.

In any B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4 and B-5 Business District, any nonconforming lot having no principal structure located on it, or on which the sole principal structure will be removed before or in conjunction with the proposed development and use of the lot, may be developed and used for an allowed use subject to compliance with all applicable requirements of this chapter other than the minimum lot size or minimum public street frontage requirements that cause the lot to be nonconforming and of all other Village ordinances and codes; provided, however, that in the event applicable requirements of this chapter cannot be complied with as a result of the lot's failure to satisfy the minimum lot size or minimum public street frontage requirements, certain other specified requirement of this chapter shall be modified in accordance with this subsection to allow productive development and use of the nonconforming lot if certain specified conditions are met.

The following items that are listed in the list in the staff memo are all in accordance with what we have on the books today with respect to the different things that the staff looks at if we've got one of these nonconforming lot situations in a business district. And so we look at each of these various steps and we try to work with the property owner to fit everything on the lot.

However, one of the items, item (h) is what we're introducing as a new amendment this evening. And item (h) is if any necessary reduction of the minimum width or internal site circulation ways does not allow the lot to be developed in compliance with the remaining current requirements, the required garbage enclosure may be detached from the building provided the enclosure is located in the rear yard. We actually have one of these situations coming up and we might have a couple of more of these coming up where we have these narrow lots and we've got a requirement that the garbage dumpster recycling enclosure must be attached. Well, all of a sudden you've got all these things attached and we don't have enough room on the sides. And what we're finding with various uses is that either the police department or fire department wants to have a circular internal roadway around the building for safety and for fire protection and such. So as a result we can't also attach that garbage dumpster enclosure to the building and still allow for that safe movement around the building.

So the purpose of this request this evening then is part of this public hearing is to add this particular provision in these two sections that talks about under these circumstances to allow for a detached garbage or recycling enclosure. Again, it still needs to be complimentary in materials and color and size to the principal structure, but also it cannot be in the street yard. It does need to be in the rear yard, side or rear yard. It cannot be in the street yard. So with that I'd like to continue the public hearing.

Thomas Terwall:

This is a matter for public hearing. Is there anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? Hearing none, I'm going to open it up to comments and questions from Commissioners and staff.

Wayne Koessl:

To the staff, do you know how expensive that's going to be to put a road around a building for one dumpster?

Jean Werbie:

It's not for the dumpster. It would be for onsite circulation for that specific property. For example, you're going to have a situation that's going to be coming before you in the next month and it's a site that they tore down an existing gas station and they want to put a new gas station and car wash on this site. Well, the Fire and the Police Chief, as well as the owner, want to have a driveway that circulates around the back of the building for you to get to the car wash, and they want to be able to get around the building. So they have reduced the minimum width to 24 feet but they still want to have that road circulation. They don't want to have that dead space behind the building.

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

No, no. We're looking for more onsite circulation as may be needed or desired by either the Police Chief, Fire Chief or by the particular property owner. And actually the property owner was the first one that brought it up and both the Police Chief and Fire Chief agreed with it. And since we do have a number of locations that I'm thinking of that have smaller, more narrow lots, this could apply to those locations as well.

Andrea Rode:

I'll make the motion to approve.

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Jean Werbie:

I'd also just like to mention and since this came up just recently with another commercial shopping center, that if we add garbage/recycling enclosure, I had someone indicate to me they didn't have the dumpster inside the enclosure because it's for recycling materials, not garbage. So I just wanted to make it clear whether it's garbage or recycling that's what we intend. Then the only other thing here is that whether or not, and I mentioned side but I don't know if there's any concern for the Plan Commission as to whether or not it should just be the rear yard or can it be side or rear yard and should it have a three foot setback. Those are the other two things that—we can put those things in here. I just was curious as to what the Plan Commission would request.

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

No, no.

Wayne Koessl:

Through the Chair I think we should add that thing with three foot setback.

Jean Werbie:

And it can be in a side or rear yard.

Wayne Koessl:

Correct.

Jean Werbie:

And what I'm talking about is three feet from rear yard or three feet from the side yard. It has to be at least ten feet from the building which we would require for any accessory structure.

John Braig:

Comment. I'm thinking of the Piggly Wiggly on 80<sup>th</sup> Street which is in the City. It has a fence along the west property line which puts a roadway between the building and the fence. All the dumpsters are up against the fence which puts them right on the property line. And I would think that it would be preferably to having the dumpster three feet in from the property line. I think what's at the line is going to be the real concern. If it's open and abuts the adjoining property visually and everything else, yes, then you might want it back. But if there's a barrier, a fence, heavy foliage or something like that, I see no problem with putting it right up against the property line.

Jean Werbie:

The staff doesn't have any objection. Because if for some reason it's abutting a residential area they're going to have to either screen it or fence it and block it and they would place that on the property line.

John Braig:

How about we make it to three feet but it could be waived by staff?

Wayne Koessl:

Through the Chair, can the staff look at those that are trying to—a little shady and making their own judgment on how it should be handled?

Jean Werbie:

We can if you give us some flexibility.

Wayne Koessl:

I have no problem with that. Something like that you're going to end up with little individual cases where you're going to have to use some common sense and be a little flexible. I think the staff should have that authority. If it's okay with the rest of the Commission we can add that.

John Braig:

I'd support it.

Thomas Terwall:

Then we need an amendment to the motion to set a three foot setback subject to—

(Inaudible)

Thomas Terwall:

Well, we can amend it either way.

Andrea Rode:

Yeah, the motion will include the amendment.

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

The motion and second then is to send a favorable recommendation to the Village Board to approve the zoning text amendment as amended to include three foot setback from either side or rear yard subject to authorization for staff to waive that under certain circumstances. All in favor signify by saying aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered. Okay, Jean?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

**B. Consider Resolution #07-30 to initiate a zoning text amendment related to the average shore setback for accessory structures.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission, this is Resolution 07-30 relating to the initiating of a zoning text amendment. The Plan Commission may initiate a petition for an amendment to the zoning ordinance which may include the rezoning of property, change in zoning district boundaries or changes in the text of the ordinance.

The Village zoning ordinance provides currently for an exception to the required shore setback for principal structures by averaging the shore setback of the adjacent properties. Whereas this exception to the shore setback only applies to principal structures, not detached accessory structures such as decks, hot tubs or sheds. The staff is proposing to evaluate this exception to include possibly include accessory structures in the averaging principle.

The Plan Commission by the adoption of this resolution is not making any determination regarding the merits of the proposed changes in the zoning text, but rather is only initiating the process by which the proposed changes in the zoning text can be promptly evaluated.

John Braig:

Move approval.

Wayne Koessl:

Second.

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

That's correct, and any change that we make as it pertains to the shore yard setback it cannot conflict with the DNR regulations. So we will make sure that we have done that check before we bring it back to you.

Thomas Terwall:

It's been moved and seconded then to approve the resolution. Those in favor signify by saying aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

**C. Review and consider Chapter VII, "Issues and Opportunities Element" of the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Kenosha County.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman, when SEWRPC initially sent us Chapter VI they meant to say Chapter VII. So it's V-I-I. It is Chapter VII, Issues and Opportunities Element. And this is the element for the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Kenosha County.

The purpose of the issues and opportunities element is to define a desired future for Kenosha County and each of the participating local government. The future demand for land, housing, transportation, utilities and other community facilities are directly related to our population, housing and employment levels. Information regarding population and household projections through the year 2035 serves as a basis for developing the planning framework along with our employment projections and is provided in Part 1 of this Chapter. The information on employment projections is provided in Chapter VIII. Part 2 of this chapter--I'm sorry?

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

Thirteen, III. I forgot my Roman Numerals. Part 2 of this chapter sets forth Kenosha County's comprehensive plan visioning process and its results. It describes the process used to develop a countywide vision statement, and then it also identifies issues and opportunities pertaining to the plan.

The vision statement was developed by Kenosha County's advisory committee to help provide an overall framework for the development of the County plan. As part of the development of the Village's plan we will continue through our Café process, and our first Café helped us to start that visioning process, but we will continue through a process of our own in order to help redefine a local visioning process for us.

The vision statement for the County expresses the preferred future, key characteristics and/or expectations for the future desired by the County including the nine local governments participating in the process. Issues and opportunities identified during the visioning process help direct the County by providing the basis for addressing each of the nine planning elements.

Section 66.1001(2)(a) of the statutes requires an issues and opportunities element and it requires that it include a statement of overall objectives, policies, goals and programs for the governmental units to guide the future development and redevelopment over the planning period.

Now, the statutes were not very clear as to how exactly this was to progress, and so the County through SEWRPC has developed a process and has defined certain terms that we'll be using as part of our issues and opportunities. We're defining goals, broad and general expressions of the community's aspirations towards which the planning effort is directed. Objectives: More specific targets derived from goals and necessary to achieve goals. While still general in nature, objectives are more precise, concrete and measurable than the goals are.

Policies: policies are rules or courses of action necessary to achieve the goals and objectives from which they are derived. They are precise and they are measurable. And, finally, programs: A system of projects or services necessary to achieve plan goals, objectives and policies. Overall goals and objectives for each element are included in Part 3. More specific goals and objectives together with related programs and policies are included in each of the following eight element chapters.

Population and household projections. The projection of future population, household and employment levels is essential to properly design a comprehensive plan for the County. The future demand for land, housing, transportation facilities and services, utilities and other supporting community facilities depends directly on the future population, household and employment levels.

The population projections assumed a modest increase in fertility rates and a modest improvement in life expectancy for Kenosha County and for the region overall. The projected population for Kenosha County in 2035 is about 210,100 persons, an increase of about 60,500 persons or about 50 percent over the 2000 population level. Much of the projected growth in Kenosha County stems from the anticipated positive net migration as residents from adjacent counties—that migration has residents from adjacent counties and northeastern Illinois migrate to Kenosha County.

This is the information that was presented in the chapter you have before you. We have concerns with respect to, first of all, that last statement that I just made and we're actually doing some checking. But it's not just northern Illinois that we're receiving a lot of in migration, especially in Pleasant Prairie. We are actually receiving quite a bit from Kenosha, Milwaukee, the western suburbs of Kenosha County and western Walworth County and other areas. So we are actually receiving a lot from a number of different areas. So we'd like to do some checking or a little bit more investigation with respect to that.

The other thing that has me concerned is the population projections by sub area in Kenosha County. As you can see, Peggy has highlighted in yellow under Pleasant Prairie existing 2000 and an intermediate projection of 2035. The current population in Pleasant Prairie is just under 20,000. So what they're saying is basically in 35 years between 2000 and 2035 our population is not going to be growing that significantly. I'm somewhat concerned based on the projects that we have in the development pipeline, the development growth rate we've been experiencing. And I would not like to see projections from households, population, employment and everyone rely on this intermediate growth scenario if, in fact, the Village feels that our growth scenario is going to be greater than this.

At this point 26,285, that would be 6,000 people between 2007 and 2035. We've done our own population projections and I have been for about 20 years now, and our population projections put us probably about 35,000 in 2035. So I'm not sure how we'd like to handle this or recommend that there might be an opportunity for more of a faster growth scenario for SEWRPC to look at, or if they truly believe that we are going to be slowing down significantly after 2000. I'm not really sure. And I'm not sure if any other community feels this same way or not.

The other thing is with respect to growth in the sewered and unsewered areas, I do have some information coming from the County Sanitarian with respect to how much growth that we have experienced with respect to existing lots we have in Pleasant Prairie whether down in Carol



Beach or elsewhere. They're only projecting that we're only going to have four more homes between now and 2035 that are going to be on septic systems or holding tanks. Again, I think that that is pretty low because I think there's more than four vacant lots in Carol Beach and that means all of Carol Beach that's unsewered. So there's a couple of things.

I have a meeting tomorrow with the technical advisory committee and I'd like to raise those two issues with them. The rest of the chapter seems to make a lot of sense for us. But the population and household projection I have some questions with respect to that. And also persons per household projections as well. I'm concerned with some of those numbers and maybe that's why our numbers are coming out much lower. We have a population right now of persons per household count of 2.73 persons per household, and they indicate that at this time we only have 2.6. I wasn't using the 2000 census whenever we do population projections so I'm just a little concerned about where they're looking at with respect to those numbers.

So under projected age composition, SEWRPC intermediate population projections anticipate change in the age structure of the population over the course of the planning period for the County. The percentage of County population 45 years and old will increase during this planning period. Under 20 years of age projected to increase from 44,939 in 2000 to 57,452 in 2035 or about a 28 percent increase. Persons aged 20 to 44 years is projected to increase from 56,444 in 2000 to 69,719 in 2035 or about 24 percent. Those aged 45 to 64 years of age is projected to increase by about 57 percent from 31,025 persons in 2000 to 48,760 persons in 2035. But what is very even more significant is those that will be between 65 years and older. It's projected to increase from 17,169 in 2000 to 34,147 in 2035 or 99 percent. So that's very, very significant. And as we move forward we need to be thinking about our future aging population and how we're going to be able to address their needs.

Household projections, the projected average household size for the County in 2035 is 2.46 persons per household. This is a decrease of 5.7 percent from the 2000 average of 2.60 persons per household. Again, for Pleasant Prairie it's a little misleading because ours is at 2.73 now and they're projecting 2.60. So I guess they're kind of lumping all of us together with the County in 2035. So I guess I would like them to look at specifically Pleasant Prairie a little bit more closely. And they have different population household size numbers between unsewered and sewer areas of the Village. It just seems odd to me that whether you live in Carol Beach and you're on a holding tank or you live in Prairie Ridge and you have sewer the persons per household is 2.6 if you're in a sewer area and 2.43 and, again, that averages out throughout the community, but I'm still questioning why there's going to be fewer people living maybe in a larger home that has a holding tank versus someplace else in the Village.

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

So this is another slide that I'm going to be questioning those numbers to SEWRPC, unless this is really just based on all the seasonal or seasonal converted year 'round housing that's in western Kenosha County, but I still don't know how it pertains to Pleasant Prairie because we really don't have too much of that here, and we don't necessarily have smaller household sizes whether you're on sewer or you're not on sewer.

Part 2, Kenosha County visioning and issues and opportunities. The visioning process I spoke of will be completed by the advisory committee. They're responsible for preparing and refining the County's visioning statement and assisting the County staff in developing and executing the visioning statement in process. The visioning process included the development of the vision statement and the goals and objectives presented in the chapter.

These goals and objectives were based on the following: Data collected and mapped during the inventory phase of the plan; results of the countywide SWOT workshop that was conducted during the Smart Growth kickoff meeting in March 2007; The Kenosha County Café; eight local comprehensive plan public informational meetings; the planning goals, objectives and principles; other public comments obtained via the Kenosha County website and e-mails; consideration of the nine element of the comprehensive plan.

The following general county planning issues and opportunities were identified during the visioning process. First, agricultural and farmland preservation. Preserving farmland is a high priority among residents. Community character, a strong desire to preserve and enhance community character including those of neighborhoods and downtowns, strong support for preserving historic buildings and downtowns. Economic development, diversification of the economy and providing future jobs and opportunities for Kenosha youths were reoccurring themes throughout the process.

Education, maintaining a quality educational system is considered a high priority. Developing relationships between schools and businesses is viewed as a method to enhance workers' skills as well as develop programs aimed at fulfilling employers' needs. Energy, developing alternative energy sources such as wind and solar power and bio-fuels that could provide a solution to this problem. The potential demand for bio-fuel and bio-fuel technology could also provide economic opportunities for the County.

Housing, a common theme expressed by the participants during the visioning process was the need to provide a wide range of housing types and choices in order to meet the needs of the households of all ages, income levels and physical capabilities. Intergovernmental cooperation, the ability of each of the communities and the governments to work together that will affect all the future planning and policy efforts.

Natural resources, preservation and protection, results from the process indicate that the loss of natural resources due to development is viewed as a threat to the County, so we need to continue to develop and enhance our greenways and our open spaces and improve on our parks and park amenities.

Planning for future growth and development, concerns about anticipated growth and development and desires sustainable and planned growth, a common theme expressed throughout the visioning process was to concentrate urban development within the planned urban service areas, promote opportunities for redevelopment in areas with existing infrastructure and downtown areas, and minimize farmland conversion.

Recreational and cultural opportunities, the development and enhancement of recreational and cultural opportunities is important to the County, and it's viewed as a way to enhance tourism, and I see they have our motto in there as making it a more attractive community in which to live, work and play.

Transportation and transit services, improving transit services and accessibility and the variety of transportation choices, particularly in light of the changing age structure. Public utilities and community facilities, decisions regarding growth and development by local and County governments must take into account costs and impacts on utilities and community facilities.

Part 3 are the goals and objectives. The goals which follow this element are the goals that define the quality of life aspects for the County by addressing the previously listed general planning objectives. The attainment of these goals and corresponding objectives will lead to the creation of plans and policies for the County through the design year of 2035. These goals provide the framework within which specific element goals were developed for the other plan elements because, again, they're general rather than specific no policies or programs are associated with the goals and objectives in this chapter. They will be presented at each of the other eight plan element chapters.

And the overall goals and objectives listed in order of planned elements in the following chapters were developed by the Committee using the same inventory data, projections and public input. These are the County's goals, collectively ours with the County: Preserve and enhance the County's natural resources including Lake Michigan, open space and ag land; preserve and enhance natural, historic and cultural character; encourage sustainable development of land for business and residential use. Encourage a balanced and sustainable allocation of space between land uses to meet social, physical and economic needs of the County residents; promote a range of affordable housing choices for all income levels and age groups; improve transportation infrastructure and land use design to support a range of transportation choices; maintain and enhance the existing level of public services; support and encourage sustainable energy options; identify and encourage desirable and sustainable businesses and job development; attract and retain jobs that provide employment opportunities; identify economic and educational opportunities that will help ensure job growth for future generations; encourage intergovernmental cooperation; ensure the Kenosha County Multi-Jurisdiction Comprehensive Plan is a living document.

The chapter does also continue with some very specific information on all of the objectives under each of those goals, and I thought if you have any questions I'd be happy to answer those. In addition, as part of the chapter, the County did include the SWOT analysis that was completed and the Kenosha County Café results from when they completed their Café on May 12<sup>th</sup>. We also completed our Café back in August and I think everyone did receive a copy of the newsletter that outlined a good summary of what our Café held. The second Café which was held by the Village for the Village Green Center, the newsletter will be available probably within the next two to three weeks and we'll get those out to the Plan Commission as well.

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

I don't know, but I know these follow very closely if not identical to the census categories so they could be used for comparison sake in 2010 and beyond.

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

I believe that I can get you that information for year 2000, but to move it forward to 2005 we don't have a sampling of the population. I'm not even sure if the census is going to be breaking it out in 2010. I got the impression that they're not going to be doing as much sampling as they did before to get those projection numbers but I certainly can ask the question.

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

It is.

Thomas Terwall:

Jean, the communities in Kenosha County that are not participating in this program because they opted to do their own are they being taken into account for this?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Thomas Terwall:

Is anybody checking the validation of those numbers for those communities--

Jean Werbie:

I would assume SEWRPC--

Thomas Terwall:

Or is it just being accepted as gospel?

Jean Werbie:

No, I'm sure that SEWRPC is but I will ask that question because the County has to take all of that information that was done for those plans and incorporate it into this one. So I will check with them, though.

Thomas Terwall:

In the County's final plan are they going to have to also incorporate the results of this independent planning process?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Thomas Terwall:

Okay. Comments?

Wayne Koessl:

Through the Chair to Jean. Jean, as you get updates on what you're going to talk to the committee about will you give those to us also?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Thomas Terwall:

Do we know if any other community is doing what we're doing as far as validating?

Jean Werbie:

I will find out tomorrow at my meeting.

Wayne Koessl:

You're going to have a long day.

Thomas Terwall:

Anything further?

Wayne Koessl:

Do we need approval?

Jean Werbie:

Please

Wayne Koessl:

Do we need approval? So moved.

Donald Hackbarth:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

Moved and seconded to adopt—yes, Jean.

Jean Werbie:

And that would be subject to us checking into and making any modifications or adjustments or notes.

Wayne Koessl:

I'm sorry, any modifications that you find.

Thomas Terwall:

All in favor signify by saying aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

## **6. ADJOURN.**

John Braig:

Move adjournment.

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

All in favor say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

**Meeting Adjourned at 6:37 p.m.**