

**PLEASANT PRAIRIE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
VILLAGE HALL AUDITORIUM
9915 39TH AVENUE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE, WISCONSIN
6:00 P.M.
April 13, 2015**

A regular meeting for the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission convened at 6:00 p.m. on April 13, 2015. Those in attendance were Thomas Terwall; Michael Serpe; Donald Hackbarth; Wayne Koessler; Deb Skarda (Alternate #2); Jim Bandura; John Braig; Judy Juliana; and Bill Stoebig (Alternate #1). Also in attendance were Michael Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Tom Shircel, Assistant Administrator; Jean Werbie-Harris, Community Development Director; and Peggy Herrick, Assistant Zoning Administrator.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER.**
- 2. ROLL CALL.**
- 3. CONSIDER THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 23, 2015 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING.**

Judy Juliana:

Move to approve.

Wayne Koessler:

Second, Chairman.

Tom Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY JUDY JULIANA AND SECONDED BY WAYNE KOESSL TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 23, 2015 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING AS PRESENTED. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? Motion carries.

- 4. CORRESPONDENCE.**
- 5. CITIZEN COMMENTS.**

Tom Terwall:

If you're here for one of the two items that are on the agenda, since both of those items are public hearings, we would ask that you hold your comments until the public hearing is held so we can incorporate your comments as an official part of this meeting. However, if you want to raise an issue that's not on the agenda now would be your opportunity to do so. We'd ask you to step to the microphone and begin by giving us your name and address. Is there anybody wishing to speak under citizens' comments?

6. NEW BUSINESS

A. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF PLAN COMMISSION RESOLUTION #15-12 FOR A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT to amend Appendix 9-3 Neighborhood Plan #2 for the Barnes Creek Neighborhood. The Barnes Creek Neighborhood is bounded by 89th and 91st Streets on the north, STH 32 (Sheridan Road) on the east, STH 165 (104th Street) on the south and the Kenosha County Bike Trail on the west in the Village.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission and the audience, Item A is public hearing and consideration of Plan Commission Resolution 15-12 for a comprehensive plan amendment to amend Appendix 9-3 Neighborhood Plan #2 for the Barnes Creek Neighborhood Plan. The Barnes Creek neighborhood is bounded by 89th Street and 91st Streets on the north, State Highway 32 or Sheridan Road on the east, State Highway 165 or 104th Street on the south, and 30th Avenue or the Kenosha County Bike Trail on the west all being in the Village of Pleasant Prairie.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to present the staff comments for the record and to provide some background information regarding this petition's request. As part of the land division, planning and development process in the Village of Pleasant Prairie, a neighborhood plan must be created for each neighborhood geographic area in order to guide its development, and that development plan must be consistent with all of the components of the Village's 2035 Comprehensive Plan including the Land Use Plan and the Zoning Ordinance.

For historical reference, the first Comprehensive Plan for the Village of Pleasant Prairie was adopted in 1967 as a part of the Kenosha Urban Planning District. Updates to this plan were adopted in 1996 and then again in 2009, each time with extensive community input. The current Comprehensive Plan guides the Village Plan Commission and Village Board in their development decisions through the plan design year 2035. Each of these Comprehensive Plans and an analysis of their various components, along with citizen input were used to develop the current Land Use Plan.

In the hierarchy of community planning, the Land Use Plan provides an overview of the general land use types, intensity and density. A neighborhood plan refines the Land Use Plan for a particular neighborhood. A conceptual plan provides additional details for a part of the neighborhood plan. Plats and site and operational plans provide specific details for the Conceptual Plan, and that allows construction to take place on a certain site. So in the slide on

the wall you can see that there is a hierarchy to the planning process in Pleasant Prairie. And, again, this is a process that we have been doing here for over 25 years. It's a very deliberate and methodical process in order to allow for future development to occur in our community.

So I'll begin with the development of the Land Use Plan. The Comprehensive Plan is an adopted blueprint which provides direction for the Village based upon a set of goals, objectives and recommendations that includes Village policies and programs in order to guide the future development and redevelopment of public and private property. The Land Use Plan, which is a component of the Comprehensive Plan, contains a listing of the amount, type, intensity and density of existing and proposed uses of land in the Village. The Land Use Plan seeks to preserve and protect environmental, archeological and other significant lands. The Land Use Plan analyzes trends in supply and demand of land uses, opportunities for redevelopment and potential for land use conflicts. The Comprehensive Plan, adopted prior to the then State deadline of January 1, 2010 also contains projections, based upon background information and research for the community's growth for the next 25 years or in this case our plan is to the design year 2035.

What I'd like to do is just briefly go through for everyone the Land Use Plan that's been adopted by the community. The Land Use Plan then outlines the general types of land uses that are permitted in different areas of the community. And as shown on the slide the 2035 plan has seen some amendments since 2009-2010, but that is an accurate plan as we see it.

Residential lands are those areas -- could I just have you just slide a little bit further, just a little bit that way? Thanks. Residential lands are those land uses that have been broken down into four different categories. There's a low density category which on our map are all of those areas that are identified in yellow. Low density residential for our Land Use Plan means that 19,000 square feet or more per dwelling unit would be planned in those areas. The low-medium density is between 12,000 and 18,999 square feet per dwelling unit. And those areas are the tan areas. The bulk of our residential is identified in this particular land use classification.

The upper-medium density has 6,200 to 11,999 square foot per dwelling unit, and those areas are identified as the orange areas on the map. And the high density areas are those that average less than 6,200 square feet per dwelling unit. We have very few, but there are a couple of these brown areas in the Village of Pleasant Prairie.

The next classification is identified in the pink color on the map, and this is pretty much located in the center off of 39th Avenue and 165, and that's identified as a mixed land use designation. Also the future Village Green Center for the community.

The next classification are the red areas. The red areas are identified as commercial lands. And there are a number of commercial lands on Sheridan Road, Sheridan Road at 91st Street. There's some commercial lands at the intersection of Highway 165 and 31, some commercial lands out by the Interstate at 165, also up at C. And then a large amount of commercial land has been identified along Highway 50 and then coming down Highway 31.

The commercial lands have been designated in certain categories. There's an N on some of the maps which reflects neighborhood retail and service centers, a C which is community retail and service centers, F which is freeway-oriented service center, O which is freeway office centers, an R which is freeway-oriented retail. The last three classifications were done with a PDD, and

those areas are just west of the Interstate. We have a BA-1, BA-2 and BA-3 areas. Again, this is very unique for a very specific property and a specific project in that location.

The next type of land use on the land use plan are the other transportation, communication and utilities lands. This is identified in purple on the map. Such lands include the power plant, the landfill site south of Highway 50, all of the railroads that run through the Village, the weigh station out by the Interstate and Highway ML, and then T which is overhead high tension wires, and we have a number of those throughout the Village as well. When they encompass larger easements they're clearly shown on the Land Use Plan map.

The next designation is governmental and institutional land uses, and they're identified in blue on the map. These areas identify M for municipal administrative offices, F for the fire station, P for the police station, H for hospital, and then the three designations for schools, E for elementary school, MS for a middle School and S for senior high school. So, again, those are identified as blue areas on the map.

The industrial lands are identified in gray. Again, we've been planning for industrial areas for years. The largest industrial area is right in the center of the community identified as the LakeView Corporate Park. And then we do have some industrial areas that are actually to the west of the Interstate. The industrial lands are divided up into L for limited industrial, G for general industrial, P for production and manufacturing, and CA PDD-1 and, again, that corresponds with those lands west of the Interstate south of Highway C.

The next designation that we have in Pleasant Prairie are the park and recreation and other open space lands. These are shown as the light green on the map. They include neighborhood parks, community parks and regional parks. Our most recently calendar for Pleasant Prairie actually identifies these parks with maps and drawings and photographs and some descriptions of each of these parks. And as most of you know many of them are associated with different schools and different areas, large area park areas. Regional parks would be the Prairie Springs Park. Community parks would be the Village Green Park in the center of the Village area. And then we have neighborhood parks in and around a number of the subdivisions.

The next classification on the map corresponds with some green and blue colors. Those areas are the environmentally significant lands. Pleasant Prairie has a significant amount of those. We have primary and secondary environment corridors which there are a great deal of those down in the Chiswaukee Prairie/Carol Beach area as well as the Des Plaines River Watershed area that extends throughout the Village on the west end, isolated natural areas, wetlands, surface waters and floodplains.

And then the final designation I'd like to talk about is an overlay area, and this is identified as our urban reserve area. And these are identified with cross-hatching. It's a little bit difficult to see at that distance, but there's a number of areas that actually have a cross-hatch designation on them. Those areas have been set aside and can only develop when and if a neighborhood plan is completed and adopted for a particular area, as well as public infrastructure has been extended to that area. By public infrastructure I mean public sanitary sewer and water in order to serve the new growth that's anticipated.

So as I mentioned the next step in our planning process is the neighborhood plan and the development of a neighborhood plan. For land use and infrastructure planning purposes, the

Village is divided into neighborhoods, sub-neighborhoods and special planning districts. Each area varies in size, but it's approximately 1½ square miles in area. These neighborhood areas are typically bounded by transportation features such as arterial roadways, railways or they can be bounded by a body of water such as along the east side of Pleasant Prairie.

Some neighborhoods as you can see cross into the City of Kenosha. Again, as part of our planning process for the Kenosha Planning Urban Area back in 1996 we developed these neighborhood areas so that planning would take place cooperatively with our adjacent neighbor to the north. So as you can see some of the neighborhoods actually transition and move into the City of Kenosha. But there are certain areas that are still in Pleasant Prairie so we do count those as part of our neighborhoods as well. There's about 33 of these such neighborhoods. Neighborhood plans are completed for these areas prior to development. Village neighborhoods, sub-neighborhoods and special planning districts, again, help us guide that planning process as we put together these neighborhood plans.

As previously noted a neighborhood plan is a more refined component of the Land Use Plan and is essential to the orderly growth of the community because it establishes a framework within which future development can occur. A fairly recent example of how a neighborhood plan works is a neighborhood plan that was developed for the Prairie Ridge neighborhood in the very northwest area of the Village. Specifically planning for municipal services to accommodate development and growth in the Prairie Ridge area which is a mixed land use development area along Highway 50 between 88th Avenue and 104th Avenue began more than 20 years ago. And it's helped to contribute to the attractive and orderly growth that will be financially sustainable into the future for the community.

So we went through the comprehensive planning process, the neighborhood planning process, we did a series of traffic impact analysis or traffic studies, and we did a lot of planning in that area in order to determine exactly how and if and when that development could occur. And by working with the landowner we determined how that would work by developing future plans for that particular area. And, again, that area is not fully built out but it's getting there.

Neighborhood plans help municipality or the Village plan for the future provision of public services such as: water, sanitary sewer, storm water management, police and fire protection, schools, parks, and road improvements. In preparing a neighborhood plan many aspects are taken into consideration such as the availability of municipal resources, the capability of the transportation system, compatibility of adjacent land uses, preserving environmental, cultural and historical resources, obtaining input from the community, examining urban design features, community character and architecture, and well as several other factors. Because the Village must remain capable of providing services as the community grows, the Village Board must be able to know with some amount of certainty what type of growth will occur and in which areas of the community.

Despite having the ability to use planning to establish a guide for orderly development, the Village is not, for the most part, the driving force behind growth in the community. The private landowners are. Private landowners decide when to sell and develop their property. Land owners or developers who want to purchase their land approach the Village with a proposed idea or plan and a pre-application staff conference typically occurs.

The Village reviews the land owner's or a developer's proposed plan to ensure that it falls within the framework established by both the Land Use Plan, the subsequent Neighborhood Plan and the associated Zoning District regulations for the area. These reviews help the community determine if the uses proposed by a private land owner or a developer are compatible with the existing surrounding land uses and the planned future uses within the neighborhood.

These reviews involve a great deal of time and effort and research and work by the Village staff as well as the developer. They include research, analysis, meetings, engineering and traffic studies, plan reviews, telephone calls, environmental delineations and studies, evaluations, public input, public meetings and public hearings. These actions help the Village to determine if it can financially provide adequate municipal services for the new development without shifting any of that costs to existing taxpayers in the community. The Village has long followed the practice of requiring new development to pay its own way so that the existing taxpayers would not have to shoulder the financial tax burden for any new development.

Now, moving next specifically to the Barnes Creek Neighborhood Plans. The Barnes Creek Neighborhood is bounded by 89th and 91st Streets on the north, Sheridan Road or State Highway 32 on the east, Highway 165 or 104th Street on the south, and the Kenosha County Bike Trail which is at about 30th Avenue on the west. Springbrook Road is currently one of the only main streets that cut right through. We do have some other roadways to the north in the south Kenosha area, but it's the only local arterial other than 91st that is kind of cutting right through the center of the development. We do have arterials as you can see, though, on all of the perimeter of the neighborhood.

The neighborhood comprises a number of older area including the Springbrook, Brookside Gardens and Hickory Grove Subdivisions. And, again, they're all located to the north end of the development area. There are a number of residential home sites along 28th and 29th Avenues, and they're in the southwest area of the neighborhood. The remainder of the area is primarily farmland but it includes some scattered home sites along the perimeter of the roadways along 165 as well as Sheridan Road and 91st. And in the very northeast corner of the neighborhood is the Keno Drive-In Theater. One other significant area is in the very south corner, southeast corner of the neighborhood, and that is the Chesrow archeological site.

Generally, the Land Use Plan, which is a part of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, shows the following existing and future proposed uses in the neighborhood. Now, what I've done is I've blown up exactly the neighborhood as shown on the Land use Plan. So based on the 2035 Comprehensive Plan the future proposed land uses have been generally identified for the Barnes Creek Neighborhood. There are several areas that are designated as low-medium density residential lands, and this is comprising a mixture of single family and multi-family housing that are located throughout the neighborhood.

[Inaudible Audience Comment]

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Again, the way that the Comprehensive Plan has been identified is that we are just looking at a generalized land use density on the Comprehensive Plan. So overall this entire neighborhood is intended to be developed with a low-medium density land use classification. This is not the

Neighborhood Plan, this is the Comprehensive Land Use Plan just for the boundary area of this particular neighborhood. An area that is designated for community retail and service center which currently has the existing local outdoor drive-in theater on it is located in that very northeastern corner, again, the Keno Theater. It's in an area that's been identified for community commercial and is identified with a C on the comprehensive plan.

There's an area identified as a government and institutional land area, and it's designated for the St. Joe's Nursing Home which is a group quartered area, and that is located in this area. And then a second government and institutional land use area which is shown for a future public elementary school neighborhood park. And as you'll see on the Neighborhood Plan we've adjusted the location, but the Comprehensive Plan kind of showed in more in the central part north of 104th Street.

There are a number a number of environmentally significant lands in this particular area of the Comprehensive Plan. These include environmental corridors, isolated natural areas, wetlands, floodplains and shorelands. These are all designated in the green areas, and they typically follow along the tributaries of the Barnes Creek. The other item I just wanted to take note is of the other significant open lands there's the Chesrow archeological site which is right at the corner of 165 and Sheridan Road.

So that brings us to the landowner's request for the Barnes Creek Neighborhood Plan. The Village has established a very detailed development review process as set forth in Municipal Code Chapter 395. That ordinance is the Land Division and Development Control Ordinance. It was initially adopted by the community back in 1990. To further provide direction to landowners, the Village staff conducts a pre-application staff conference, and we also provide a developer checklist for land divisions and developments. This describes all of the steps required when proposing new development in the Village.

The request to complete a Neighborhood Plan for the Barnes Creek Neighborhood was submitted by the landowner who was interested in selling his property for a big box development to be located at the southwest corner of State Highway 32 or Sheridan Road and 91st Street to replace the current commercial land use, the Keno Drive-In outdoor theater at the location.

In order to obtain direction from the community, the landowner has requested approval of Barnes Creek Neighborhood Plan Alternative #1 that depicts a 150,000 square foot big box retail supercenter at that southwest corner of 91st Street and Sheridan Road. This alternative also presents a slightly higher overall residential density than what is allowed for in the current Land Use Plan. So we're going to leave that alternative 1 up for just a minute. We're going to come back to each of the alternatives, but I'm just providing a general overview first.

So due to Village staff concerns for the proposed land uses presented in alternative #1, the staff went ahead and drafted two additional Neighborhood Plan Alternatives for comment and consideration. Alternatives #2 and #3, and we'll be going through them, this is alternative #2, and this is alternative #3. Both alternatives #2 and #3 prepared by Village staff are compliant with 1) the existing Community Retail and Service Center land use designation that's in the Land Use Plan for the most part, and the B-2, Community Business Zoning District for the area in the northeast corner of the Neighborhood.

Again, when I said for the most part there is one exception, and that's both alternative 2 and 3 do allow for one additional lot at this location to be identified as part of a community commercial designation. This plan also does comply with the overall residential land use density as provided in that Land Use Plan. And, again, that was that low-medium density classification. Therefore, in addition to the Neighborhood Plan based on what's been presented an amendment to the Land Use Plan would be required for these plans. There are some similarities between each of the plan alternatives, and there are some major differences with respect to the alternate plans, and all three will be explained in detail.

So with respect to the Barnes Creek Neighborhood Plan overview I'm going to be looking at them by land use type. Under residential lands, each Neighborhood Plan Alternative shows the existing 324 single family residential units. Again, these are existing residential, and they're all identified in the tan color on the map. So all three maps would show those existing residential single family units. This comprises about 211.5 acres of this neighborhood. This includes areas west of 22nd Avenue, north of 93rd Street, an area north of Highway 165 or 104th Street, areas adjacent to both 28th and 29th Avenues and areas adjacent to 91st street and Sheridan Road. So, again, all of the areas I've just reference are the areas that are in that low-medium density classification.

In addition, each alternative includes the existing units at St. Joe's property which includes some residential apartments. Proposed residential land by various conceptual density types is shown throughout the northern, central and southern portions of the neighborhood. It is important to note that while the number of multi-family units is shown on each building, the total number of buildings is not an automatic approval of that exact number of units shown for each development. So what I mean by that is in each of these areas there's boxes that delineate a multi-family building. And in each of these boxes there's a number. It could be 2, 10, 12, 36, 40, and that represents the number of units that was proposed as part of this alternative 1 plan.

But just to be clear as each individual project is developed it is still a requirement that they need to meet certain standards for setbacks, fire access and parking. So at this level of planning that detailed analysis was not done. This was done just as an overview as part of a refinement to the Land Use Plan. That typically would be covered in the next planning step or the conceptual plan step.

The chart that Peggy is just putting up now is actually a breakdown of the total number of existing and proposed residential units by building type in each alternative. And many of you had an opportunity to take a look at the three plans, and this is a chart that breaks down the numbers. So we've got the residential unit type, alternatives 1, 2 and 3. The existing number of single family units is the same in all three, 324.

The existing multi-family was the same in all three for the St. Joseph's apartments. The proposed single family units alternative 1, 203, alternative 2, 203, and the third is 285. And the proposed two unit buildings 86, 96, 92. Four-unit buildings -- I'm sorry. Oh, the four units are existing, I apologize. And then the six unit buildings 24, 132, 132. Ten unit 280, 280, 280. Proposed 24, 360 in alternative 1, none in alternatives 2 and 3. Proposed forty unit buildings 560 residential units, 480 in 2 and 3. proposed 48-units buildings a total of 96 units. So the total units in the three alternatives, again, the first alternative is 1,977, alternative 2 is 1,651, and alternative 3 is 1,733.

The acres or the area of residential development 506 total for alternative 1; 505.6 and 524 in alternative 3. Net residential density the first alternative is 3.9, the second is 3.27, and this is the total number of units per acre, and alternative 3 is 3.30. The average lot size, and again I spoke of this earlier when we talked about the Land Use Plan, the average lot size per unit in alternative 1 is 11,158, in alternative 2 is 13,339, and alternative 3 is 13,188.

So in accordance with the Village Land Use Plan, the overall net density for the neighborhood is recommended to be within the Low-Medium Density Residential land use category with the average lot area being between 12,000 square feet 18,999 square feet. This allows for some areas of the neighborhood to have larger residential lots while some areas will have smaller residential lots or be developed as multi-family. The net density of the alternative #1 has an average lot size, again of 11,128 which is outside the lot size per dwelling allowed for this neighborhood per the Comprehensive Plan. Alternatives 2 and 3 have an average lot size of 13,339 and 13,188 respectively and are within the density range as shown on the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

With respect to population projections for the neighborhood, the vacant portions of the neighborhood will not develop until the land owners wish to develop their land which makes neighborhood planning essential for the growth of the community. The Neighborhood Plan is used by the community to evaluate the proposed population growth patterns in order to track growth on an incremental basis as the neighborhood develops over time so that it can be appropriately served by the municipality.

Based on the 2010 census information for the Village, the average number of persons per household is 2.71 and school age children between the ages of 5 and 19 make up 22.6 percent of the population. The Village provides copies of proposed developments to the Kenosha Unified School District to assist in their long-range planning. Pursuant to the information provided by the KUSD for Pleasant Prairie, 42 percent of the new dwelling units will have new students that will attend public schools.

The long range population projections at full build out at 2035 for this neighborhood, alternatives 1, 2 and 3 are shown on the slide. With full build out, again, that can come 20 to 25 to 30 years from now, alternative 1 986, alternative 2 986, number 3 986 for current population. Proposed population 5,358 under alternative 1, 4,474 under alternative at full build out, and 4,696 under alternative 3 at full build out. So the estimate of school age children 830 under alternative 1, 693 under alternative 2, and 728 under alternative 3.

The next area I'd like to talk about is community commercial areas. All three plans show a commercial area at that southwest corner of Highway 32 and 91st Street. However, the areas shown for all three are not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan requires that the Land Use Plan and the Neighborhood Plans be consistent with the Village Zoning Ordinances both the Zoning Text and the Map. As such, the Village established specific Zoning Ordinance Districts to reflect the various commercial land use designations identified in the Land Use Plan. That's something that I talked about at the very beginning when I talked about all those different classifications, C for commercial, N for neighborhood, F for freeway oriented.

The Land Use Plan identifies land on this corner as a community retail and service center to provide community level retail and service facilities in a medium density residential urban area. Specifically, the community retail and service area corresponds with the B-2, Community Business Zoning District, which only allows for buildings to range in size from 4,000 to 25,000 square feet, and it's intended to provide for a cluster of retail, service or office uses.

Alternative #1: Alternative #1 shows approximately 19.3 acres that encroach into the portion of the environmental areas to the west. This alternative shows a 150,000 square foot big box retail store at the corner and a 30,000 square foot building to the south. As indicated previously, a 150,000 square foot big box retail store shown in alternative #1 is six times larger than the maximum commercial building size of the B-2 District which is only 25,000 square feet.

It's important to note that alternative #1 provides for a land use that would be classified in the Village's Land Use Plan as a Freeway-Oriented Regional Retail Center land use designation. This land use designation corresponds with the B-3, Regional Retail Business District, which would allow for big box retail with a minimum floor area of 50,000 square feet per building. The Freeway-Oriented areas near I-94 freeway interchanges and the Land Use Plan anticipate continued strong demand for regional retail but along I-94.

Under alternatives 2 and they both show similar commercial layouts with approximately 18.3 acres of commercial land with no encroachment to the environmental features. Both alternatives indicate small commercial buildings ranging in size from 8,900 square feet to 24,000 square feet. They comply with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan with respect to the building size. With, again, a minor exception of that additional commercial area, that additional lot to the south. The smaller commercial development would be created to meet the requirements of the B-2 District with no more than 25,000 square feet permitted per building for each of its own parcels. Six parcels could be created each meeting the minimum two acre lot size with a minimum of 150 feet on a public road as required by the B-2 District. These alternatives would require shared parking and cross-access easements and agreements.

The southernmost commercial lot on each alternative, alternative1 the 30,000 square foot building and alternatives 2 and 3, an 11,000 square foot building, is not identified on the Land Use Plan currently as commercial. If any of the alternatives are being considered for approval, it is important to note that the Land Use Plan Map would need to be amended first to include this area in the Community Retail and Service Center land use designation.

In addition, alternative #1 does not comply with the Land Use Plan as stated above. The Commercial Community Retail and Service Center designation does not allow for big box retail in the B-2 District. If alternative #1 is approved an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, not only the Land Use Plan but other areas of the Comprehensive Plan would need to be amended to allow for big box at this location.

In addition, the corresponding commercial land use designation would more likely be Freeway-Oriented Regional Retail Center. Therefore a new policy direction would need to be provided and re-evaluated by the community to determine if big box retail should be allowed in other areas of the Village not just by the freeway. If this direction is pursued, other changes to the Zoning Ordinance may also be required since the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance shall be consistent.

The next area is government and institution area. All three alternatives show approximately 40.8 acres of land identified as Governmental/Institutional land uses, including: the existing St. Joseph's facility at the northwest corner of 93rd Street and 29th Avenue and a site approximately 26.4 acres which is along 104th street for a future elementary school and park. It's approximately where 22nd Avenue would come through to the south. The Village staff continues to work with the Kenosha Unified School District on proposed developments and the locating of future schools. This site is intended for development in approximately 15-20 years depending on the development status of the surrounding neighborhood and the need for another elementary school in this area to serve the community.

With respect to open space areas on the neighborhood plans, the neighborhood plan includes the following types of open space: public park which includes the Brookside Gardens Park which is the recently renamed area, the former Manutronics site, primary environmental corridor, isolated natural areas, wetlands, 100-year floodplain and other open space. Open spaces range from 267.5 acres to 331.9 acres in the three alternatives. These are areas that have been identified in green and gray. Primarily the gray areas reflect the isolated natural areas on the plan.

- Alternative #1 identifies approximately 267.5 acres or 30.3 percent of the lands within the neighborhood would remain as open space.
- Alternative #2 identifies approximately 268.7 acres or 30.5 percent of the lands that would be open space.
- Alternative #3 which has the most open space is 331.9 acres or 37, almost 38 percent of the land within the neighborhood that would remain as open space.

Each alternative shows the existing 10-acre park for Brookside Garden Park between 26th and 24th Avenues. Each alternative shows 31.3 acres of isolated natural areas. Again there are woodlands, wetlands, floodplain and other areas that are deemed to be approved for preservation. And each alternative shows approximately 166.4 acres of land for primary environmental corridor. Again, that's primarily adjacent to the waterways of the Barnes Creek and its tributaries.

Each alternative also shows the location of the 100-year floodplain. The floodplain is located adjacent to the Barnes Creek and its tributaries throughout the neighborhood. Prior to consideration of any conceptual plan or any other detailed site planning on the property, there would need to be a detailed field verification of the 100-year floodplain or any other environmental on the property.

Any development that constricts the flow of water or reduces floodplain storage which may create upstream or downstream flooding problems and reduces capacity of the floodplain to store water is prohibited. In some instances property can be removed from the floodplain, but this is only with the proper floodplain boundary adjustment, engineering analysis. And that equal amount of floodplain would need to be recreated within this neighborhood.

In addition there would always need to be additional regulatory approvals from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and the Federal Emergency Management Agency. In addition,

again, there would need to be an equal volume classification, equal volume characteristics that would allow for areas to be filled if new areas are created. The last thing that I would like to say about floodplains is that any area that is in the floodplain that is going to be filled needs to be filled to an elevation at least two feet above the elevation of the regional flood elevation to avoid any potential problems. Again, in Pleasant Prairie we don't allow any development within the floodplain.

Each alternative shows the location of interpolated wetlands. What I mean by that is that prior to any development occurring within a conceptual plan or a site and operational plan the developer would be required to have field verified wetlands by a biologist. At this point they're interpolated by the Regional Planning Commission and by the Wisconsin DNR. They're mapped as final wetlands, but again they're subject to that interpolation and further delineation. And that work needs to be done and they have to be verified by both the DNR and the Corps of Engineers prior to any development that could take place.

And typically these environmental areas are not delineated right now. We're using the aerial photo interpretations because those delineations are typically valid for five years or less. If there are a lot of changes in the environment and development is not imminent then that verification and that delineation that was done five years ago may not last five years. It may only last a couple of years. So it's important to note that that has not yet been done on this property or any of these properties.

Each alternative indicates other open spaces, and this is what causes the variation in the open space classification and the category of the percentage of open space. Between alternatives 1 and 2 they're very similar because they're based on the similar road layout pattern as it relates to the single family development. So alternatives 1 and 2 have that more traditional look to a single family development in Pleasant Prairie. They have public roads, larger lots that are anywhere from a third to a half acre in size. And a lot of the open space is incorporated then into those individual lots.

Alternative #3, however, that's a little different. We decided to introduce a newer concept for alternative 3, and that new concept would provide for smaller single family lots that could be single family or they could be condominium with the open spaces around each unit to be common open space for the development. These single family units would front upon private roads, and the intent is that every unit in this particular area would abut upon green space. So as you can see there's green space on all perimeters inside the development area and outside. And that would be the same thing this area to the south and the same thing to the area to the west. It's kind of a new concept. We thought it could work as a gated community. Again, it would have private streets in these particular areas. The multi-family areas on alternatives 2 and 3 are the same. Again, it's alternative 1 that the density of the multi-family was much higher.

The other open spaces include future stormwater management facilities, retention basins which are shown on each of the alternatives. And at the time that a conceptual plan, again which is that next level of detail or a detailed site and operational plan is submitted for any portion of the neighborhood, the developer's engineer would be required to evaluate the development site based on actual field conditions. And they would need to provide detailed stormwater management plans which meet all the Village requirements.

Now I'd like to go into a Barnes Creek Neighborhood plans overview analysis.

1. Availability of sanitary sewer and water: For all three Neighborhood Plan Alternatives all new residential, governmental and institutional and commercial development are required to be connected to the municipal sanitary sewer and water facilities as a condition of development approval. For any new residential development to occur in the neighborhood, sanitary sewer would need to be extended from south to north based on the grade of the land and the depth of the sanitary sewer line. So what I'm saying is that all new residential development would likely need to begin near Highway 165 or 104th Street and progress northward.

New commercial development as proposed at the southwest corner of 91st Street and Sheridan Road would not be able to develop until a new water distribution line project is completed in 2016 along Sheridan Road. In the Village's Capital Improvements Plan, the Village had planned for a new water distribution line along Sheridan Road in order to protect the integrity of its two main water transmission lines that transport water from the Kenosha Water Utility into Pleasant Prairie. The commercial corner at 91st and Sheridan Road already has a temporary access to municipal sanitary sewer on 91st Street. Additional development or redevelopment would require access to the sanitary sewer main at about 92nd Street at Sheridan Road.

So for that corner only up here there's a temporary connection to the City of Kenosha system. And if it's redeveloped or developed for any purpose a new connection would have to come from the Village's main not from the City of Kenosha's main. All other lands to be developed would be required to have all of these services prior to any development.

2. Transportation system and access analysis: All new residential, governmental and institutional and commercial development must evaluate the traffic impact generated by a new development. This analysis typically begins at the Neighborhood Plan review step. Roadways must be designed and specific access defined to allow traffic to move throughout the neighborhood and throughout community.

The Barnes Creek Neighborhood is adjacent to two state highways, State Highway 165 on the south and State Highway 32 along the east. Springbrook Road runs on an angle diagonal through the neighborhood, and 22nd Avenue serves as a local arterial or collector street within the Barnes Creek Neighborhood. These State highways and local arterial and collector streets carry local traffic and traffic for those passing through the community.

A Traffic Impact Analysis is also referred to as a TIA. So a TIA is required to be completed by a traffic engineer to determine the amount of right-of-way needed, the type of improvements required to address the future traffic increases, the type of intersection improvements needed, and the location and number of driveway access points to continue to move the traffic in and around the area. The TIA will also provide time lines as to when improvements may be warranted based upon proposed development patterns. A preliminary TIA which the Village has and was put out on the website, has already been prepared by the Wal-Mart Super Center traffic consultant for their proposed big box development.

There are several preliminary comments and concerns from both the Village and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation regarding the impacts of the proposed big box retail store on the adjacent and nearby roadway system as reflected in the traffic study and the Wisconsin DOT letter which was dated June 27, 2013. Also, since 91st Street is in the City of Kenosha jurisdiction, the City will also need to be afforded the opportunity to provide comments regarding the traffic study and any required improvements.

It is important to note that a TIA not only looks at existing traffic counts but puts great emphasis on future traffic counts to be generated which is based on the land uses being proposed. The TIA cannot be completed for final review or evaluation until the Neighborhood Plan is completed and adopted.

All of the Neighborhood plan alternatives 1, 2 and 3 show existing and proposed access roadways and driveways to the local arterials, collector streets and state highways generally at the same locations. Some intersections are shown as a typical four-way intersection which may or may not include stop signs or signals, and some are shown as roundabouts. As noted on each of the alternatives, the type of intersection will be determined by the TIA. The TIA will need to be approved by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, the Village and the City of Kenosha.

Neighborhood planning also involves examining how other local roadways connect to these arterials and how traffic will flow throughout the neighborhood. Due to the larger amount of environmental features within the neighborhood, what is being proposed are two main boulevard streets on all three alternatives. There is a proposed north/south boulevard with roundabouts connecting to 165 on the south at about 22nd Avenue and to the north at Springbrook Road at 29th Avenue. So this is the main north/south road through the development. Again, roundabouts are shown on the south, in the center and at the north. This is a very precarious intersection with five different legs that are coming into that particular area.

There is an east/west boulevard leading from Highway 32 or Sheridan Road at 97th Street and extending west to 28th and 29th Avenues. Again, a boulevard road is shown, a roundabout is at this time shown on Sheridan Road, a roundabout in the center, and then connections to the two 28th and 29th Avenues on the west.

These collector roadways intersect in the center with the roundabout. These roadway locations were carefully laid out based on environmental features of the site with limited crossings of environmental areas at the narrowest parts. Roadway crossings of these environmental features require detailed environmental delineations, surveys, and detailed engineering plans along with approvals and permits from other government agencies. The Village staff believes that these two boulevard collector roadways are very important to move traffic throughout this neighborhood and from neighborhood to another.

3. Compatibility with adjacent land uses analysis: The Alternate #1 Neighborhood Plan commercial area for a proposed big box retail store is not compatible with the adjacent land uses. The negative impacts to be generated from the development at this location far outweigh the benefits to the community. Big box retail development should be located in proximity to other retail uses in a freeway regional area or regional commercial area

where the surrounding residential land uses would not be negatively impacted by the operations of the commercial activities. The regional retail commercial operations could negatively impact the quality of life for residents in close proximity to the development, along with placing undue burdens on the local community for services.

Such negative impacts could include, but would not be limited to traffic congestion, noises from vehicles, trucks, back up truck beeping, banging of trucks, garbage dumpster and compactor usage and collection noises, parking lot and building light pollution, garbage and debris, stray shopping carts, electronic signage flashing and glare, patrons on site after hours, increases in crime, site and landscaping maintenance issues, and illegal pods and trailer storage brought on site to deal with surplus goods and services.

4. Preservation of environmental and archeological resources analysis: As reflected in the neighborhood plans, the Village staff is recommending the preservation of the environmental corridors and the wooded isolated natural areas within the neighborhood. For the most part, these areas are interconnected by the Barnes Creek and its tributaries. At the southeast corner of the neighborhood is a property that was donated by the land owner and designated as an archeological site-referred to as the Chesrow site.
5. Compliance with the Village's Land Division and Development Control Ordinance process: While the Village has not yet received any formal submitted application request for an amendment to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan modification on behalf of the land owner or the retailer, a rough draft of the Wal-Mart Conceptual Plan and a preliminary traffic study were submitted for the Village staff's initial review, and an initial pre-application staff conference was held regarding the placement of a big box retailer at the referenced location.

Because the size of the big box store depicted in the land owner's proposed neighborhood plan it was identified that it was six times larger than the maximum commercial building size currently allowed in this area, and because of the higher residential housing density proposed in the neighborhood, the developer must request amendments to the 2035 Comprehensive Land Use Plan and the Zoning Map and Text in order to proceed. Under the Village's current master planning document which is that 2035 Comprehensive Land Use Plan and the corresponding zoning which is that B-2 District, the maximum commercial building size currently allowed on this corner is 25,000 square feet. In addition, the density proposed is higher than that allowed for in the Land Use Plan.

As indicated previously, the Village's Land Division and Development Control Ordinance and the developer checklist sets forth required steps to follow for the approval process in the community. As noted in a January 22, 2015 Village staff letter to the landowner, in quotes, in order for the Village to process the landowner's request for the Barnes Creek Neighborhood Plan, which will be a component of the Village's Comprehensive Plan, a complete application shall be submitted along with the required application fee of \$225 for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment. The application shall be in the form of written letter that details the specific amendments to the Village Comprehensive Plan that you are requesting. This direction was again provided by the Village staff in a letter to the land owner on February 22, 2015.

As noted in the letter, upon receipt of the required application materials, the Village staff will process your request in a timely manner; however, we feel obliged to caution you that your proposed Neighborhood Plan for Barnes Creek Alternative 1 does not comply with the Village Comprehensive Land Use Plan in that the southwest corner of STH 32 and 91st Street, which is identified as Community Retail and Service Center would not allow for the big box retail that you are proposing at this location. In addition, the Village staff indicated again to the landowner that the Comprehensive Plan component, the Land Use Plan, must be amended either prior to or at the same time as consideration of the Neighborhood Plan. The request for the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Amendment was not submitted.

6. Economic impact on the Village services: The Village has made a land use commitment about 20 years ago that major regional retail and big box retail centers in the community would be located along I-94 in proximity to 165 and along Highway 50 with Village's resources for major retail services focused in those areas. Locating a major big box retailer on the east end of the community does not allow for an efficient and effective use of the Village's municipal resources.
7. Examining urban design features, community character and architecture: Urban design features, community character and architecture would need to be closely reviewed and approved for the entire neighborhood. The Village has not yet received any detailed architectural plans for a big box retail store for review. The architectural design of the building and site is critically important to the review of the property and its future use.

And finally I'd like to mention that in order to obtain public input on these Neighborhood Plan Alternatives, the Village sent the required notices to property owners within the neighborhood and within 300 feet of the neighborhood boundaries. Over 640 notices went out to Village and City residents. We then posted and published the required 30 day notice in the *Kenosha News*. In addition, the Village on its website solicited public input in an open Village Hall forum. And as a point of information, this information is also out there, and all of the comments of individuals that posted concerns regarding these neighborhood plans and other issues.

In addition, I just wanted to mention that we did receive some additional comments to the Village Clerk and to the Village administrative staff that came in on Friday as well as today. And those additional items have also been provided to you or have been placed in front of you. Those are concerns and emails from additional residents above the other ones. In addition, the staff has spoke with or met with approximately 50 people who came into the Village Hall to take a look at the neighborhood plans and the process and to get information. And this afternoon a public open house was held. There was no formal presentation at that time, but there was a good lively discussion about the various neighborhood plans. And I think we had between 80 and 100 people that attended this afternoon to gather some additional information.

Many of them are back this evening, and they signed up this afternoon. But also many of them signed up to speak this evening as part of the public hearing record. And then in addition staff reminds me that we also did receive some written comments that we will make part of the record as well from folks that could not come back this evening but were at the public open house this afternoon. So with that I'd like to continue the public hearing. I think it would be best to begin with the landowner and his application and listen to any comments that he has for our public

meeting and public record. And then we do have a number of signups. And I would recommend that we start with those signups. And then anybody else in the audience that didn't get a chance to sign up that we can call them in an orderly fashion to come up to speak for the record.

Steve Mills:

Thank you. My name is Steve Mills, and I am the owner or I should say I represent the owner tonight of Berwick Properties and Mills Holdings. Ninety percent of the entity is owned by my children. S.R. Mills is here tonight, Kathleen and Elizabeth who are not. Ten percent is owned by Marty Mills, their mom, and the balance myself, the balance of that 10 percent. The property is 556 acres. And it is basically the subject of this land plan and the fact that the other properties that make up the 200 and some odd other acres are already basically built out. So that I think we're the subject matter for the evening.

The history of this property goes back 39 years. I acquired the first component of this I believe in 1976. It was the Duma farm. The address was 9501 29th Avenue, 60 acres, an old farmhouse and barns and buildings. And Marty Mills and I moved in and made that our home. And it was a true fixer upper going back to those days. Actually had two houses, one of them we had to burn down. But over the next four decades, 39 years, I've acquired the other parcels that make up this 556 acres when those parcels became available. There's actually another 100 acres down the road, down Sheridan Road called Tobin Creek which we also developed probably a decade or so ago. That as I believe, Jean could probably tell, 93 lots I believe on about 100 acres.

My son and I -- first of all I guess it's fair to say that we're here bringing this land plan forward. We've owned much of this property a very long time. I don't believe that I will probably see this property fully developed in my lifetime. I thought while I was still kicking we'd at least bring a plan forward. So Jean did a very eloquent presentation. And I thank her for the comments. I'm here tonight with my son, S.R. In the past we've had a land planner, our engineers and environmental consultants, and we worked on this plan for about three years.

I'd like to thank Jean Werbie-Harris, Peggy Herrick and Mike Pollocoff specifically for the time and the effort and professionalism throughout this whole process. While we didn't always agree and still don't we've never had anything but courtesy from the Plan Commission, and it was never mean spirited or adversarial. It was all business and we appreciate that.

My vision for this property really includes Sheridan Road. And it includes Sheridan Road from 75th Street I believe all the way to the State Line. When I came to Kenosha in 1971 South Sheridan Road was a very vibrant area. It had a commercial corridor. There were auto dealerships. There were grocery stores, a Kroger's. There was a big box retailer, Arlen's if anybody remembers that, and many other prosperous businesses. Arlen's wasn't so prosperous. It did eventually close, and that's where the County has a facility there today.

I guess I looked at this plan as maybe a rebirth of that corridor. Our Alternative Plan 1 calls for approximately 1,900 housing units on 506 acres, about 3.9 units per acre, very similar to what Jean and her group have basically brought forward. And it is as we look at it very low density, and we believe that we're sticking close to the plan. We can work that out. These new residences will need shopping and neighborhood services. Our plan accomplishes that. It also

provides these services to all south Kenosha, Pleasant Prairie and really Green Bay Road east of Lake Michigan.

We have an interest in our commercial site for the most successful and well capitalized retailer in the world. I don't believe there will ever be another Arlan's. Their interest, their market research, their commitment to invest \$10 to \$15 million in this location proves to me, again, that they've done their homework, that it will work at this site if we're allowed to put it there. The possible addition of a Wal-Mart or a big box retailer to this corner I think would be a game changer in a positive way. It would bring business and commerce up and down Sheridan Road and I believe, again, from 75th Street all the way to the State Line. We might bump out the old book store and maybe knock off another vacant gas station down on south Sheridan Road. I think south Sheridan Road in Kenosha has had some significant progress in the last few years with new business with a Culver's, a Taco Bell, an Auto Zone, a Walgreens.

Our vision or my vision, right or wrong, was that that also could be accomplished on the site that we own here. My family would be willing, as Jean mentioned, to do a neighborhood shopping center of about 30,000 square feet which they call a shadow anchor to a Wal-Mart where we'd have 1,200 square feet to 5,000 square foot users. And we could fill that space because of the amount of people that Wal-Mart would bring to this location. One of our concerns or my concern is without an anchor at this corner the ability to backfill this space with small users or six 25,000 square foot users is not practical. The land area on 91st and Sheridan Road consists of 56.98 acres with about 34.5 usable for the assessor, Pleasant Prairie Assessor. Clearly it's certainly the balance is wetlands, 34.51. It's certainly large enough to accommodate the proposed uses that we're talking about.

And I guess I go back, again, many years as you can see by the ownership of this property, and I'm a principal in a real estate company called the Bear Real Estate Group. We've been around since 1924 in this area and this County. I promise I'm not that old. I started with I.J. Bear in 1973. That is 42 years ago. I've seen Kenosha County in the worst of time, and I now believe I see it in the best of times. Progress and what has happened in the I-94 corridor and the throughout the marketplace is finding its way out of a very tough recession that there were not too many prisoners taken in the business world. And those of us who survived are very optimistic.

I and my company were also part of development of that Highway 50 corridor that Jean talks about, and we're very proud of that. I know a local farmer who acquired 300 acres on the corner of 104th Avenue and Highway 50. And we did that in 1980. It was the Neblong Farm, and we raised corn there until about 1992. And that parcel is on the north side of Highway 50, Prairie Ridge is on the south side. Later actually when we acquired it that property on the north side was in Pleasant Prairie. And because of the incorporation it found its way into the City of Kenosha.

Many positive things have happened in that corridor where once we were raising corn. And on the north side of the road between about 86th Avenue and 104th Street we did most of that development where we had the land and supplied that to the developers that came into the market. That started in about '92. We just sold our last site, at least in the 300 acre site, actually we didn't sell it, we developed it where Concordia University is. And the reason I say that is it looked much like Sheridan Road. And I believe that the 869 housing units that were put on the Neblong farm, we built 1,212 condominium units, retail, office, Candlewood Suites that we own, we built a hotel there, banks and financial locations, two assisted living facilities, daycare, day school,

adult education with Concordia, a new backfilling of a building with a medical and surgical center that's just gone in across from Aurora. And numerous other tenants that are occupying that space up and down Sheridan Road, excuse me, up and down Highway 50 I would like to emulate in this Sheridan Road corridor.

I believe that, again, with the retailer that has expressed interest in this site being the most successful retailer and most well capitalized one in the world that this location would prosper. And the area from Green Bay Road east, State Line north, 75th Street south people need to go someplace and shop. And it's basically a department store. Whether it's all under one roof or spread out across multiple 25,000 square foot boxes it can draw to this location and this location and also all of Sheridan Road.

The elephant in the room here, though, and it's why I think a lot of people are here tonight is the Keno Drive-In Theater. And so I thought I'd just make some comments in reference to that. I acquired the Keno Drive-In in 1996. And the Keno has had its ups and downs. Immediately after I bought the Keno in 1997 Cinemark Tinseltown came to town with 14 screens. And they opened in Kenosha and immediately put three other theaters out of business. We were the lone survivor. And because we didn't really generate our livelihood off of the Keno we fed it and kept it open. It was sort of like David and Goliath.

So for many years we made some money and we lost some money. And we had a lot of fun running the Keno. We gave away tickets to customers in our real estate business, to our tenants, to charity raffles, employees and their kids. Sometimes I even gave them to strangers who looked like they were having a bad day. Here's a couple tickets to the drive-in. As I said, we had fun and liked the notoriety. I can tell you right now I and my family don't care much for the notoriety because of the fact we're in the cross-hairs of having to close it.

The Keno was purchased for what it is and that's a commercial corner to be developed as a shopping center when retail parcels to the south were assembled, this map. The time is now and the plan is needed to move our 556 acre parcel forward, and that's really why we're here. The Keno itself, the facilities which is evident if you were ever to drive by in the spring we lose a number of boards off of that screen, four by eight pieces fly around the infield so to speak, and we get to put them all back up. And Jim was here a little earlier, and Jeff who really worked that Keno and loved it for many, many years they did a lot of that work. We usually supplied the capital. The screen, the projection room, the concession stand they all are in dire need of replacement. They're 67 years old.

Kind of the straw that broke the camel's back was the new digital equipment meaning that we can't get movies now without spending \$80,000 to \$100,000 in new equipment for the ability to play movies at the facility. We can't insure the facilities on the site, meaning the buildings, for loss due to their age and conditions. There are certain possible code violations that if enforced to the letter to be too prohibitive financially to cure. And we don't want to wait around for that. And Pleasant Prairie has been very good kind of letting us limp along.

We're open about five, six months a year, and we have five employees. I think Wal-Mart has 250 full-time employees and 350 including their part-time. So I can go into all of the reasons why it makes sense potentially to put that kind of an engine on Sheridan Road. But I don't think I'll do that. I know I've chosen not to comment in the press or local newspaper, the TV station, and I

know it's been a hot topic. Our choice was really to come here as business people in the community for a long, long time and air this up and out in front of you, the Plan Commission. We thought that was a proper venue. And really what we're doing tonight is doing just that, we're just kind of giving you our take or our opinion of what we think should happen to Sheridan Road and how what we're proposing at that corner could be a viable alternative and make this side of Pleasant Prairie as attractive as that side of Pleasant Prairie. Because there's a lot of people in Carol Beach and these neighborhoods that I think deserve it.

As far as the Keno is concerned I believe there's a future for a drive-in theater, but it's just not I and my family running it at that location. I believe those who are here to support it should continue to support it. I think they should probably put together a nonprofit type of an organization. I know there's people out there that they've worked very hard, and we might do some contributing, to do, again, a nonprofit organization to be formed. They need to have enough energy and enthusiasm and fundraising ability to prove to the donors that it could be viable and continue to benefit the community. But it's not the responsibility of me or my family to provide that. This was bought as a real estate investment. And we've kind of done what we can do with it. And it's kind of now whether it's an adjacent site next to the Keno, whether it's going to another location. There's lots more people, and if there's a market for it they ought to be able to replace it, again, with us or without us. And those are my thoughts, and I thank you for your time. I am going to ask my son to come up to deal with this land plan and the ultimate economics of it and what we would like to see adjusted or changed or discussed. Thank you.

S.R. Mills:

Thank you, appreciate your time. As my father mentioned I'm going to discuss a few more of the particulars. Really in dealing with Peggy and Jean and Mike and Tom very much appreciate --

--:

Need your name and address.

S.R. Mills:

Sure, S.R. Mills, 4011 80th Street, Kenosha, Wisconsin, thank you. Again, I appreciate all the time and effort that staff and officials have spent with us. As mentioned, our goal tonight is really just to begin the conversation on the neighborhood plan, review the potential important impacts, both positive and negative, and receive feedback from this Commission that will allow us to continue to work with staff to refine the plan. We appreciate that there's multiple steps in this process. Jean did a far better job of explaining that than I ever could as it relates to the land plan, more of a macro look, the neighborhood plan which is what we're dealing with this evening, more granular. And then an eventual concept plan as it relates to site and operational, building elevations, etc.

And to be very clear our expectations tonight are not to vote on on a land plan. We would very much just like to receive that feedback. Two of the main reasons we've tempered our expectations, really we're not all that thrilled with any of the three alternatives either. Again, we believe they all need work, we think that they can get there, but both as it relates to the commercial and the residential we need some thoughts and to roll up our sleeves and to work

through it. Also, we realize the adoption of a neighborhood plan will likely require some plan amendments both from a land use plan and as it relates to the commercial specific to the concept plan. We fully, again, appreciate the process that Jean laid out. And it's sometimes a little cart before the horse here, but in trying to solicit that feedback we will work in conjunction with staff to prepare the necessary land use plan amendments, prepare the detailed concept plans. We just want to make sure we don't get ahead of this body and start proceeding down the path that you don't want us to.

As mentioned, the total neighborhood plan encompasses 881 acres. The commercial component we're discussing this evening is 18 to 19 acres. Open space parks, prime environmental corridor, isolated natural resource approximately 216 acres. And the residential component is about 505 acres plus or minus depending on the plan, 211 of which has already been developed. And I just mention that as a precursor to some of the specifics I'm going to review here first with the commercial. As noted, the northeast corner we actually own 56 contiguous acres there. But the commercial is only denoted as 18 to 19 acres depending on where that final prime environmental corridor line gets set.

Alternatives 2 and 3 that were proposed by staff, and Jean please correct me if I'm wrong on this, but I counted about 106,000 square feet in total when adding up all of the various buildings. It essentially accounts for six to seven users ranging somewhere between 5,000 and 25,000 square feet. It's our understanding of the rule book which we don't think is very applicable here where we could have hypothetically six separate sites, 25,000 square foot building per site. The 106,000 square feet on that 19 acres is about a 13 percent coverage ratio which is what we use often to try and compare it at least from a commercial standpoint to density and intensity of use.

Alternative 1 depicts 150,000 square foot user in addition to a 30,000 square foot box due south of that. The biggest difference between other than there are some obvious square footage differences, but really the bigger question is it small and medium box users versus having one large anchor tenant that acts as a catalyst and a driver of retail traffic. It's our opinion, and it is just that, our opinion, that for this 18 to 19 acre commercial site we need a large anchor for it to be successful as a great retail development. Now whether that anchor is Meijer, Costco, Wal-Mart we feel it's appropriate to have one large user. Fully acknowledge that it is different from the plan as it's written today where we would have six 25,000 square foot users or some deviation of such. We're just trying to compare apples to apples.

A good example is right across the street at Village Center. Village Center I believe has 24 acres of commercial that has been approved, neighborhood plan approved, probably not concept plan at this point. Approximately 135,000 to 267,000 square feet on the 24 acres due west of here. It's a coverage ratio of 13 percent to 26 percent. So that site is currently planned for small to medium box retail in that center, so that would be a different experience, a different type of retail product than what we're proposing at least in alternative 1 on the subject commercial site.

One of the topics brought up that we would like to discuss this evening or discuss at a future time is the police and fire and the concern with proximity. It's our thought being one and a half miles from 130,000 to 260,000 square feet of proposed it seems that they would not be out on an island there. We recognize that having an outpost where police and fire have to constantly go to or have to go to and juggle that drive time could be a lot of balance. Our thought is, though, that it's still within the wheelhouse here given its proximity to the Village Center and the Village Hall.

We also believe, and we've agreed to disagree with staff on this, that one larger user would be easier to manage from a police/fire issue standpoint because you have one point of contact versus multiple smaller users. But that's something that we can certainly debate and discuss. The biggest issue just to go full circle on it is the size difference from what was proposed in alternative 2 and 3 with 106,000 square feet versus what we've proposed to 180,000 square feet. We're certainly willing to discuss what's appropriate. And really our goal this evening was to try and solicit that feedback so we can modify it accordingly and put something together that the Plan Commission feels is reasonable, staff feels is reasonable and would work for us as well on the commercial side.

On the residential it's easy to look at this 881 acre plan, and we're spending probably a disproportionate amount of time on the commercial, not that it's not important, but very much concerned, and the balance of the residential is something that we want to focus on as well. We are committed to achieving the 12,000 to 18,000 square foot low to medium density area per dwelling unit. So right now that plan that was submitted is 11,000 and change. We would like to try and clarify a couple of points because we think we can make the plans better.

One of those issues, again, with over about 500 acres of residential is how we quantify the prime environmental corridor and the isolated natural resources, the woods area. We need to get a little further clarification on that. The numerator and denominator in coming up with that 12,000 to 18,000 feet it's just figuring out what that balance is and what counts. As mentioned, we have 166 acres of prime environmental corridor here that doesn't count in that equation. So we basically take that out of the mix when we're coming up with that 12,000 to 18,000 square foot ratio, as well as the 31 acres of isolated natural resource.

So one thing we've done in the past, and we've done it successfully at other developments is SEWRPC, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, allows a development within a small component of a prime environmental corridor. I'm not sure if that's allowed within the Village, but we can look at that potentially where it's one unit per five acres. Again, not that we'd be looking at a significant component of it, but think that they could be some nice estate lots and do something very unique, maintaining the trees, deed restrictions, and creating some unique sites. Alternatively trying to figure out how those PEC and isolated natural resource areas factor into that equation. So that's something we'd like to get help with.

Specific to the plan and residential piece the Creekside Crossing in the southeast component that's an area that we'd like to discuss a little further. We believe it's potentially unnecessary given the proposed circulation, and it's also very expensive. In addition to that we're still working through what the permitting process would be there. I think we have a number of unanswered questions that we would like to review. So the crossing area here [inaudible] corridor. So that's a topic we'd like to review.

The school site right now we're showing 26 acres of a school site. We think that's a little large. We looked at the other neighborhood plans, they're between 14 and 19 acres. I believe one neighborhood plan shows about 90 acres which is a high school site. But what we would like to do is find something, we think there's a design that could be incorporated there to shrink the size of that a little bit. We'd like to bring KUSD in on that discussion as well to ensure what we're allotting as far as land size is appropriate and that they would want it.

And then there's a good example in the Pleasant Homes Neighborhood Plan which I'm not sure when exactly it was adopted, but it seemed that there was a unique structure set up there where they actually approved a neighborhood plan in the event the school didn't take the site. So we would like to try and have a neighborhood plan ready to go, have a period of time, whether it's 10 years, 15 years, 20 years if KUSD chooses not to proceed on that site that we have that alternative to proceed with.

And then my last comment really is on that density. I'm bringing that back down within that 13,000 to 18,000 square foot tolerance. We're very committed to doing that whether it's a component of the single family, the multi-family, multiple pieces. We would just like to gain feedback this evening and have the directive to work with staff to continue to refine the plan. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Before I open it up to comments and questions, Wayne you had a comment you wanted to make?

Wayne Koessl:

Mr. Chairman, through the Chair to the staff, I really appreciate the in depth study that you presented tonight on how the Village of Pleasant Prairie does their planning and zoning to ensure we have quality development. I don't know how many man hours the staff put into that plan tonight. But I went over it twice, and I could not find any flaws. It gave me every detail I wanted to make a decision tonight, and I really appreciate that. And I hope the people in the audience realize they got an education on how we do our zoning and planning. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Thanks, Wayne. I'm going to open up now. This is a public hearing. I'm going to open it up for comments from the audience. Before I do I just want to preface my remarks by two comments. Number one, I want to thank everybody for how attentive you've been this evening. We've had groups not quite this large that hasn't been this nice. So we appreciate the way we've been treated tonight. That was for your benefit as well.

Secondly, the other comment I want to make is it's not an issue for the Plan Commission tonight whether the outdoor theater should be there or shouldn't be there. The outdoor theater is valid, it's within the zoning, it can stay there as long as it wants to stay there. And the Village is not in a position to either knock it out or to keep it there. It's a permitted use, it's zoned properly, and as long as it's there we're happy with that. But we also are not in a position to force the owner to tell him what he has to do with that property anymore than we can tell any other business in this community what they have to do.

So I'm going to open it up now for your comments. By the way, for those who wish to speak tonight we're going to limit you to three minutes because we've got to be out of here by midnight. If there's that have not signed up after I've completed this list you'll be given an opportunity as well. The first one is Steve Watron.

Steve Wattron:

Hi, I'm Steve Wattron, 8215 26th Avenue. I had a couple questions but I think Mr. Mills already answered them. Do Bear Realty or Mr. Mills seriously consider keeping the outdoor movie theater? I didn't see anything in these outdoor plans. And, number two, is the cost of digital conversion the biggest problem here, the \$50,000 to \$100,000? Because I know some wealthy people who might be able to help out to save this local landmark. That's all I have. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. When we get through these, if Mr. Mills you're prepared to answer some of these questions we're going to ask that you be prepared at the end of this. The next person is Harold Brown.

Harold Brown:

Harold Brown, 9441 8th Avenue. I'll be just very brief. I was very impressed with the young lady over here, and I also was very impressed with the two gentlemen that spoke in the first place. And I would like to agree with him wholeheartedly. I see we need something on this side of town. We don't have any. We have to drive a long way. And I'm looking at tax revenue as far as sales tax. Most of the taxes are going out to Somers, out to Wal-Mart and the stores out there. And I think that we really have a gold mine if we have this big box store here.

If you look at the geographics of Kenosha you've got hundreds of condominiums down by the lake, you've got surrounding most of Kenosha would be coming here to shop. And then you'd have people in Winthrop Harbor coming here. And so I think it would be a gold mine for the Village of Pleasant Prairie. I served on committees in Beach Park before I came here, and I was on the business commission, and we would have given a right arm to have a store like that for revenue. And so I think it's a gold mine for Pleasant Prairie. And Pleasant Prairie has done very well as far as sales tax is concerned. And I appreciate your looking into this. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. Michael Rosenthal.

Michael Rosenthal:

Hi, I'm 10219 29th Avenue. And I really didn't want to speak about the Keno Drive-In. I'm more interested in the residential, the thorough ways that you're putting through. I'm on 29th Avenue. You're planning on turning that into a main thorough way. Which if everything in there was single family residential or duplex or something, you know, it wouldn't be so bad. But you're putting 40 unit apartment complexes just junked together in there. And the traffic in this neighborhood is just going to skyrocket. I bought this property five years ago, living in Pleasant Prairie, choosing to live in Pleasant Prairie because it was such a small community. Now what do we get? It's going to turn into a major, major -- I might as well have moved to Kenosha, you know? What's the point of moving to Pleasant Prairie if this is what you're going to do to us?

Mary Cohn:

Thank you, 9037 15th Avenue, Kenosha, the City of Kenosha. And the first thing that I want to say is thank you to Pleasant Prairie for inviting the citizens of the City of Kenosha to attend this meeting as your neighbors. Thank you very much.

Tom Terwall:

You're welcome.

Mary Cohn:

I would like to just say that I don't agree with the big box store on that corner, not only because it's in my neighborhood, but because there's a tremendous amount of expense. And you don't need me to tell you about the expense of creating roadways between I-94 and Sheridan Road to be able to get carriers and delivery vehicles down there. That expense is not only State, County, Pleasant Prairie, it comes back to us taxpayers eventually. But that's just a small part of it. Maybe a big part of it.

But the other part is that in alternatives 2 and 3 I would just like to comment that there are a couple of things that I would have liked to have seen. And not being a resident of Pleasant Prairie I do respectfully request that you would at least consider some things like perhaps a year 'round marketplace, like a true farmers' market, perhaps a place for selling fresh and seafood because the whole City of Kenosha does not have one spot that can do that. Some toddler parks in the various neighborhoods. Peggy was kind enough to point out to me several parklands that are in each of the neighborhoods. But some small toddler parks would be nice so that you don't have to walk a mile and a half to get your toddler to a swing or something.

I agree with what the gentleman back there said about the 40 unit apartment buildings. It just seems counterproductive to what the rest of Pleasant Prairie has been planning all of this time. I'd like to see just a little bit more recreational areas, some tennis courts, maybe a bocce ball court. Maybe a softball diamond for kids to play softball, okay? Thank you for listening to me, and than you for inviting us.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you very much. Mary Herbert.

Mary Herbert:

I'm going to let my husband speak.

Mike Herbert:

I'm Mike Herbert, 2511 Springbrook Road. I by no means begrudge Mr. Mills' right to develop his land or make a profit. That's the American way. But I do have a few concerns. First of all I'm a small business owner. And Wal-Mart is to small businesses what Tinseltown was to the

other three theaters that Mr. Mills spoke of. You would be doing a great disservice to us small business people by putting such a big box store in that location.

My other concern is the density. When you look at this map it's very heavy multi-family. And I feel it's too heavy multi-family. The complex on 116 with all the 40 units that is a huge complex. I'm an old apartment manager and I know. That's a big complex. But of particular concern is the 24 units on the bike trail and Springbrook Road. Those are just too big for that area. Those are inappropriate. When you look at the map and you talk densities you're saying low to medium density. If you take all of that environmental corridor out of there it becomes medium to high density. There's too much multi-family in there, and they should be toned down a bit.

And my third concern is particularly Springbrook Road and the whole area there needs to be more bike friendly. There's a lot of bike traffic on Springbrook Road right now, and it's very dangerous. Someone is going to get killed. I see bicycles going down there, and there's 45 mile an hour cars going down there. There's no police enforcement there. With this development I would like to see it be more bicycle friendly, and bike path or lane included down Springbrook Road at the same time as this development. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. John Oldham.

John Oldham:

Thank you, Village Board for allowing me to speak tonight. 1401 11th Avenue. I wanted to start up by actually addressing Mr. Mills and letting him know that this group that I had started, Save the Keno Drive-In April 2015, we have to disrespect for him, no hate for him. I understand he's a businessman and what he's trying to do here. But we ask that he understands that this is a part of our family, this history of this, the Keno Drive-In. Comments were made about going to Tinseltown. It's not the same thing. By no means is it the same thing. So with that being said I'd like to ask Mr. Mills if he would please spare a small piece of this plan he's got and save the Keno Drive-In.

And also addressing Mr. Mills once again, he made a comment up here, and hopefully everybody caught it that he said it's not his family's obligation, and I may not be quoting this exactly right, Mr. Mills, that is wasn't his responsibility to supply us with the drive-in. But the very next breath he says I would be willing to make a contribution. And with that being said please include us in your plans. That's all we ask is for a partnership. We want to save the Keno Drive-In. That's been our only motivation through this. Sir, I have the utmost respect for you. Anything that we have said to degrade you or disrespect you please accept my sincere apologies, sir. Thank you very much.

Tom Terwall:

I can't read the first name. Riley is the last name.

Eli Shai Riley:

I am representing a group of LakeView Technology Academy students.

Tom Terwall:

Give me your address, sir.

Eli Shai Riley:

9202 24th Avenue. This comment is personal and not school affiliated or produced as adjoined pending by multiple students. There are several approaches that can be taken to preserve the Keno. But by far the most inclusive of them involves a slightly downsized Keno Drive-In, several 1950s themed restaurants and other commercial developments along Sheridan Road. The Keno Drive-In would most optimally be reconfigured to fit within the boundaries of Sheridan Road, 91st Street, a continuation of 15th Avenue, and a continuation of 92nd Place. 15th Avenue and 92nd Place would intersect to form a 90 degree angle or slight curve. These continuations would serve as an access road for the Keno which would eliminate the traffic that currently builds up on 91st Street and Sheridan Road on showing nights.

A 1950s themed restaurant would continue the theme. This business establishment along with the commercial along Sheridan Road would remain open year 'round and would serve as a stable source of income throughout the area. There are many options we have to look at, and we hope to work with Bear Realty to develop the best plan for everyone. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. Ken Bozych.

Ken Bozych:

2802 Springbrook Road. I'll also speak on behalf of my neighbors Jim and Joan Wood at 2814 who were not available to join us here this evening. They are somewhere in the middle of the Pacific Ocean on vacation. Jean, thank you so much for your [inaudible] leading this meeting and speaking for so long. Thank you for pointing all the ways in which the alternative number 1 plan here does not meet the Village's Comprehensive Plan as required. In truth I'm a bit perplexed as to why the Planning Commission and the residents in attendance here, time is being wasted listening to this alternative when it does not meet that Comprehensive Land Use Plan. We should not be considering going back and changing our Comprehensive 2035 Land Use Plan. That is what sets the tone for the entire Village. Follow the rules.

There's little I can say to communicate my disapproval for this big box store being proposed in alternative #1 that hasn't already been said. Let me just say this. I'll remind the Planning Commission and all the residents here in attendance that we already do have a Wal-Mart in this location. That Wal-Mart is less than five miles from this very location we are at tonight. We really do not need a second Wal-Mart store within six, seven miles of the other one. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Lori Ralph? Lori Ralph? Earl Beasley?

Earl Beasley:

920 91st Place, Pleasant Prairie, I was glad to hear that Wal-Mart really doesn't fit. I would prefer that there be single family homes there. But if they really wanted to put something commercial there how about something like PF Chang's or the Cheesecake Factory? They're fairly big restaurants. The trees in the background would make really nice outdoor seating. So I just wanted to throw that thought out there.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. Donna Caliendo. Welcome back.

Donna Caliendo:

Donna Caliendo, 2710 104th Street. I don't think we need to address the fact, or may I repeat that this big box store is six times larger than the ordinance calls for. So, again, I don't think it works in this area because of that. I border the residential area. I, too, feel that it's too high a density. I understand that we need rental, but 40 unit buildings are just way too large. I like plan number 3, and the reason I like it is because of the green space. I love the plan the way that it backs up to the green space areas. And my other concern is 28th Street. I border 28th Street. The traffic, I'm concerned if curb and gutter is called for I don't want that on our backs. The street is crumbling away as it is now. So let that be on the developer to put that street together. And I think that's it. As far as the commercial area he can do what he likes, it's his land, it's not an issue regarding the drive-in theater.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you, ma'am.

David Horvath:

10322 29th Avenue. I like the idea of the good old days. And it's the first time I've ever heard of Wal-Mart being associated with the good old days. Being on 29th Avenue my biggest concern, too, is that the quiet dead end road right now, it's a very narrow road you can barely get two cars down that road. Some of the homes are very close to the road. So making that a through street I don't see how that would work. It would make it very unsafe for my four year old that we have, and there's other families with young children on that road. The increased traffic volume on 165 which from that point to Sheridan Road is already a death trap. If you're walking on 165 and a car approaches you, you have a choice to either jump in the ditch or you block traffic.

Sheridan Road itself would have to be widened considerably to allow for that kind of development. But, again, I definitely go back with the other gentleman. Since the ordinance doesn't provide for that size of a store I think that's a non-issue then. That should not be allowed,

and nothing should be amended for that to take place in there. I think that that covers everybody else's, pretty much what I was gong to say as well. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you.

Leo Schuch:

1328 30th Court, Kenosha.

Tom Terwall:

Give your address again, sir.

Leo Schuch:

Pardon me?

Tom Terwall:

Give your address again, please.

Leo Schuch:

1328 30th Court, Kenosha. I just want to thank you for your land use plan and your neighborhood plan as far as allocating 38 percent of the space for your environmental corridors and your natural buffers. I think that's going to add value to the whole project. It's going to give us a nice upscale look to the whole area. And I think it will be a great complement to the Village of Pleasant Prairie. I can see why you got the award for excellence. I think it's going to help the demand, and it's going to be easier to market those properties.

And we're looking forward to it because we need some developments like this, especially the condo area and some of the single family homes. Because right now there's no developments like this with that much green space involved in it. And we have people now that are trying to buy in Prairie Village and a couple of the other developments, and there's just not a lot of product out there for side-by-side condos and smaller condos that are one to one and a half stories. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you very much.

Hillary Schellinger:

1342 110th Street.

Tom Terwall:

Wait until you get up here ma'am. We didn't get that on the record. Now give us your address again.

Hillary Schellinger:

1342 110th Street. I'm the one with the noisy baby so I do apologize. In speaking with my neighbors at Tobin Creek I haven't met one person who supports any of the three proposed plans for the area. Pleasant Prairie is unique because of its green space and charm. Adding even more commercialization and development to this area takes away from the very essence that leads many people to call Pleasant Prairie home. I know this meeting isn't about saving the Keno, but I believe a partnership can be developed that has the Keno at its heart. The community has spoken, and many do not want big box development in this area. Certainly a plan can be drafted that will allow Mr. Mills to make a profit on his investment while giving the community what it wants.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you.

Judy Nelson:

10330 29th Avenue. I'm with my neighbors here on 29th Avenue. I don't know if they need to widen that road. Are we going to have to have a stoplight since we're going to be a very thoroughfare through everything. Our houses are pretty close to the road. I don't know how they would do it. They have a lot of places to get in there. I don't know why they have to go down 28th and 29th and open that up. That's all I have to say.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. Dr. Joe Mangi. Welcome, Joe.

Joe Mangi:

Thank you, thank you very much. Joe Mangi, 8712 3rd Avenue in Carol Beach. And I would like to thank the Planning Commission for the opportunity for all of us to speak tonight, and to Jean Werbie for your help, Mike Pollocoff, everybody that's made Pleasant Prairie pleasant, a pleasant place to live. My wife Pat and I moved here in 1970. We've been here for 45 years. And we stayed here because of the quality of Pleasant Prairie, the green space, the wonderful people in our community, the great school system.

And, yes, the Keno Drive-In it's here tonight. I mean it's been part of Kenosha since the 1940s. And so Pleasant Prairie has done an outstanding job of continuing to make our community family oriented. A case in point the RecPlex. There's no place like the RecPlex anywhere else in the country. With that in mind, since you've already demonstrated the commitment to be family oriented, why not keep or try to keep somehow some way the Keno Drive-In which is a positive, wholesome family entity for almost 70 years? Our children, our grandchildren, friends, there's

noplace like it. The point is it's family oriented. Why would we give up a 70 year old jewel that makes Pleasant Prairie and Kenosha unique for a big box store or even a strip mall?

I'm arguing that we find a way, since the commitment is already there with the RecPlex, continue with that. That's what makes us special. It's Pleasant Prairie. It's not Everywhere, USA. It's not blight that you see all over this country. The comment was made that Wal-Mart's the best in the world. Fine, but you know what they're going to do? They create urban blight wherever they go because they'll knock out the Piggly Wiggly on 22nd, the CVS. They're going to knock out the White Hen or Southport Pantry on 7th Avenue. They're going to knock out the stores on Sheridan Road. They are like an amoeba. We've already got blight with Roger and Marv's sitting there. There's blight on 75th Street going along Highway 50 with all those stores west of 47th. We have eight big box stores in our community already. We've got only one Keno Drive-In that's part of our history.

The other problem I have before my three minutes is up air quality. Last time I looked we've been failing for some years now.

Jan Petrovic:

Time.

Joe Mangi:

Okay.

Tom Terwall:

Finish your point, Joe.

Joe Mangi:

Thirty more seconds. I'm really concerned about, and I think all of us are about the air quality in Pleasant Prairie and Kenosha and Somers. It's not our fault. We're near Chicago. We've got the power plant, all of those things. But Pleasant Prairie is a hedge against that because of the green space. And God bless you guys and Jean for putting in green space as part of this plan. But putting a big box with the noise pollution, all the rest of it, we've got sick people in this community because of the quality of air. This isn't going to help it. So for that, lastly, the more big box stores you put into a community and the blight that it creates with the closing of other stores around it means fewer students in our schools. We've got a problem with our schools in that we're losing enrollment. Whatever we can do to build our neighborhoods and continue to bring families into our community and let them grow and have fun and enjoy more power to it. So thank you very much.

Tom Terwall:

Thanks, Joe.

Keith Rosenberg:

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. Keith Rosenberg, 8709 34th Avenue. I'm the Alderman of the 9th District which borders basically this property. The north side of Pleasant Prairie borders up with my district from Sheridan Road all the way to 39th. I have a lot of concerns with the big box store. I've had several phone calls. A little history going back to what we dealt with in the City of Kenosha with Wal-Mart. They wanted to build a Super Wal-Mart next to Supervalu where the current Festival Foods is right now. Well, before I got elected the City came up with an ordinance no big box stores east of Green Bay Road of more than 100,000 square feet. That was a good fit. You don't want it in our crowded neighborhoods. We had a lot of safety concerns there if Wal-Mart was placed there with Lance Middle School, Tremper, etc.

The bottom line when it comes down to Wal-Mart, if you buy a property for \$240,000, it's worth \$3 million now, they offer you \$10 to \$15 million you can say, oh heck yeah, give me the money. That's what it comes down to, show me the money. The history of the Keno, I was born and raised in Kenosha. I grew up at the Keno. I would love to see it stay the Keno, but it's going to take somebody to buy that property from Mr. Mills. I have the utmost respect for Mr. Mills. He's a businessman. If Wal-Mart is going to shove \$10 to \$15 million in front of your face you're going to take it. He's a realtor. That's how he makes money for him and his family, and I respect that.

But you as Board members for Pleasant Prairie you need to listen to the residents of Pleasant Prairie. I'm the voice of the 9th District so I'm just passing on my concerns for my constituents that a big box store would be bad for the neighborhood north. The south Sheridan business complex is starting to come back, i.e., with the Taco Bell, the Culver's, the Kenosha Kingfish. Things are slowly -- Toolamation just moved in my district out of Zion. So I mean businesses are coming back. Pleasant Prairie has always been a quiet village, always has been where people want to get out of the city, nice and quiet out in the country. Same thing going out west out in Paddock Lake, Salem, Silver Lake, Trevor, Paris. People want to get away from the hustle and bustle of the city.

Let's talk about the development on Highway 50 Mr. Mills brought up. Yes, they've done a lot of development on Highway 50 and what's happening now. The State is coming in in the next few years and totally redoing Highway 50, tearing it up because that's the most traveled area. Green Bay Road and Highway 50 is the worst intersection in the city because of all the businesses that we put out there. That was all farmland when I was a kid. I remember that.

Jan Petrovic:

Time.

Keith Rosenberg:

Thank you very much for your time. But please don't put a big box store near my district. I would appreciate it.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you.

David Salica:

Hi, Dave Salica, 9801 Sheridan Road. I can't really add too much to what has been presented so far other than if you stick to your guns and keep the commercial property as originally designed it would be better. Because it was already included in designs, and by expanding it it's not going to work out so hot. I understand that doing a balancing of the size of the TRA -- doing the balancing of the size of the population versus traffic you can work numbers out and the size of the property as the same thing. Including another 18 acres would maybe fit the formulas better. But it goes against for what we stand for in Pleasant Prairie. We want to have a nice Pleasant Prairie. That's it. Thank you very much.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you.

Patrick Vranak:

Hi, Patrick Vranak, 4710 24th Street, Kenosha, Wisconsin. And you know with sprawling growth comes the inevitable development of commerce. People like convenience, they like one stop shopping. They like being able to stop off on the way home from work and grab things that they need in a timely manner. They also don't want to pay a lot for them. And what better way to deliver this to people in a sprawling suburban community is to build a new shopping center. You know, after all, it's easy to woo those attractive anchor stores like Wal-Mart and Target with the promise of new facility. To land a big name like that and the smaller specialty retailers are certain to follow. And before you know it business is booming, a new location. It's a win for the business and a win for the city, right? I mean after all the new tax revenue the mall provides there. It's plenty of extra money in the coffers.

Not so fast. How the tax revenue will impact the Village of Pleasant Prairie really depends on the tax structure. There are a few things that small villages overlook when evaluating financial impact of large scale development. One is the loss of existing business from the revenue of the businesses that already exist there. Tax revenue is often stagnant after a new development goes up you see. An equivalent drop in tax revenue from the existing retailers matches the increased revenue at the new location. This in turn can lead to stores in the other existing malls closing. This also impacts the city revenue. Once these other malls start dying then the property value decreases and, in turn, the property taxes decrease along with it impacting the revenue the Village of Pleasant Prairie receives. It allows existing commercial districts to fail while developing ones is a waste of public resources. People invest in the same expenses of the new infrastructure to serve that the new model is going to have.

You're going to be spending the money over again. We already spent that money in the malls that exist and now we're maintaining that. You still have to factor in the cost of providing public services for the development, maintaining new roads, power and sewer lines, public and fire services all on the taxpayers' dime. While a brand new commercial development project may

seem enticing at a glance, at the end of the day it's unnecessary, and it's just plain a reckless use of the taxpayers' money. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. Sue Holt.

John Holt:

She left, she left. She was disgusted with the whole thing. I'm John Holt, 9205 Lakeshore Drive. We're looking at the choice of three choices, alternative 1, 2 and 3. I would like to propose alternative 4 which is to leave it alone.

Tom Terwall:

Pardon me?

John Holt:

Which is to leave it alone. All this Village planning and everything is growing and booming, Mr. Mills said I'd like to make Sheridan Road just like over by the highway. Do you want that?

Voices:

No.

John Holt:

We don't want that. We live in a quiet community. This is the Village of Pleasant Prairie. It's a pleasant place and it's a prairie. And if you develop all this land, all that wetland, even alternative 3 you have all that open space. Well, what happens in an open space? All the chemicals, the salt, everything leaches into that open space. You kill all the wildlife, the frogs, the birds, everything that's living there. Everything that we're here for. We're here to live in open space and to live in a quiet family community. That's what we want. We don't want to build and put concrete on every single place that is left. So that and, of course, like everybody else, save the Keno. Thank you.

Laverne Garos:

I live at 324 116th Street. And I think everything I was going to say has been said. I would just to reiterate I would support the Keno if there's any way to save it. I especially like the ideas from the students. I think they have some great creativity. I want to say I'm opposed to alternative 1. I have concerns even though about alternatives 2 and 3. For number 1 the aesthetics which has been talked about, we don't want a big box store. Number 2, corporate neighbor Wal-Mart does not have a very good reputation as being a good corporate neighbor for a number of reasons, safety, wages, what it does to other businesses in the area, and there are huge lists of concerns.

But, third, I guess is my concern about traffic. And I think the one thing that hasn't been discussed too much is I think the impact all the way down to 116th Street and to Russell Road. I think that that particularly with Wal-Mart and the traffic that would be coming from Illinois that that's going to back up. It's going to affect the whole route of Sheridan Road. And then you're going to have to probably look at widening the road, and what cost would that be. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. Jeff Weiss? Jeff Weiss? Larry Casebolt, Jr.?

Larry Casebolt:

Hi, good evening. I'm at 4510 Wood Road, Racine, Wisconsin. I do have some concerns about the big box. I understand what people have said about the multifamily. I wouldn't want that in my neighborhood. But main concern is the tradition that the Kenosha Drive-In holds for this community. I've spoke to a lot of people about this particular plan, all three of these plans actually over the last couple of weeks. And I've found very few people at all that want to get rid of the Keno. They do agree that it needs to be restored. I think that could be obtained through community help, fundraising and donations by businesses.

The group that I'm involved with, John's group, Save the Kenosha Keno Drive-In we would like to offer our services to Mr. Mills to do just that. We would like to fix the buildings, we would like to put in new screens. We would like to keep the Keno in our community. We'd like to make it a beacon in the Village. It's been here so long. There's three, maybe four generations of families that have been going there. I understand it's just an investment to him, and if somewhere down the line he wants to seel it off to us give us a chance to buy it, the community buy it and make it something that's going to be there forever.

Right now the Keno holds the longest continuous operation history of 66 years. We would like to see that not be disrupted. That puts it at the top of the list of all those drive-ins in Wisconsin. This group has already set up a donation site. We've already set up fundraising. We have actually filled out an application to send into the Historical Society at the State level. And some of our people have already spoke to them. They said that the Keno could probably get on the State registry, and then the State would recommend it for national registry. And if it were accepted to the registry there would be tax breaks for the owner. There would be funds available for restoration.

And I think it means something to this community that if there was a group of people, 100 dedicated people that we have in this group, there's 2,500 total. But there's 100 people that are very dedicated and passionate about that venue. We would like to raise it up, renew it and make it something that is a tourist attraction not only from the 50 miles wide that we get now and the radius, because I've talked to many people when I was at the drive-in and they come in hours away. You get free publicity, places to see in Wisconsin, places of interest. I think it's worth a hot. If Mr. Mills is to work with us, with the community, I promise you I will do everything I possibly can, sir, to safe the Keno Drive-In.

Michelle Marschel:

My address is 6116 82nd Avenue. And I came here tonight solely for the drive-in. I do appreciate the presentation with the three different options provided. I would say that it was very disheartening to hear that the property was purchased solely for commercial development at some point. That someone didn't actually procure it in order to preserve the charm of the things that were in place to begin with. As a person who has a young family and who would probably consider some of these different housing options I would not move to Pleasant Prairie for a Wal-Mart or a big box store. I think when you do send out information to families who are new to Kenosha which I received when I first moved back here after college I got picture of the lake fronts, of the sprawling green areas, of the stars in the sky that you can see from this area because there is no light pollution. And certainly something as charming as a drive-in is going to welcome families.

Also limiting the number of acres to a school is probably not in your best interest because as schools expand when you're trying to invite families into a community then you want to have that extra space in order to provide playgrounds and more rooms and things like that. So I wouldn't think that it would be beneficial to limit an area. You would want to expect that growth and plan for that growth. And so if you really want to create a community where people want to come to and belong to the kinds of things that have been proposed tonight will actually have a negative or adverse effect on people who are making those decisions. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you.

Gary Dryer:

Gary Dryer, 1426 87th Place, Kenosha. First of all I'd like to thank you for inviting Kenosha residents people to speak at this as being a neighbor to your north just about three and a half blocks. And obviously a big box retail store would drastically affect not only Pleasant Prairie but our neighborhood as our alderman got up here and spoke about some of the difficulties that we've dealt with in Kenosha when they wanted to move in there.

The second thing that a big box retail store, specifically Wal-Mart, if anybody wants to know just go out to Somers. As you can see the Wal-Mart first of all they have trouble staffing it sometimes, and it's starting to get in a decline look-wise from when they just opened. So maybe they think about keeping their store that they have right now up to par before they start opening up a second one.

I think at the 2035 plan that you guys developed that had limited space for retail there's a reason that that was done, and I've heard several people from Pleasant Prairie come up here that basically said the same thing, that they don't want that large big box store in there. So to go off of what you originally planned for this space is not a good idea and is not going to be good for the community.

Now on the subject of the Keno, and this is more directed for the Mills family, would be to if you want an example of someplace that was in decline in the City of Kenosha that they actually

brought back with help from private investors take a look at Simmons Field. That's a good example of an area where they brought in some private investors, they were able to work with the City to bring that back. I think between the Village of Pleasant Prairie, Mills family and private investor that there could be something done to save that to bring people into your area. You hear many people, and I've seen comments online where people are coming from Illinois, down from Milwaukee area to come see this. People aren't going to drive down here to go to Wal-Mart. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

That completes the list of people that have signed up. In a minute I'm going to give anybody else that wants to speak an opportunity to do so. But I just want to preface that by saying that the Village Planning Commission is not a developer. It's not our intention to develop 1, 2 or 3. All we're saying is we need to put a long-term plan in place so that when development does occur this is the way it's going to happen. You have to be ready with the roads, with sewer, water, and so we're trying to put a plan to go to the year 2035 of what could possibly develop. So that's what we're trying to do here tonight.

I'm not here to advocate any one of those plans because I'm not going to develop any one of those plans. But if a developer comes in and wants to develop either a multi-family or a single family area he's going to have to abide by whatever plan gets ultimately adopted. So with that I'm going to say if there's anybody else that wishes to speak. Yes, ma'am?

Beth Brown:

Thank you so much for letting me speak. My name is Beth Brown, and I'm at 1917 104th Street. There is absolutely nothing about this plan that I like. I am going to speak more from the fact that I'm a resident who is deeply affected by the choices that you will be making. I will speak for those who live on 28th and 29th Avenue. And for myself I know we all feel the same. We chose Pleasant Prairie to live for very specific reasons. I moved here 15 years ago from Illinois because I wanted to get away from what it's turning into. I moved into here because it was a pleasant area. My blood pressure went down when I crossed the State line. I'm not kidding.

I love Pleasant Prairie. I love where I live. I have the most beautiful piece of property that I think anyone could imagine. This incredibly beautiful open field across the street from me. I can't get to it because of this enormous waterway. I can't walk through it. It's private property anyways. There's deer across the street. There's animals across the street. I get to view them. There's racoons and fox and everything like that everywhere. Thank you for the new garbage cans, my garbage no longer gets eaten on a daily basis.

29th Avenue and 28th Avenue do not need to connect to this new neighborhood. There's no reason for it. Those people chose that property so that they could live on that dead end street. I chose my property because it was incredibly beautiful because Pleasant Prairie is only town in Kenosha County, thank you Jesus, that gives me consistent taxes. I can rely on my taxes every single time. But I'm going to just tell you that I'm one of the houses that's going to be torn down when you do this. I am slated to be ripped down. So I will not have a home when you decide to do this which makes my ten year old and my nine year old say that Pleasant Prairie is not pleasant and will no longer be a prairie.

So I'm going to tell you that no one has mentioned the fact that the house on 22nd Avenue and 104th is going to get ripped down to put in your roundabout because it's clearly right through his house. My neighbor will lose her house, two houses down will lose her house because the street is going to need to be widened. And I get that. I really get that. I was told many years ago that I'll probably never be able to sell my home, and I'll just have to sit out and wait until it's time to go. But I will tell you that I totally disagree with the 40 units across the street from my home. That does not fit in with this. And I totally do not like that we're covering up this so called low density because half of the property practically is undevelopable. It is high density to me when you drop 440 people across the street from my home who will have multiple people in there, who will probably be over maybe 1,200 cars entering to get to these first units here by the street. So my road will be widened and I will lose my home.

But on behalf of the people who do get to stay I don't agree with the way this is laid out. I don't agree with the immense amount of multi-units. The only thing that I will agree with at all is what the other lady said where everyone has some backyard, but that's only at the price of paying for less property, that's all. It's the same exact property. It really is the same amount of empty space, it's just now community empty space. Developers have got to do what they've got to do. If he wants to sell his property and he wants to develop something that's fine. But I will tell you that I think all these people agree the only thing I wanted was a gas station and you gave it to me. It's right down the street now, you're building it. I'm going to be able to get my milk, I'm going to be able to get my bread.

I want to live in the middle of nowhere. I chose the middle of nowhere. I chose no sidewalks. I chose no neighbors. This is what I chose. And I think that's why we all chose this. And I just feel as though the way this is laid out doesn't match. I like Village Green. It's right down the street. I like it. I think it really improves Pleasant Prairie and draws in really wonderful families who want to appreciate our neighborhood. But I don't think a 1,000 people across the street from me is what Pleasant Prairie stands for.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. Yes, sir?

Tom Wood:

I've been listening to this.

Tom Terwall:

Give your name and address, sir.

Tom Wood:

My name is Tom Wood, 1131 92nd Place. Right there where the little X is. I've been listening to this, and it has occurred to me that so many hearings have been held, and they've fallen on deaf ears for this. I want to know, I hope you can give me an answer Mr. Terwall, or someone, the people who have raised their voice in opposition to the big box stores are they really heard or will

they be heard? Will they be represented? Or will this body like other elected bodies feel that they've been elected, they know best, they'll do what they want?

Tom Terwall:

That won't happen. I'll go that far and tell you that it's not going to happen. Ultimately the decision on whether a big box goes in at that location or not is not for this -- we will make a recommendation to the Village Board, and the Village Board, all of whose members are here tonight, will make the ultimate decision. But we'll make a recommendation to them based on what we heard tonight. And that's as far as I'm prepared to go right now. Stay until the meeting is over and you'll know what our decision is because I can't speak for the other members. But I can guarantee you that it's not falling on deaf ears.

Don Hackbarth:

I resent the fact that you say that we don't listen to people. What do you think we're doing tonight?

Tom Wood:

I'm sorry.

Don Hackbarth:

We took the time to listen to everybody here tonight.

Tom Wood:

I'm sorry. I did not say that you don't listen to people. I said so many elected bodies don't listen to people. I was not referring to you, Mr. Hackbarth. I wasn't referring to anyone in this room.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. One more. Anybody else? You're up, sir.

Dave Moresi:

I'm Dave Moresi. I live at 104 87th Place in Pleasant Prairie. That's Carol Beach. I wasn't planning to say anything tonight. In fact, I was planning to say nothing tonight. But one statement was made that I just can't let pass. It was stated that the residents of Carol Beach deserve this, and as a resident of Carol Beach for almost 20 years we don't deserve this.

Tom Terwall:

Go ahead. Two more. You're up first and then you.

Charles Bress:

I'm Charles Bress. I'm 10525 West Greenfield Avenue. I'm actually from West Allis. I wasn't planning on speaking tonight. I'm here to support the Keno. Too many drive-in theaters have come and gone to places like Wal-Mart. You have a unique situation here in Pleasant Prairie. It's a destination that people come. There's very few of these left even in the country. To me it feels like a cross-roads right here and right now. The decision could be made to try and preserve it or let it go. I want to see it preserved. I respect Mr. Mills and his right, it's his property. But I do hope that he would take this opportunity to be the hero of this community and to southeastern Wisconsin, northern Illinois and just save that little chunk of land right there. Yes it needs work. There's a lot of people here that are willing to do the work and help and finds ways to finance it. It's a small little chunk of the land of the big picture. It can be preserved for future generations and families from here on forth. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you.

Robert Clarke Davis:

Robert Clarke Davis, 10330 32nd Avenue. I came not to say anything either. I came to listen. But I wonder about the idea of a big box store there. I'm not from the area. I moved here about 15, 20 years ago, and I remember when South Sheridan Road was the way it was. Morrow, the shopping center and all that stuff was there. They moved to the highway not from the highway. Likewise there was a Wal-Mart in downtown Kenosha. It didn't move toward downtown, it moved toward the highway. So I am not Wal-Mart obviously because I have a hole in my pocket. But the idea of I just find it really suspect that at company where they're doing everything to be around where people can get into it would move to an area here. It just seems like it goes against all logic and all that we've seen happen in Pleasant Prairie and Kenosha for the last 15 or 20 years. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. You're it, ma'am. You're the last one.

Diane Lynn Frank:

Hi, I'm Diane Lynn Frank, and I'm at 8980 Lakeshore Drive. And I just thank all of you for listening to us today. I really do appreciate it. I understand Mr. Mills has a right to sell his property. He has a right to close the drive-in, and I appreciate it being open as long as it was. I'm going to miss it, but it is what it is. I don't want a big box store there. I don't think I deserve it either. I'm part of Carol Beach and we don't deserve it.

I want to mention that through a couple websites I found there's 152 vacant Wal-Mart stores in the United States. That's over 1,600 million square feet of land that's blighted across the United States. Wal-Mart Realty.com has 63 properties right now for sale or lease. And so that's around five to six million square feet. So if we see a discrepancy there between those two I'm wondering

where the other ten million square feet are. Maybe they're over on 52nd Street right now like that Wal-Mart store that's closed.

So I don't think that the first thing that people need to see when they come into Wisconsin on Sheridan Road is a dark store because I think that's what will happen. I think they're going to open that store, close one of these other ones, close whatever else is around. Then they're going to close that store, and we're going to have another dark store right as we drive into Wisconsin. I don't want that to happen.

Tom Terwall:

I'm going to close the public hearing and open it up to comments and questions from Commissioners and staff. Don, you're first.

Don Hackbarth:

You know the 2035 plan was really not our concept. It was what the State of Wisconsin demanded, that every community look at their areas and to zone it. And the reason we zoned the thing the way we did is because we wanted the industrial park where it is, we wanted the retail out at the west, okay? And when we looked at the eastern side of Pleasant Prairie we looked at it and zoned it in such a way to protect the residents. And this is exactly why we zoned it this way to protect you to say that we don't want a big box. This is exactly why we did it. And this is why we're saying it's going against our Comprehensive Plan because we zoned that piece of property already in the future to say that that should not take place.

Michael Serpe:

Tom, we can discuss back and forth about the neighborhood plans, about each alternative plan. But I'm going to make a recommendation that we deny all three and send especially number 2 and 3 back to staff with special consideration to the density issue that a lot of people have talked about.

Wayne Koessl:

I'll second that.

Tom Terwall:

Is that a motion?

Michael Serpe:

I'll make that a motion.

Wayne Koessler:

I'll second.

Tom Terwall:

Okay, we have a motion by Michael Serpe and a second by Wayne Koessler. You're up. You want to speak?

Judy Juliana:

Yes. I would like to thank everyone for coming. I appreciate all of your comments. I'd like to thank the Mills family for coming. But I agree with Mike and with Don that we spent a lot of time on the 2035 Comprehensive Plan. We wanted to make sure that we had good growth, we didn't have a lot of high density areas. We didn't want to have big box stores. And alternative 1, 2 and 3 just do not fit into the Comprehensive Plan. I don't feel that we need to go back and revisit the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and make any changes to it. I agree with Mike Serpe that we need to deny all three alternatives and work on 2 and 3 on the density issue.

Tom Terwall:

Do you have a comment, Deb?

Deb Skarda:

Yes. I guess I want to thank the audience because a lot of the things that I read on the forum probably 90 percent of it was about the Keno and the respect that everyone showed in addition to the time limit. Some of you cut that short, and we very much appreciate that. But the holistic thought patterns that you all put into your comments about the space, the traffic, the density, the schools, the pollution, from all of those perspectives we really appreciate a very well balanced approach. To the Mills family thank you very much for your collaboration with the staff. And I think that it's something that I know that we may continue to disagree. I agree with my fellow Board members that I would agree to deny all three of the plans and have the staff go back and see if there are potential alternatives. But the Comprehensive Plan I think was put in place with good purpose. Thank you.

Don Hackbarth:

The last thing I want to say is when we did the 2035 we laid that out and that was zoned. What really isn't fair is for a developer to come in and say, well, I don't like that zoning, let's change the rule in order for my big box to fit. And I don't think we're going to do that.

Jim Bandura:

I'm in agreement with this. I can't support the three plans right there. And with that said to the group out there for Save the Keno at one time I believe there was a national group that was trying to save the drive-in theaters throughout the country. So I would definitely recommend you looking into it, and maybe that would help. And if Mr. Mills and whoever you get to support

leaving that there more power to you. I would definitely look into it and start a dialogue with the owner.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. Chairman, did you want staff to respond to some of the comments that were made before we give our recommendation?

Tom Terwall:

Please do.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think one that's important because it was a comment that was made about what the community is going to have to pay for development, and I think it's important not only in this neighborhood but across the entire Village, one, when it comes to retail development and commercial for sales tax every time you buy something and you pay five and a half percent sales tax, five percent goes to the State of Wisconsin, and a half a percent goes to Kenosha County. So the Village receives no revenues from any commercial development for sales tax. The only revenues we see are for property taxes.

And the local tax rate in the Village this year, similar to some years before, is \$4.42 per thousand. When you get your tax bill it's higher than that, but the amount that the Village keeps for police, fire, rescue, snowplow, all those things we do is \$4.42. For a commercial building valued at \$6 million which Target in Prairie Ridge is looking to have their store valued at that, that brings a local tax of \$26,534. Not a lot of money. If it was twice that it would be \$55,279. Now, I don't begrudge anybody paying taxes. I'm happy when people pay their taxes because that's what we all do. But it's not a big source of revenue.

But that being said what I want people to walk away from this meeting know is that the Village Board and the Village Plan Commission have adopted ordinances dating back almost 30 years where we're different than the City of Kenosha whereby the Village won't pay for anything. We don't pay for roads, we don't pay for curb and gutter, we don't pay for sewer, we don't pay for water, we don't pay for grading, we don't pay for stormwater basins because we can't. We can't afford to do that. It just doesn't happen. So any development you see whether it be this development in whatever form it eventually takes and as it eventually develops, or any other development you see in the community whoever develops that property and whoever is going to profit from that development has to pay for that development.

At \$4.42 we can't afford to -- the average home in the Village pays \$800 in taxes. For \$800 we have to have a copy by there so many times a day, we have to have a fire engine and an ambulance ready to go there, we have to plow the snow. We take care of all this in the office. For all these things to have to happen that \$800 basically covers. But if we have to go and repave the roads or do things like that it's difficult. So any development that occurs, whether it's this or anyplace else that developer has to pay for it. The development in Lake View Corporate Park which is a really expansive development that was paid for through the TIF District which means

those businesses in the Corporate Park paid for that development. You as property taxpayers, residential property taxpayers didn't pay for that. They pay for it.

And that's become even more critical under the new public finances going on in Madison where there's a lot less room to maneuver. So however this unfolds, and whatever unfolds there's going to be, if Mr. Mills decides to proceed and go back and amend the land use plan we'll all be coming back to take a look at the next version of what that looks like and what the staff prepares. But the one thing you can be certain of is that us, all of us who live here as residential taxpayers in Pleasant Prairie we're not going to pay for that development. Not because we're scrooges or we're stingy or whatever, we can't afford it.

We've adopted laws that say the developers have to pay for that. The developer will get that money when he sells it or he borrows from the bank or whoever they do it that's up to them. But that's how it has to happen because we can't afford to build 165 or build Highway 32 or build that new north/south road or anything like that. I want everybody going away from this meeting know that's the concept. The City of Kenosha was built on the City charging special assessments for sewer and water and streets to promote development over the years. They don't do that as much now, but we've never been able to do that. And I would be really surprised to see the Village Board or the Plan Commission to adopt something like that.

I think that in response to some of the comments made by S.R. Mills about the questions that were raised about how much density the Village would approve under the Master Land Use Plan, commercial density or comparing it to other uses, I think those are all fine discussions to have. But they need to be had in the setting where we're talking about the Master Comprehensive Plan so that we have some balance in the community as to what we're going to approve and we're not going to approve. I really think to jump in and say, well, look at our Conceptual Plan, accept that but don't look at the master plan. One, this committee won't do it, but secondly I just think it really spends a lot of resources either for him or us to look at something that's out of step.

And I think to have those kinds of discussions, and we don't mind having them because that's why we're here, everybody should be able to come to the community with a different idea of what they want to do with their land, but that's got to fit in with the master plan. And those discussions, those issues you brought forward are good discussions to have, but they need to happen at the master land use plan level so that our comp plan if we have to make adjustments there's a public hearing process, a public notice process, a public input process so that we can do that efficiently.

And I think all that happens, I think if we do this right and we stick to what the community really from a ground level creates or generates for land use planning, the Keno problems or whatever they take care of themselves. Maybe the Keno doesn't get built, another one doesn't get built, maybe one doesn't come there, but I think that everybody should know that the efforts they've made into over time, not just tonight, but to have input and comments into how this community is going to grow and look that's what really sustains this community is to stay true to what we really wanted when we laid down our plan for what we wanted. Not for one specific use or another. I think if we as a community do that the decisions of the Keno are probably made easier by Mr. Mills, or you guys can accept the fact that whatever he's going to do is going to be easier. But I think the worst thing we can do is chuck the plan just to save one use or one item. I think that doesn't serve anybody very well.

I know Jean has got some other comments. And the staff would like to get in our final recommendation and a recommendation on the resolution for the issue tonight.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

One of the comments that I wanted to make is we do have an adopted bike and pedestrian trails plan for the community. And that is one layer or one element of the Comprehensive Plan. And we would like -- the next time we would bring any plans back we will make sure that that overlay is shown on here so it's very clear that there's an interconnection, a system of trails and bike trails and so on. Because we are trying to achieve a very bike friendly community aspect here in Pleasant Prairie.

So what I'd like to do, Mr. Chairman, is I'd like to read the Village staff comments for the project. Based on all the facts, the Village staff recommends denial of the Alternative #1 Neighborhood Plan. Specifically, the Neighborhood Plan is in conflict with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and the B-2, Community Business Zoning District regulations and cannot be approved. Furthermore, the Alternate #1 Neighborhood Plan commercial area identifying a proposed big box retail store is not compatible with the adjacent land uses. In addition, the negative impacts as discussed in this memorandum that would be generated from a big box retail store at this location far outweigh the benefits to the community.

The Alternative #2 and #3 Neighborhood Plans warrant some consideration, however, with the addition of another property at that southwest corner of Sheridan Road and 91st Street as a community commercial land use as shown on the Neighborhood Plans there is a conflict with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and these Neighborhood Plans cannot be approved until and unless there is an amendment to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan if that's the desire of the Plan Commission and the Board in order to expand the community commercial further south. Therefore, the Village staff based on everything that has been discussed recommends denial of Alternatives 2 and 3 Neighborhood Plans.

John Braig:

Thank you. I really didn't know what to expect coming to this meeting tonight. We've had meetings before that have aroused considerable interest in the community. I think this exceeds by far any that we've had that I've been exposed to in the past. But more significantly of the issues that have aroused interest in the past there were usually two sides that were quite strong. This is one time when everybody in the community is expressing a uniform opinion with the exception of the developer. I'll make a comment to the staff, I think this group will support rejecting all the alternatives. But I think as the staff looks at additional possibilities or plans it definitely should not allow a big box, and that would be my position.

Tom Terwall:

We have a motion by Michael Serpe and a second by Wayne Koessl.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

For the record there is a Village of Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission Resolution 15-12 as prepared by staff to deny the Comprehensive Plan amendment as presented. So the staff recommends that this resolution specifically say resolution to deny the Pleasant Prairie amendment to alternatives 1, 2 and 3. And it states at the bottom that it would be denied for the following reasons as I just read into the record. And, again, it also references the public meetings, the public hearings, the open house and all the input that we have received up to this point with respect to this. And due to the fact that they're in conflict with the land use plan that we are recommending that the Plan Commission send a denial recommendation to the Village Board for alternatives 1, 2 and 3. And, again, it should read to deny in the heading.

Michael Serpe:

I'll amend my motion to deny Resolution 15-12.

Wayne Koessler:

And I'll second, yes.

Tom Terwall:

A MODIFIED MOTION BY MICHAEL SERPE AND SECOND BY WAYNE KOESSL. AND I'M GOING TO CALL THE QUESTION. WHEN I HEAR REVEREND HACKBARTH SAY THIS IS GOING TO BE THE FINAL COMMENT, WHEN A MINISTER SAYS THAT'S IT, THAT'S IT. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered. Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen. I want to, again, express my appreciation for the way you folks have conducted yourselves. Can I have your attention please. Can I have your attention. The Plan Commission is not done, so we're taking a five minute recess to give you an opportunity to clear the auditorium, and then we've got to continue on. So thank you very much.

[Recess]

Tom Terwall:

I'll call the meeting back to order. Jean, we're ready to proceed in Item B.

B. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT to amend Sections 420-27 and 420-28 related to zoning fees for fences and driveways

permits and fees for Site and Operational Plan application that requires staff review only.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission and the audience, this is a public hearing and consideration of a zoning text amendment to amend Sections 420-27 and 420-28 related to zoning fees for fences and driveway permits and fees for site and operational plan application that requires staff review only.

On March 23, 2015, the Village Board adopted Resolution #15-07 to initiate some amendments to the zoning ordinance to re-evaluate zoning permits and application fees. Section 420-27 C is being amended to change the application fee for site and operational plan application that required staff review only, and we're recommending that it be changed from \$100 to \$50. This fee has been re-evaluated and reduced since the application fee coupled with the zoning permit fee of either \$40 tenant change without alterations or \$85 tenant change with alterations covers the staff time to review the permit and the zoning permit inspections required.

Zoning permit fees are being amended for fence permits, Section 420-28 A (6), Section 420-28 A (8) and Section 420-28 A (9). The fee is being changed from \$40 to \$50. This fee includes the zoning review, a staking inspection and a final inspection. The Building Inspection Department does not charge any additional fees for a fence permit although they do perform the two inspections for the CD department.

Driveway permit fees are being created in the zoning ordinance. Currently the permit fees for a new, replacement or extended driveway are found in the building code and range in price from \$30 to \$50 per driveway entrance. Since a driveway permit is regulated in the zoning ordinance, the permit fees are being removed from the building code and being added to the zoning ordinance. In addition, there will be one fee for a new driveway, a replacement driveway or to extend a driveway of \$50 per entrance. This fee includes the zoning review, a staking inspection and a final inspections for each driveway. The Building Inspection Department will not charge any additional fees for a driveway permit although they perform the two inspections. And my staff and I have worked through all of the modifications and changes with the inspection department superintendent. So with that this is a public hearing.

Tom Terwall:

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

Wayne Koessl:

If there aren't any questions, Mr. Chairman, I'll move approval.

Jim Bandura:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY WAYNE KOESSL AND SECONDED BY JIM BANDURA TO APPROVE THE ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS AS INDICATED. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered. Thank you.

7. ADJOURN.

John Braig:

Move adjournment.

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

All in favor signify by saying aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? We stand adjourned.

Meeting Adjourned: 9:04 p.m.