A regular meeting for the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission convened at 6:00 p.m. on August 13, 2012. Those in attendance were Thomas Terwall; Michael Serpe; Donald Hackbarth; Andrea Rode (Alternate #2); Jim Bandura; John Braig; and Judy Juliana (Alternate #1). Wayne Koessl and Larry Zarletti were excused. Also in attendance were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Jean Werbie-Harris, Community Development Director and Peggy Herrick, Assistant Zoning Administrator.

1. **CALL TO ORDER.**

2. **ROLL CALL.**


   John Braig:

   Move approval as presented in written form.

   Judy Juliana:

   Second.

   Tom Terwall:

   **MOVED BY JOHN BRAIG AND SECONDED BY JUDY JULIANA TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 9TH AND JULY 16, 2012 PLAN COMMISSION MEETINGS AS PRESENTED IN WRITTEN FORM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.**

   Voices:

   Aye.

   Tom Terwall:

   Opposed? So ordered.

4. **CORRESPONDENCE.**

5. **CITIZEN COMMENTS**
Tom Terwall:

If you’re here for an item that appears on the agenda as a matter for public hearing, we would ask that you hold your comments until the public hearing is held so we can incorporate your comments as a part of the official record. However, if you’re here to raise an issue that is either not a matter for public hearing or is not on the agenda now would be your opportunity to speak. We ask that you step to the microphone and begin with your name and address. Anybody wishing to speak under citizens’ comments?

6. NEW BUSINESS

A. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF PLAN COMMISSION RESOLUTION #12-09 FOR AMENDMENT #4 TO TAX INCREMENT DISTRICT #2 (TID 2) related to: proposed amendments to the TID 2 Project Plan, including changes to the TID 2 boundary (through both additions and subtractions of parcels); revisions to project expenses to complete infrastructure improvements; the provision of financial incentives for development of industry (which may include cash grants to owners, lessees or developers of land within TID 2); and the acquisition of properties that are required for public improvements.

Tom Shircel:

Mr. Chairman, I’ll take this item. Thank you. This is a public hearing and consideration of Plan Commission Resolution #12-09 for amendment to Tax Increment District #2 and this would be amendment #4. I’m going to go ahead and give a brief back and description of the project plan for you.

The Village is initiating an amendment to Tax Increment District #2 hereby known as TID 2. This 4th amendment is a project plan amendment that includes both addition and subtraction of territory to TID 2. There are some proposed changes obviously to TID 2 with both additions and subtractions of parcels to the boundary, revisions to project expenses to complete infrastructure improvements, provisions of financial incentives for development of industry which may include grants to owners, lessees or developers of land within the district, and finally acquisition of properties that are required for public improvements.

Through the years there have been some amendments to TID 32. Amendment #1 was in 2002. It provided the Community Development Authority with the resources to identify, acquire and redevelop blighted properties along I-94. This amendment included the merging of land adjacent to I-94 that was originally developed as TID 3.

Then in 2004 there was a second amendment. That allowed the Village to install broadband infrastructure within TID 2 for the provision of the next generation of technical infrastructure improvements for existing and future development. And amendment #3 in 2008 provided funding for site development and utilities for the then 200 acre Uline corporate campus.

TID 2 encompasses the I-94 and the 165/Q interchange. At this location, the Village of Pleasant Prairie has been able to provide an economic environment that is poised to create well over 13,000 well-paying jobs where none previously existed. The Village has established a modern
retail center, that being the Premium Outlets Mall, which employs over 1,000 persons and is a significant source of sales tax revenue to the State of Wisconsin. West of I-94, the Village created a property tax base of over $2 billion dollars on land that was formerly occupied by adult bookstores, junk yards, fireworks stands, and a hodge-podge residential development that was valued at less than $15 million dollars.

The recent Uline annexation west of I-94 requires adjustments to the boundaries of TID 2 in order to continue to enable the orderly development of the Uline corporate campus. The proposed revision of TID 2 project expenses will allow for necessary and critical infrastructure improvements and land acquisitions and in order keep current and proposed development proposals on track. The Village needs the flexibility to ensure that businesses relocating and locating in the Village that the district can be modified in order to facilitate new construction.

The Village of Pleasant Prairie has established a credible history of creating successful TIF districts in the past that have created over 8,000 new jobs, nearly one half billion dollars in new value, and substantial commercial and residential spin-off that have kept the Village and Kenosha County economy robust and vital.

TID 2 financing, the financing for TID 2 projects, in the form of general obligation bonds, will be issued in the years that projects are undertaken. Debt for the TID will be repaid with property taxes from businesses within the district. Once all of the debt for the TID has been repaid, the district will be retired, and the property tax payments will then be directed back again to the taxing entities. It is expected that TID 2 will be retired somewhere around 2021 or earlier, depending upon the success of the development within the TID.

There is a specific statute that applies to Pleasant Prairie, and I’ll go through that. On July 29, 2011, Governor Walker signed into law a bill enabling the Village to increase the value of the existing TID beyond 12 percent of the Village's equalized value of taxable property in the entire Village. And this is known as the 12 percent limit. The new TIF law specific to the Village will allow the value of TID 2 to exceed the 12 percent limit by allowing the value of TID 2 to be up to 1.32 times or 33 percent of equalized assessed value of the entire Village. Again, that’s rather than 12 percent so, again, it’s specific to the Village of Pleasant Prairie, this law.

The new law will allow the Village to enhance the financial effectiveness of the TID. With the proposed amendment #4 that we’re reviewing this evening the value of TID will be approximately 16.6 percent of the total equalized assessed value of the taxable property within the entire Village. Then, again, we’ll be within that 33 percent obviously limit.

The map in front of you you see on the PowerPoint shows the properties to be added which are in green and subtracted which are in red. So you can see the largest portion that we’re proposing to take out of the TID District is a large portion of Prairie Springs Park there in the red. And that’s somewhere near 500 or 400 acres. And then the green portions are to be added, and you’ll see that some of the major ones, if I can use the laser pointer, this is the Uline property that was annexed a couple years ago on the very west side, the 35 acres. The Ries property, some properties within the LakeView Corporate Park East, Iris, some land down here that’s south of 116, and then there’s this long stretch that will stretch out almost to 39th Avenue, sort of an umbilical cord, that will enable some improvements to 39th Avenue which I can speak to later.
Some reasons for amending TID #2 is to update financial estimates to complete infrastructure improvements; secondly create changes to the TID 2 boundaries which I just showed you the map; thirdly revise project expenses to complete infrastructure improvements, that being roads and storm sewers, sanitary sewer, water, site grading, storm water management; four, provide financial incentives for the development of industry and creation of quality, family-sustaining jobs; five acquire land and easements for public improvements, essentially transportation and storm water; and finally to accommodate the proposed expansion of the Uline corporate campus.

This is also in your packets and shown on your Power Point, this is a project cost summary. Again, it shows the project as of this year, 2012, and 2008, the second column, the last time the project was amended. And then it shows the difference. And if you go to the very last row there the total for all projects. So the total expenses are $94 million approximately, and the project expenses for this proposed amendment #4 in the bottom right hand corner is just over $15 million.

The proposed total project cost, as I said, has increased by over $15 million. The new project cost of $15 million is comprised of approximately $6.8 million for roadway improvements; $6 million for Uline site improvements, $3.1 million for sewer, water and storm water improvements, $1.7 million for a multi-modal transportation facility, $1.3 million for economic development incentives, and $1.3 million in land acquisition, administrative and other costs. So the new project cost as you saw in the previous slide is an estimate $94.2 million, that’s for the entire TID. Without the use of TIF funding the proposed amendment #4 development projects would not occur.

Now I’ll get into some specific projects for the TID amendment #4.

First is Uline. In 2010, Uline, Inc. relocated its corporate headquarters from Waukegan, Illinois to a new approximate 200 acre site here in Pleasant Prairie. Uline is the leading distributor of shipping, industrial and packing materials throughout North America and worldwide. The existing Phase 1 of the Uline corporate campus consists of the two-story, 200,000 square foot corporate headquarters and a 1 million square foot warehouse/distribution center. Uline's corporate campus currently employs an estimated 800 positions, with 600 positions in the office and 200 positions in the current warehouse.

On October 18, 2010, the Village Board of Trustees adopted Land Ordinance #1 which transferred approximately 35 acres from land owned by Route 165 LLC which is Uline and the Charles and Bobette Eichberger Family Trust from the Village of Bristol into Pleasant Prairie. And that’s that extreme western portion that was annexed a couple years ago, this portion right in here.

In 2013, Uline plans to develop the annexed 35 acres with an approximate 1.25 million square foot warehouse/distribution facility to be located immediately west of the existing 1 million square foot warehouse, so that’s shown in the yellow on the PowerPoint. The new warehouse/distribution facility will further contribute to the success of the TID and expansion of the District's tax base. Similar to the initial warehouse/distribution building, this second warehouse center will be constructed with precast concrete panels, at approximately 37 feet in height. Uline anticipates the second warehouse will employ 400 persons when fully operational.
The required infrastructure improvements associated with the construction of the second warehouse will involve an expenditure of approximately just over $6 million. The improvements include on-site storm water facilities, a fire loop around the building, mass grading, parking and maneuvering lanes, water, sanitary sewer, landscaping and other on-site improvements.

The Project Plan for amendment #3 to TID 2 also proposed the relocation of a 345kV overhead electric transmission power lines which estimated at just over $4 million was that cost, and also the relocation of an underground natural gas line which that cost is estimated at $700,000. The relocation of the electric and gas lines were to allow the full, unimpeded development of the Uline property, but those utilities will no longer be relocated, and that will remove $5.225 million from the district cost. So to sum that up there are some electric and natural gas lines that run through here, and the old project plan had the cost of over $5 million to relocate those, and those are now being taken out of the plan.

Secondly, a second project is a multi-modal transportation facility. The Village, in cooperation with the Wisconsin DOT, is planning for the development of a multi-modal transportation facility to include commercial retail building components to be located in the vicinity of the RecPlex. Initial concept plans for the facility provide approximately 290 parking spaces that will serve the purpose of providing parking for commuters, retail establishment customers and for overflow parking of the RecPlex. Here’s some views on the PowerPoint, one looking north from 165 where this proposed multi-modal transportation lot is supposed to be. And the second on the right is looking to the southeast from the main entrance to the RecPlex. It is anticipated that the development of the Multi-Modal Transportation facility will involve an expenditure of approximately $1.678 million.

The next project proposed is 39th Avenue reconstruction. 39th Avenue is proposed to be reconstructed to an urban profile, that’s with curb and gutter, a two-lane roadway with a median, bicycle lanes and parallel parking between 104th Street and 97th Street. In the shot on the PowerPoint you can see it’s just in front of the Village Hall looking northwards towards the intersection of Springbrook Road.

The improvements to 39th Avenue, an arterial roadway, will serve the proposed Village Green Center generally located within the demographic center of the Village at 104th Street, Springbrook Road and 39th Avenue. The Village Green Center is a planned, but yet-to-be-constructed, mixed-use commercial/residential development incorporating not only commercial, civic and park uses, but also a variety of higher density residential uses. This improvement will provide the foundation for the necessary infrastructure to start commercial development, by a private developer, in the geographic center of the Village.

It is anticipated that the necessary funding for the reconstruction of 39th Avenue, which includes engineering fees, right-of-way acquisition, property acquisition for two storm water facilities, sanitary sewer, water main, storm sewer mains, roadway, traffic signals, landscaping, irrigation, street lighting and the relocation of some overhead utility lines between 39th Avenue and 100th Street, northwards to Springbrook Road, will involve an expenditure of approximately $3.45 million.

And up on the slide now is a proposed cross-section of the widened 39th Avenue. You can see it has a 20 foot wide median down the middle, and then 12 foot driving lanes and a 5 foot bike lane.
And then outside of that is an 8 foot parallel parking lane, and then 2.5 feet for curb and gutter and a 19 foot wide landscaped terrace. And then on the outside is a 5 foot wide sidewalk. And then on the slide you see before you now shows potential right of way acquisition, and it might be somewhat hard to see, but if you see in the lighter yellow-greenish color and the red color are proposed potential property acquisitions for the proposed widening of 39th Avenue.

The next project is the Lakeview reservoir water main extension. In order to provide an additional water supply to the existing five million gallon storage facility located at 39th Street and Dabbs Farm Drive, it is necessary to construct a 24-inch water main along Old Green Bay Road, from 104th Street north to the reservoir. This improvement will cost approximately $1,555,000.

The next proposed project is site preparation for the Kenosha Area Business Alliance or KABA property. KABA Development LLC is the owner of an approximate 30 acre parcel located in the northwest quadrant of I-94, bounded by County Trunk Highway on the south and the West Frontage Road on the west. In anticipation of the development of this KABA-owned site, it is necessary to grade and remove the pavement from the vacated portion of the former West Frontage roadway. These improvements will involve an expenditure of approximately $550,000. So on the slide in front of you can see that’s the old soon to be vacated frontage road that ran through this former 20 acre property which is now a 30 acre property. So there’s a new frontage road you can see way in the upper left hand corner of the slide. You can see the new frontage road in the upper left hand corner. So the site will be graded and the pavement removed as part of this project.

The next proposed project is the State Trunk Highway 165 and County Trunk Highway H intersection improvements. The intersection of State Trunk Highway 165 and County Trunk Highway H located in the heart of the LakeView East Corporate Park is a signalized intersection that carries a large amount and vast majority of semi-truck and semi-trailer traffic and automobile traffic that travels in and through the Corporate Park. This intersection has seen an increase in traffic accidents and has become a problematic intersection. Most accidents are mainly associated with left turn movements from north and southbound CTH H or 88th Avenue to east- and westbound 165 or 104th Street. The increase in safety at this intersection would be through added capacity, improved geometrics and traffic signal upgrades which will cost approximately $100,000.

The next proposed project in the amended plan is 97th Street improvements also known as Abbott Road B off the West Frontage Road. Abbott Lab owns approximately 485 acres of undeveloped on the west side of I-94, between Highway C on the north and Highway Q on the south. In anticipation of potential development of this land, or a portion thereof, 97th Street extending west from the West Frontage Road would serve as a main entrance to this future corporate campus area that will potentially create an employment base of around 13,000 persons. The 97th Street roadway improvements will cost approximately $392,000.

The next proposed project plan are public works projects. The following infrastructure improvements to the municipal sanitary sewer and water utilities will accommodate additional demands on systems totaling approximately $115,000. And those would be booster station motor control improvements at Booster Station #1 at Sheridan Road and 104th Street; telemetry improvements for west end businesses which would cost approximately $10,000; force main
valve work on State Trunk Highway 165 lift station; and finally force main discharge vault reconstruction, and that would cost approximately $25,000.

So that’s a brief description of the proposed project plans and their costs involved in amendment #4. And there are a series of ten maps that you also have on your computers. I’m not going to go through all those maps. I can if you’d like me to. I’ll go through them quickly. Before you is map 1. We saw this one earlier. It’s proposed additions and subtractions properties to the TID boundary. Again, the red are subtractions, the green are additions.

Map 2 are boundaries and wetlands. The wetlands have not changed since 2008 since the last TID amendment. Map 3 are existing uses. This map just shows the current use of each parcel within the amendment 4 TID 2 boundary. Map 4 is grading and infrastructure. Some of the highlights here if you see on the west side in the yellow are, again, the KABA portion at the northwest quadrant of I-94 and Highway Q which I spoke about and, of course, that L-shaped piece way on the left side, on the west side, is that Uline 35 acre annexation piece.

Map 5 is existing sewer and water. Again, this has changed slightly obviously. You see the new water – I’m sorry, this map 6, proposed sewer and water, you can see the blue line along Old Green Bay Road right in this area here. That’s the project going from 104th on the south up to 93rd Street on the north for the 24 inch water main. That’s the main project there. There’s still a piece of water main here along H that needs to be put in pursuant to the old 2008 amendment. And, of course, you see all the infrastructure work that’s proposed for the Abbott Land west of I-94.

Map 7 shows existing zoning. Again, the gray color is industrial manufacturing, the red gets into retail, green area is conservancy and so on and so forth. And the proposed zoning is the same as you see on map 8 as map 7. We’re not proposing any new zoning amendments with this amendment number 4. Map 9 is existing land use taken from the Comprehensive plan. Again, gray industrial manufacturing, red commercial, blue is the institutional at the southeast quadrant of I-94 and 104th Street. Green areas are conservancy areas. Once again, you’ll see map 9 and I’ll go over to map 10, proposed land use, there are no changes in land use. Both those maps are exactly the same.

And, of course, before you tonight is Resolution 12-9. That’s for amendment #4 to TID #2 to send a favorable recommendation to the Village Board to approve the amendment. And, of course, it’s also for the Plan Commission to approve Resolution 12-9. And if you have any questions I’d be happy to answer them.

Tom Terwall:

This is a matter for public hearing. Is there anybody wishing to speak on this matter? Mr. Ryzak?

Gale Ryczek:

Gale Ryczek, 21531 81st Street, Bristol, Wisconsin. I’m District Administrator of Bristol School. My concern is, I sat on the first TID committees we had a long time ago, and certainly strayed from the original 1,000 acres that were there. I need to speak to our public because we’re looking
to putting an addition on our school. And it was like 2/17 or 2/18 when it was going to be finished. I guess what I’m most concerned about is Uline. If Uline comes on line it means a lot to the taxpayers in Bristol because it’s 20 to 25 percent of the value of the present equalized assessed valuation of our district right now. So if this continues to get pushed out and out and out I can’t in good faith tell them that we’re ever going to get anything. Because I have it set up if we put the addition on I’ll have it paid before this gets retired and shortly after I retire. I guess that’s my comment. That’s my comment.

I have to rush off to another meeting, so I just want to let you know that’s our concern. I guess I would like to get a copy of that. You can probably just email that to me. I talk to Mike every once in a while, so I try to keep in touch with Pleasant Prairie and Kenosha to see what they’re doing. It does affect us and it affects a lot of people out there. Actually a lot of those people are in Kenosha, they’re in Strawberry Creek. So keep up doing the good work here. Maybe just take Uline out of that and put it in our school district. It does lie in our school district.

Tom Terwall:

I understand. Thank you very much. Anybody else? Anybody else wishing to speak? Hearing none, I’ll open it up to comments from Commissioners and staff. Don, you were first.

Don Hackbarth:

The 39th Avenue project is Gordy’s is going to be gone?

Mike Pollocoff:

I tend to think not, but we really can’t start the design of this until the TIF is approved.

Don Hackbarth:

Because the right of way looks like it’s going right through his –

Mike Pollocoff:

I think we have to look at that.

Don Hackbarth:

The other thing, the electric lines they’re going to be going underground?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah, we’ll be burying. Again, when you look at where the proposed relocation is we can’t put those between the relocation and the Village Hall because we’d be right on top of the Village Hall. So we’d be burying. For the uses that are along that east side of the road we’ll be burying the lines.
Don Hackbarth:

Do you know why they didn’t bury the lines along 165 when they rebuilt the roadway?

Mike Pollocoff:

Because the State usually won’t do that just as a matter of policy. They’d much prefer to have the utilities relocate the power lines out of the roadway or out of the right of way or have them acquire easements. It’s just a matter of how they do it.

Don Hackbarth:

And then 165 and H the redesign of the intersection, why isn’t that a roundabout?

Mike Pollocoff:

It actually could be. And I think that if the State – this is one of those projects where it’s a little aggravating because it’s a State highway and a County highway, and neither one of those agencies is addressing the problem there so we’re looking to having the Village do it. I think if there was some State money that was going in there they would be required to do a roundabout analysis.

Don Hackbarth:

The reason I say that is because Saturday night there was an accident on 165 and Sheridan and I responded to it. And I was talking to the police officer there and I asked him about the roundabouts, accident rates, and he said they’re way, way down, they’re way down compared to what they were before.

Mike Pollocoff:

And this intersection here it could function just like the roundabouts we have now, they’re all double lane roundabouts.

Don Hackbarth:

The only problem I see with the roundabout we’ve got is at five o’clock when people are going through it they chase each down the roadway. It’s not the speed limit. There’s a drag race to be the first to the next roundabout.

John Braig:

The addition of the Uline warehouse is that going to be a third warehouse, or is it going to replace the one that’s east of I-94?
Tom Shircel:

That would be the second warehouse on the Uline campus. So they have the existing just under one million square foot, and this is a proposed 1.25.

Mike Pollocoff:

But they’ll keep the one on H.

John Braig:

They’ll keep the one on H.

Tom Shircel:

Right.

John Braig:

Thank you.

Michael Serpe:

Tom, 39th Avenue reconstruction, is that going to be one lane each way with the median and a bike path and a parking lane?

Tom Shircel:

Yes, if you look at the slide on the wall right now you see you’ve got two –

Michael Serpe:

And the reason I’m asking Tom is –

Tom Shircel:

Here’s one lane northbound and southbound.

Michael Serpe:

I understand. If Village Green develops the way we anticipate it to develop and the amount of housing that’s going to go to the west of Village Green, is that going to be an adequate enough road to handle that much more residents?

Tom Shircel:

The total right of way width, as you can see, is 130 feet from east to west. Mike Spence, do you want to explain this?
Mike Spence:

Mike Spence, 9915 39th Avenue. We did a capacity study, and the engineer looked at all the proposed developed including Village Green, and they could not justify two travel lanes in each direction. So what we’ve done to sort of hedge our bets, because we wouldn’t be able to get any funding for that because it wasn’t an approved capacity, so what we’re looking at in our cross-section is if you look at on the edges we have a rather wide terrace. So it would be our intent to have that as a safety area. If we ever did have to add lanes we would have the right of way to do that.

Michael Serpe:

Okay, thanks, Mike.

Tom Terwall:

Anybody else?

Michael Serpe:

Another comments. I think we have to commend Mike on approaching the State in getting this TIF District redirected, and a good job on his part for doing it and whoever else helped out on that. I’m sure John had his share of input as well. I’d move approval of –

Tom Terwall:

I want two motions. First I need a motion to adopt Resolution 12-09.

Michael Serpe:

I’ll make that motion.

Tom Terwall:

Is there a second?

John Braig:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

MOVED BY MIKE SERPE AND SECONDED BY JOHN BRAIG TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 12-09 AS PRESENTED. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.
Voices:

   Aye.

Tom Terwall:

   Opposed? So ordered. Now I need a motion to send a favorable recommendation to the Village Board to proceed with this project based on the adoption of our Resolution.

John Braig:

   So moved.

Tom Terwall:

   Is there a second?

Jim Bandura:

   Second.

Tom Terwall:

   Moved by John Braig and a second by Jim Bandura. All in favor signify by saying aye.

Voices:

   Aye.

Tom Terwall:

   Opposed? So ordered. Mike?

Mike Pollocoff:

   Just a comment on a couple things that don’t affect your vote. Mr. Ryczek’s concern that he’d like to have that tax base available for them to use, we’d like to have the tax base available for us to use as well. But it comes to the fundamental concept of a TIF. If we didn’t do this thing the development wouldn’t be there anyway. Right now they’re held harmless from any formula changes because we have this. But once the investment’s made there and the community in essence has banked those future tax savings, then it will be significant for both Bristol Elementary School as well as the Village of Pleasant Prairie who is providing the services. Right now they’re in a little bit luckier position because they don’t have to service any children from that development because there isn’t any kids there.
Tom Terwall:

As Gale pointed out this will be 25 percent of the total equalized value of the Village of Bristol, and there are no students.

John Braig:

Another way of putting it is it increases by one third.

Mike Pollocoff:

I think when you look at the significance of the Pleasant Prairie development over here, between Uline and Premium Outlets the value in those developments is equal to the entire Town of Brighton. It’s a major spot of economic development in Kenosha County. So this thing hopefully we’re looking at 2021 conservatively, hopefully we do better than that. It’s hard to visualize doing better given the economy we’re in right now, but we will do better.

Secondly, there’s no way we could have done this without the amendment of the law, and I really had very little to do with it other than coming up with the scheme. But the Village President and our Representative is the one that really helped get this thing or got it going on the legislature and got it done for us. Other than that we’d actually be done. We wouldn’t be doing any more TIFs at all. We’d have to be waiting for the housing market to get better. And all it does is it forces people to act in a way that isn’t contrary to stall his economic development.

Andrea Rode:

Mike, regarding the multi-modal transportation facility, it’s kind of exciting to think about an Amtrak stop. I’m surprised nobody started to discuss it because that is huge. That’s a huge development.

Mike Pollocoff:

It’s been something that Uline and Abbott and some other people have requested to be able to have a stop there. I know it was tried initially when WisPark was looking for a development. It was actually going to be where Lakeview Tech was. And we don’t have a plan for it other than we’ve done some initial groundwork to set that land aside. once the Governor and the US Department of Transportation start playing nice again on trains we’ll have a better chance for it to happen. But right it’s going to be deadlocked, but that doesn’t mean we shouldn’t do good planning and be ready to do that.

That whole site, RecPlex has become a multi-modal facility only because everybody uses the parking lots there to park as they go to Illinois. On a daily basis we’d have like 150 cars that are parking out there that are not using the facility to park, they’re using it as a park and ride. So we are looking to get a grant that Kenosha County has helped us get to get this thing started to be able to accommodate cars. We’re going to work on the train. That’s not going to happen right away but we’re going to start working on it diligently. Bus drop off and pick up. We’re going to try and get that stop for the airport runs to go from there as well as bikes so we can use it for as many things as possible. But I really think when you look at the metra proposal that existed,
here’s one where the train already does go to Milwaukee and Chicago, and you don’t have to put in more tracks or anything. It’s there in place, so we just have to get the political actors to play nice together.

Tom Terwall:

In our lifetime are you expecting to see that, Mike?

Mike Pollocoff:

My lifetime? I hope so. Who’s a younger person I can pick on here. To me it just makes too much sense and it’s right there.

Andrea Rode:

Yeah, good planning.

Tom Terwall:

We’ll move on to Item B. You want B and C to be considered together, Jean, is that correct?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yes, please.

Tom Terwall:

Can we have a motion to that effect.

John Braig:

So moved.

Michael Serpe:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

MOVED BY JOHN BRAIG AND SECONDED BY MIKE SERPE TO COMBINE ITEMS B AND C FOR ONE PUBLIC HEARING BUT TWO SEPARATE VOTES. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.
Tom Terwall:

Opposed?

B. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION ZONING TEXT AND ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS for the request of Jeffery Marlow, President of Lexington Homes Inc., to rezone the property located south of Prairie Ridge Blvd. between 91st and 94th Avenues and north of 80th Street in the Prairie Ridge Development from the R-9 (UHO), Multi-Family Residential District with an Urban Landholding Overlay District to the R-11 (PUD), Multi-Family Residential District with a Planned Unit Development Overlay District for the proposed development of 4-apartment buildings (176-apartments--including 72 efficiency units, 68-1 bedroom units and 36-2 bedroom units) and a clubhouse to be known as Cobblestone Creek and to create the specific PUD zoning regulations for this development.

C. Consider the request of Jeffery Marlow, President of Lexington Homes Inc., for approval of a Certified Survey Map, Development Agreement and related documents for the proposed Cobblestone Creek apartment development project located south of Prairie Ridge Blvd. between 91st and 94th Avenues and north of 80th Street in the Prairie Ridge Development.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission and the audience, we have a public hearing and consideration of zoning text and zoning map amendments, and this is at the request of Jeff Marlow, President of Lexington Homes, and this is to rezone the property located south of Prairie Ridge Boulevard between 91st and 94th Avenues, north of 80th Street and south of Prairie Ridge Boulevard, and they are proposing to rezone from the R-9 (UHO), Multi-Family Residential District with a UHO, Urban Landholding Overlay District, to the R-11 (PUD). So it would be a Multi-Family District with a Planned Unit Development Overlay. Their request comes with a proposed development of four apartments buildings, 176 total apartments, and a clubhouse to be known as Cobblestone Creek. And, again, the PUD will address specific zoning regulation flexibility for the development.

The second part of their request of the approval of a certified survey map, development agreement and related documents. Again, this is for the Cobblestone Creek apartment development and the clubhouse on the referenced property.

Specifically, the petition is requesting the approval to subdivide a 9.79 acre property located south of Prairie Ridge Boulevard between 91st and 94th Avenues, north of 80th Street south of Prairie Ridge Boulevard into two properties for the Cobblestone apartment development. They are looking to rezone the properties from the R-9 (UHO), Multiple Family District with an Urban Landholding Overlay District to the R-11 (PUD), Multiple Family Residential District with a Planned Unit Development Overlay. Specifically we are going to be addressing the Planned Unit Development Overlay and the flexibility based on the defined community benefits that they are providing to us for this project this evening.
In addition, one of the conditions of the PUD is that they are going to be putting in a digital security imaging system, or a DSIS system, and this is a security system, and they’ll also be granting a blanket access easement to the Village. Specifically with respect to the DSIS this will be a system that is owned and operated by the developer or the owner of the property, and the Village will just have maintenance rights, the right but not the obligation, to go in and to assist them with that security system if, in fact, it’s not being addressed by the owners.

Cobblestone Creek will consist of two 40-unit two story buildings and two 48-unit three story buildings with a total of 176 units. As shown on the site plan on the screen, a total of 72 efficiency units, 68 one-bedroom units and 36 two-bedroom units. The development will be on 9.79 net acres with a density of 17.98 units per acre. In addition, in the center of the development there will be a clubhouse, and on either side of the clubhouse will be two ponds that include walking paths and a nice outdoor patio area, gathering space just south of the clubhouse. Parking will be accommodated primarily one space per unit in underground parking with the balance of the parking onsite in individual parking lots that are adjacent to each of the buildings.

The majority of the units will have front loaded washers and dryers. Units will have built in microwave, smooth top ranges, refrigerators. The rents that are anticipated with this project based on their market study will vary from the mid $600's for an efficiency apartment to over $1,100 for a two-bedroom apartment. This excludes heat and water. With respect to this project, the payment of the water will be accomplished by the Village sending one bill to the developer, and they will need to divide it up amongst the units and bill it separately to the individual user.

The 40-unit buildings are, again, two story with a variety of floor plans. And as I mentioned back in the spring, as identified in the staff comments, you can see that there’s quite a variety of different sizes of the units. Again, the smallest are the efficiencies at 448 square feet, very suitable for one person, and then the largest in that four-unit building goes up to almost 1,364 square feet. So quite a variety in the four-unit buildings. Also in the staff comments it talks about the 48-unit buildings. Again, there will be two of those. They will be three stories. They’ll have elevators. And, again, they’ll have some efficiencies in those buildings, and they will range from 560 square feet, and then the largest of the units are almost 1,500 square feet or 1,487. So, again, a lot of variety in different types of units. Not cookie-cutter, not every unit is going to be the same. Peggy and I toured these buildings, one of their projects, and quite a bit of variety offered for the individual tenants depending on who is looking to get what type of an apartment.

As mentioned at our previous public hearings in the spring, there’s a number of site amenities, and Cobblestone Creek will offer this executive style clubhouse complete with security monitoring via cameras and an access key system. The clubhouse is 2,421 square feet including a 570 square foot garage. The garage will house any of their equipment that they need on the site, but in addition a golf cart because they will take potential clients or tenants around in golf carts around the site to tour and such instead of just walking or driving from building to building or site to site.

The clubhouse will also have the kitchenette, and it will also allow for a focal point for them as an outdoor patio gathering space and amenities for an inside gathering space for the tenants. Their management offices will also be located inside the clubhouse as well. Outside in their outdoor patio gathering area they’re going to have sitting areas, there will be esthetic ponds with fountains,
and they’re also going to install an electric grill for cooking out for the residents that are entertaining or having parties at that location. Initially, it was thought that they were going to be putting an outdoor pool at this site, but after discussions with the staff and viewing the RecPlex facility, they felt that the RecPlex provides some great opportunity for pool amenities and workout and fitness equipment and so on and so forth, and I believe that they’re going to work directly with the RecPlex and encourage their tenants to use that recreational facility for the community.

The ponds measure about a third of an acre on either side of the clubhouse. They’ll be constructed in the center of the site. They’ll have walking paths around the ponds. One of the questions initially was whether or not a well could be drilled or dug on the property. The staff has discussed this with them, and we will allow the well to be used to fill and stabilize the pond levels and the creek, hence the Cobblestone Creek, but municipal water is going to be required for all domestic as well as fire protection and irrigation systems on the site.

Cobblestone Creek will have curb and gutter throughout the property. Each individual building will also have its enclosed berm and screened trash receptacles, and those will be matching to the buildings with respect to color and such.

With respect to site access, parking and open space, we’re very aware of the existing access roadways, driveways throughout the perimeter of this development. So with respect to the site plan the driveways connecting the south side will be directly across from access points to Extended Love as well as the school. On the west side on 94th Avenue there will be direct connections to the senior center access. On the east side there’s one connection that it mid way, exactly mid way between St. Anne, two driveways, and then on the north their main entrance is directly across a median opening on Prairie Ridge Boulevard.

So we did a couple of different things since the initial presentation to you. Number one, we provided some more internal connections between the buildings and their underground parking, and we also made sure that all these driveways align so that there is no conflicts or great problems with respect to users going in and out of the site not only for the apartment project but as well for the users that circle on all four sides. Basically this is a little unusual in that basically public roads encircle this entire site. So it was a little bit more challenging for them to do their design and their connections.

With respect to the parking on the site, there are a total of 176 underground parking spaces, an additional 162 additional surface parking spaces, so they have 338 parking spaces. A couple of other things as we talk about how we’ve set this up, again, it was set up so there wasn’t one big massive parking lot. We wanted to make sure for the safety of the tenants as well as for there just not being large, open, vast parking areas that each building basically has the parking spaces attendant to those particular buildings. And by doing things the way we did and making these buildings a little bit larger the site as 58.4 percent open space, where only 25 percent of the site was required to have open space. So it will allow for and appear that there’s a lot more open green space on the site. And we felt that that would be a more attractive amenity for this area.

With respect to the DSIS that I had mentioned earlier, the DSIS is intended to cover apartment building entrances, parking lots, garage entrances, and it’s being monitored via a camera monitoring system pursuant to the Village ordinance. This is actually our first residential project,
large project that uses the DSIS. As you know we have that system for many of our new commercial projects from Prime to Shopps at Prairie Ridge, Lynch Chevrolet, Gordon Foods. We have a lot of projects all having this type of security system which is a live feedback to the police department. Again, we are not monitoring it on a minute-by-minute basis, but it is something that could be pulled up directly at the police station as well as in the cars for the vehicles in case an incident may occur at the site.

With respect to construction practices, Rob and Jeff did a nice job at presenting a lot of very unique things with respect to how these buildings will be constructed above and beyond what is typically done or required. And what we’ve done is those detailed construction practices, many of which we have incorporated as part of the Planned Unit Development requirements for this particular development. Again, typical development probably doesn’t build to these standards, but they have found that everything from the sound insulating walls and other details that they put in these buildings that it’s quite an attractive project, and people are very, very excited about living here because they don’t think of it as just a very quick transitional apartment lifestyle and unit. They have a tendency, and correct me if I’m wrong, Jeff, but they have a tendency to be there much longer periods of time because they feel very comfortable there, and it’s a quiet and affordable place for them to live.

Some of the other things that Jeff had mentioned at our meeting in the spring is that their success to their community does lie with their long-term management as well as the maintenance of their site. And so in the staff comments Jeff talked about the leasing and all the different requirements and the things that they go through as well as the management structure. And I might just have him reiterate a couple of those things but, again, we’ve introduced and put this into the staff comments, and we refer to this management leasing style as one of the most attractive elements that helped us support this project.

As I mentioned in the spring I contacted six or seven of the various police departments in Southeast Wisconsin, and I asked them what type of problems have you had with this particular project, and have you had any concerns. You know what, they were scratching their heads from the police chief down to the detectives to the beat guys, they had a hard time coming up with any concerns or any list of any type of issues that brought them on any type of regular trip to the buildings that had been put in these other communities. In fact, a couple of them asked me are you sure that’s in our community? I said, well, yes it is and this is where it is. Oh, well, we haven’t had any issues or problems with respect to whether it’s incidents or management or problems with respect to the center.

With respect to the site construction schedule, my understanding is that their anticipated start date is still September of this year with respect to site grading and excavation work. Building of the clubhouse and the digging of the esthetic ponds will also occur at the same time. Their intent is to start the first 40-unit building in September, this fall, and be completed sometime late spring of next year. My understanding is they want to start one and see how that leases up, and then work to the next, to the next, to the next. They want to keep going with respect to the project. And Jeff can confirm, but I think 2014 is still their target date to be completed with respect to the entire development which would be just over two years from now.

With respect to the projects on the agenda tonight, we have a number of items. The certified survey map is proposed because they are intending to subdivide the property into two parcels.
For financing purposes the developer does intent to keep ownership of both of them but to actually divide it and have two separate lots, one and two, for this particular project.

The CSM we’ve reviewed it. There’s a couple of things we’d like them to add to the certified survey map. We just need to make sure there’s identified cross-access easement and full accessibility from one parcel to the other for all the tenants, the Village, everyone who is going to be crossing and using all of the amenities on the site. And the staff comments does address some of these new easements that will need to be shown on the CSM, the storm water management, access and maintenance easement, additional utility easements as they are going to be needing from We Energies, vision triangle easements at each of the corners, cross-access easements, and then the blanket DSIS access easement, although we will record a separate DSIS access easement with the Register of Deeds office in addition to the certified survey map.

In addition, just as a reminder, they will need to get a formal written approval from the Prairie Ridge Commercial Owner’s Association. They did kind of give them an initial approval in the spring, but they will need to get final approval from them with respect to this development.

In addition, this project has very little public infrastructure. There’s public sidewalks and public street trees. The trees have already been planted for the most part. There might be a couple that need to be replaced, but public sidewalks also need to be installed. I think there’s some there, but they need to ringing the entire property. So a development agreement that addresses the private improvements that they’re going to be doing as well as the public improvements does need to be addressed, and we’ll be getting security for the sidewalk improvements on the site.

With respect to the text and map amendments, as we mentioned earlier, they’re going from R-9 (UHO) to R-11 (PUD). And some of the modifications to the zoning ordinance for this PUD are listed below in the staff comments. One is to address the net density. Number two is to increase the number of apartment units per building. The next is to allow the building height to go from 35 feet to 48 feet. Next is to allow for these efficiency units at a size down to 425 square feet. To allow for overhead garage doors to face a public street. Obviously they’re on the street on all four sides so that goes without saying. To allow for setbacks to the interior lot lines to be modified. To allow for underground parking spaces to be adjusted slightly.

And as I had mentioned previous some of the other defined community benefit were all the construction modifications that they’re looking to make. That they have to have one parking space per unit in the underground enclosed garage. Three bedroom units are prohibited on this site. Additional secured storage spaces will be allowed for each of the units in the basement area or the garage areas. Exterior building materials and the types they were presenting to us. Increase the open space area from that approximately 25 percent to over 50 percent. We have all of the buildings fully sprinklered. In the clubhouse in particular a defibrillator and local alarm box is going to be installed and provided.

Landscaping and exterior turf are going to be sprinklered. The multi-family sign is going to meet the maximum requirements per the Prairie Ridge Commercial Association, so maximum height of that is six feet. A DSIS system is going to be installed at the developer’s cost. Public sidewalks will need to be installed. They are not going to be allowing for any dogs in any of these units. And then they’ve addressed that if they have any concerns with respect to parking or it’s not
supposed to be on driveways or the access roadways, internal circulation roadways that they will address that through no parking signage as well as pavement on parking.

So the staff has put together a list of recommendations that cover the approvals of the certified survey map, development agreement and related documents as well as all the development plans that they’ve submitted to date. The staff recommends approval subject to the satisfaction of all these conditions, and actually closing with the Village within 30 days of the Village Board’s approval. I know that they have a number of things. They have to close with the bank and they have to, like I said, get some final documents to me for the development agreement just for the sidewalk. And so they need to satisfy all those and then close with us within 30 days. My understanding is they want to move very quickly because they want to get a jump in starting to work with some of the grading on the site out there as quickly as possible.

With that I’d like to introduce Jeff Marlow from Lexington to add any other additional comments that he’d like to present. Again, we are continuing the public hearing.

Jeff Marlow:

Jeff Marlow, 1300 North Kim’s Court, Green Bay. It’s a pleasure to be here tonight, and actually ten times better than the last time I was here. Jean’s covered a lot of the points. I can tell you we’re excited to be here, and we are really looking forward to getting started. We’re finalizing all our numbers. We’re just waiting for this final step of our process. I know Dan is in back waiting for this closing to occur also with us as he worked with us on putting this project together. So it’s just a matter of getting the approvals and being able to move forward. We’ve penciled in everything that we need to do within reason. We’re just finalizing. We’ll be selecting a finalized bank here between the three different quotes that we have. And we’re just ready to move forward with the project.

What exciting news what’s happening with Uline. I mean we’re good. I just told Peggy before the meeting started that when they came up and when they toured the property that we had in Pewaukee they were talking about which is the form of the 40-unit building, that had three buildings that were on site at the time. I think at the time you came you were in our first building. The other two buildings they’re already built and they’re 100 percent occupied. Occupancy has been tremendous.

One key point I will touch upon is the type of design. I hate to even call them apartments, because truly, and that’s why we actually call them lease residencies, because when you talk about them it’s all about diversity of the unit, of the makeup. I do own quite a few apartments that are truly more apartment driven, 20 years old and it’s the box. This is not this. This is something very esthetically pleasing. These are homes, and people are living in these for longer periods of time. We have a big shift that’s occurring where we’re seeing less people of home ownership and more people of rentalship. And I guess they want nice things. So hopefully us as developers are trying to listen and start to be able to give people those opportunities.

There’s a lot of people, too, that want to be able to retire today, and when they sell that home they don’t want to deal with that maintenance, but they’re still used to a nice place. So that’s when we talk about diversity of going from right, from having our efficiency unit to the working professional that maybe might be there once a blue moon but needs a place to hang his or her hat,
or the person that says, you know what, I want to be able to retire and I want the 1,400 square foot unit that’s going to have the two bedrooms, the full two baths and all the amenities. So that much I can tell you. It really truly is a unique project, and I think it’s something that’s really going to fit in well, and we definitely wan to be a part of the community. So are there any questions I can answer for anyone?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I was wondering if you have received any calls from any residents or anyone in the Village since this project was announced in the spring? Has there been any interest generated?

Jeff Marlow:

We have over 20 people on a waiting list that are interested in this project. Yeah, we’re excited. So that’s why we’re hoping to get this all through and try to get everything set to go to start. One thing just to add to what Jean had mentioned, we would start moving all the dirt around, begin with the clubhouse, work on those ponds, and we’re going to put two foundations in right away. So that way when we can start we can get going because we never know what the weather has entailed for us, but those two foundations we’ll get in. We’ve wrote an order to Spancrete because it’s a 12 week lead time to be able to get the products. I guess I’m sort of keeping my fingers crossed that I won’t be sitting with $350,000 worth of Spancrete here for orders. So we’ll start with those two and then we’ll go through the first one and get that done. And then we’ll just work our way right into the second one right away. Then from that part, as long as we get that set, as long as we hit our – we like to have a 80 percent rental occupancy, but truthfully for over 20 years I’ve been doing this we’ve filled anything that we built, because we pride ourselves on good quality locations that are going to be there. Then we’ll start with the next group which will be the same sort of thing, put in another foundation and another. We try to put in two foundations at a time otherwise the timing of it takes a little longer to get it built. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. I’m going to continue the public hearing, and we may have to call on you again. Anybody else wishing to speak? Anybody else? Hearing none, I’ll open it up to comments from Commissioners and staff.

Don Hackbarth:

On a unit that size, 1,400 or 1,500 square feet, why don’t we allow three bedrooms?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

The Village has had some concerns with respect to three bedroom units bringing in three or four or six different families or unrelated groups of people and it turning into more of a college dormitory. And so we would like to focus in on that not happening.

Tom Terwall:

Okay, that’s a serious problem in Waukegan. Mike?
Michael Serpe:

Jean, the application process for this development is very unique, very strict and very good I might add. And the property management is outstanding as I see this. Did we have conversation with Jeff on in the event next year, 10 years, 15 years he sells this property and the new owners as part of the conditions of purchase would follow the same process that he has put in place with the application and property management?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

The planned unit development that is the zoning for this property which is the overlay I did put a paragraph in here that talks about regardless of property ownership the property shall be operated and maintained in a uniform manner, and the development shall continue to operate under the detailed and structured process related to the leasing and property management as presented by the developer at the April 30, 2012 Plan Commission meeting, and we’ll probably change this, as to this Plan Commission meeting tonight and the Village Board meeting.

We did not specifically want to attach all of his leasing documents to this because we recognize that things can change. But the intent is all of these comments and all of the things that we’ve talked about these are some of the reasons why he’s receiving the density and the project and the uniqueness and the level of craftsmanship and quality in this project is what’s selling this project in addition to how they intend to maintain it. Because the maintenance and operation is key to any residential project from being a success and well maintained.

Michael Serpe:

And by doing that we’re going to keep the integrity of this project in place. That’s good.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

That’s good. He has indicated to us that this is one that they’d like to keep in their portfolio. Obviously I can’t guarantee that, but what I can guarantee that there’s a certain level of quality and quantity of expertise that they’re bringing to the table, and we would like them to understand that this is moving forward as like a covenant on the property pursuant to the zoning.

Michael Serpe:

And that’s been agreed upon, right Jeff?

Jeff Marlow:

If I could address two points. On the three bedroom situation, that’s a lot of our intent. We have no desire to have any three bedroom units. It’s just bad karma and we just don’t like to go there. And on the other application of the management style, yes, for the long-term hold absolutely. We’ve already went and working on long-term financing. I just did a huge refinance package on five of my properties through a Fannie Mae loan program. And I went ahead and had the appraisal all done on a Fannie Mae program, too. So we already have those steps where we’re
looking to go either Fannie Mae which is a long-term market of a 20 year, otherwise we’re looking to go FHA for a 35 year. Either one of them are throw away the key type of programs where they’re in place and they’re whole projects. So that’s our ultimate goal.

Andrea Rode:

Jeff, I just wanted to comment, too, for the Village I’m really looking forward to seeing this come to fruition. I can’t wait to see it once it starts and the first building goes up. I really love the design. It has a very European, very charming look and design to it, and it will just only add to the Village.

Jeff Marlow:

Thank you. It truly will. These pictures really don’t do it justice. Jean you saw and thought it was wonderful, this is even taking it steps even further, some really uniqueness and character to it.

Jim Bandura:

Just a quick question. You mentioned that you had a waiting list already. Just out of curiosity, what’s your age range on that?

Jeff Marlow:

I couldn’t even tell you. From property management Michelle that was here before I would ask her how many people on the list. I didn’t really ask her age-wise. But if I had to give you a best estimation I’d probably say you’re going to say somewhere about 35 to 40. What we find with the units that are here and the price points for what we’re at there’s very few people that are coming out of high school and they’re renting from us. That’s not our demographic. We talked about no dogs, absolutely want nothing to do with dogs. I love dogs but I just don’t love to deal with them on properties we own.

Don Hackbarth:

If I ever move into that place I might join St. Anne’s.

Tom Terwall:

I think St. Anne’s might have something to say about that, too. If there’s no further comments I’m going to move ahead then. I need a motion first of all to send a favorable recommendation to the Village Board to approve the zoning text and zoning map amendments.

Andrea Rode:

So moved.
Jim Bandura:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

MOVED BY ANDREA RODE AND SECONDED BY JIM BANDURA TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE ZONING TEXT AND ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered. And then Item C, a motion to send a favorable recommendation to the Village Board to approve the certified survey map, the development agreement and related documents.

Don Hackbarth:

So moved with the attached stipulations.

Michael Serpe:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

MOVED BY DON HACKBARTH, SECOND BY MIKE SERPE. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered. Go for it, Jeff.

D. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF PLAN COMMISSION RESOLUTION #12-10 FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN for the request of Mark Eberle, P.E. agent for Water Street Land LLC, owner, for the proposed commercial development of a the property located at the southeast corner of STH 50 and 104th Avenue within the Prairie
Ridge Development Plan. Specifically, Map 9.9 is proposed to be amended to correctly identify the field delineated wetlands, excluding the 2,578 square feet wetlands proposed to be filled into the Park, Recreational and Other Opens Space Lands with a field verified wetlands land use designation and the non-wetland areas including the 2,579 square feet of wetlands to be filled into the Commercial Lands with a designation as Community Retail and Service Centers land use designation on said property. In addition, to update Appendix 10-3 of the Village of Pleasant Prairie Wisconsin, 2035 Comprehensive Plan to include said amendment.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. Chairman, we’ve got items D, E, F, G, H are all related, so I’d like to make one presentation.

John Braig:

So moved.

Michael Serpe:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

MOVED BY JOHN BRAIG, SECOND BY MIKE SERPE. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

E. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A CONCEPTUAL PLAN for the request of Mark Eberle, P.E. agent for Water Street Land LLC, owner, for the proposed commercial development of a the property located at the southeast corner of STH 50 and 104th Avenue within the Prairie Ridge Development to create four (4) lots for the potential development of two (2) restaurants and two (2) other commercial buildings (retail or office uses) on the 9.2 acre property.

F. Consider the request of Mark Eberle, P.E. agent for Water Street Land LLC, owner, for approval of a Certified Survey Map, Development Agreement and related documents to create four (4) lots for the proposed commercial development of a the property located at the southeast corner of STH 50 and 104th Avenue within the Prairie Ridge Development Plan and extend public municipal sanitary sewer to service the development.
G. Consider the request of Mark Eberle, P.E. agent for Water Street Land LLC, owner, for approval of a Preliminary Site and Operational Plans to allow for the mass grading, installation of public and private infrastructure improvements for the proposed commercial development of the property located at the southeast corner of STH 50 and 104th Avenue within the Prairie Ridge Development Plan.

H. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A ZONING MAP AND TEXT AMENDMENT for the request of Mark Eberle, P.E. agent for Water Street Land LLC, owner, for the proposed commercial development of a the property located at the southeast corner of STH 50 and 104th Avenue within the Prairie Ridge Development Plan to amend the zoning map and rezone the field delineated wetlands into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District and to rezone the non-wetland areas including the 2,578 square feet wetland area to be filled into the B-2, Community Business District and to rezone the entire property into the Planned Unit Development District, (PUD). In addition, a Zoning Text Amendment is intended to create the specific PUD District zoning regulations for the proposed commercial development on said property.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission and the audience, we have six items that are related, and I will read each of them as on the agenda, and I’ll be making one presentation this evening. This has to do with a public hearing and consideration of Plan Commission Resolution 12-10 for an amendment to the comprehensive land use plan for the request of Mark Eberle, P.E., agent, for the Water Street Land, LLC, owner, for the proposed commercial development of a property located at the southeast corner of State Highway 50 and 104th Avenue within the Prairie Ridge Development.

Specifically, Map 9.9 is proposed to be amended to correctly identify the field delineated wetlands excluding an area that is proposed to be filled and developed, and specifically the area for this development will be placed into the commercial lands designation as a community retail and service center area land use designation on the property. In addition, we’ll be amending Appendix 10-3 of the Pleasant Prairie 2035 Comprehensive Plan to include the amendment.

The next item, also part of the public hearing will be a conceptual plan for the request of Water Street Land, LLC and, again, this is for the same property in the Prairie Ridge development. And this is to create four lots for potential development, two restaurants and two other commercial buildings, retail or office uses on the 9.2 acre property. The next item, again, the same petitioners, they’re requesting approval of a certified survey map, development agreement and related documents. This is to create the four lots within the commercial development.

The next item on the agenda the same petitioner, they’re requesting preliminary site and operational plan approval, and this is to allow the mass grading, installation of public and private infrastructure improvements for the proposed commercial development of the property, again, at that same location in the Prairie Ridge area. And the next is, finally, the zoning map and text amendment, and this is to rezone the property into – it’s to rezone based on the field delineated wetlands. Those areas that are wetland will be placed into the C-1 District. There’s a small area that’s proposed to be filled for the driveway entrance off 104th so that will be placed into the B-2,
Community Business District area. And then there will be a PUD, Planned United Development Overlay on top of the entire property.

So with that, the petitioner is requesting several approvals for the development of a 9.2 acre property within the Prairie Ridge development at the southeast corner of Highway 50 and 104th Avenue. The development area is to be referred to as the Prairie Ridge West Commercial Development. This is actually a redivision of Lot 1 of Certified Survey Map 2666.

With respect to the conceptual plan, again, they’re looking to subdivide this property at that southeast corner of 50 and 104th Avenue into four lots for the potential development of two restaurant pads and two other commercial buildings, retail or office uses. Lot 1 is proposed to be developed with a restaurant site that’s approximately 7,985 square feet. At this point the names of the restaurants have not been identified, with 170 parking space. Lot 2 is proposed to be developed with approximately a 4,897 square foot restaurant with 88 parking spaces. And actually we are looking for some flexibility that that still might be a multi-tenant site on Lot 2.

Lot 3 is proposed to be developed for a retail building of approximately 10,000 square feet with 59 parking spaces. And Lot 4 is proposed to be developed for a small office building, retail site. The maximum size would be 4,260 square feet with 21 parking spaces. Any use that goes in that small site would have to be able to accommodate the parking, so it can’t be too intensive of a retail or office use because we’ve only got space for about 21 spaces.

At this time, again, they are looking to just do some preliminary site and operational plan work to start the initial mass grading, pad ready sites, get the sewer and water infrastructure to the site. Detailed site and operational plans will need to be advanced by each of these users and presented to the staff and Plan Commission for formal approval before those actual pads start any type of building construction.

Site access for this complex or this outlot area is from 104th Avenue. There will be in a right-in, right-out as shown on the site just south of Highway 50. A secondary access will be from 77th Street, and then there will be some additional access, cross-access from 77th Street through the Olive Garden site and then cross-access to the first of this Lot 2. In addition, there is actually cross-access being provided that can circulate for each of these sites. The only exception is Lot 4 they will have that one direct access off of 77th Street. So as you can see we did provide good, smooth cross-access between each of the various building pad sites to get the users in and out of the site as well as deliveries and others that are coming in out of the site.

The conceptual plan also shows the potential for all the cross-access parking lot areas at that southeast corner. What’s important to note is each individual user does need to provide for adequate parking for that particular use. That doesn’t exclude cross-access, but they need to make sure that there are agreements amongst all of the users and, again, there will be a sub-association that’s created so that each of the individual parcels does have adequate parking throughout. It’s not the intention that there will be any parking allowed on Highway 50. There will be no parking on 104th and no parking on 77th for these users. There is a potential at the very south end right here to add another kind of overflow parking. I’m not sure that they would build that initially, but in the event that there is a parking issue they can add some additional parking. And obviously the users will work so those will be the parking spaces for their employees.
The wetlands on the site, as you can see there’s two main wetland complexes, were redelineated by Dave Meyer of Wetland and Waterway Consultants. This was done on October 22, 2011. There is a small area of just over 2,500 square feet of wetlands in this proximity that are proposed to be filled and developed in order for this cross-access driveway access from 104th Avenue to be brought into the site. The Village feels very strongly that this access is maintained on the site for access in and out of this development area. It was an access that was originally platted when Prairie Ridge was platted back in 1998. There was a curb cut that was provided, so the Village staff feels very strongly that this access point remain even as a right-in, right-out to get people in and out of this area of Prairie Ridge.

The wetlands are located within a common open space access and maintenance easement area that’s shown and described on the CSM. The Dedicated Wetland Conservancy Area Easement and Restricted Conservancy area that was originally shown on the previous CSM, we are asking for there to be some slight modification to the language. These wetlands are not intended to be used for storm water management, so we are requesting that there be some slight modifications to the CSM language for this CSM.

 Lots 1, 2 and 3 are proposed to be serviced by public sanitary sewer that the developer is going to be installing in the first instance along with private water and private storm sewer mains which will all connect to 77th Street. Engineering plans have been provided as part of the review and submittal as part of this preliminary site and operational plan approval process. So we’re waiting for a couple of pieces with respect to getting us the detailed contractor bids and proposals. But they are working to get that information to us. Lot 4 is kind of a little bit by itself and, again, that’s the one that’s way down at the corner right at that northeast corner. They’ll be getting their direct public improvements through laterals attached to 77th, in 77th Street.

Each of the four lots will have individual primary monument signs similar to the other developments along Highway 50. The primary monument signs for Lots 1 and 2 front along Highway 50. We’re recommending that these monument signs at these two locations do not exceed the same heights that have been approved similarly in Prairie Ridge at a maximum height of ten feet. There are some secondary monument signs that have been identified at the 104th Avenue entrance and the 77th Avenue entrance. Again, we’ve identified specifically the maximum heights for those secondary monuments. Both this Lot 3 and Lot 4 they will have their primary monument signs off of 77th Street, and their maximum heights for their signs that we’re proposing is six feet.

With respect to the secondary monument signs as noted in the staff comments those will be for helping to identify these three major users on the property. Again, we still envision that this Lot 4 will be more of a stand alone, and they likely will not be on those secondary monument signs.

The owner is proposing to create the Prairie Ridge West Commercial Development Association. Basically is will be a sub-association to the overall association for Prairie Ridge commercial area. And the purpose for this is that since they have some internal private roads, parking lots, open space areas, it’s intended that this sub-association will manage those types of activities within this particular area. That doesn’t mean that they still don’t have to comply with the requirements of the overall association. They will so they’ll have two basic associations that they’ll have to comply with in this particular area.
In the staff comments it notes that the declaration also outlines for the sub-association the responsibilities with respect to the DSIS. Again, it’s intended that there is going to be one DSIS, digital security imaging system, that services not only these four lots that we’re talking about this evening, 1, 2, 3, 4, but also the Olive Garden Restaurant. When we approved that development a few years ago, one of the conditions was that that restaurant and their access points also needed to be serviced by the DSIS. But instead of having a separate individual just for that restaurant, we had agreed as a Village that all five of these uses would be subject to the same DSIS. They could have one DVR, one secured centralized location, and it would be a little bit easier for this development. The concern is that we do want to see this DSIS go into one of the multi-tenant buildings that is in this area, or a separate stand alone hut or shelter building can be created so that each individual one they could come online one at a time. So we need to have a little bit further discussion with the developer as well as their users to discuss how they want to proceed. I kind of left it open in the DSIS of one way or another and the same in the PUD.

The certified survey map is proposed to subdivide the property into four lots. Again, Lot 1 will be 2.4 acres with 250 feet of frontage on Highway 50. Lot 2 will be 1.4 acres with 200 feet of frontage on Highway 50. Lot 3 1.4 acres with 230 feet of frontage on 77th Street. And then Lot 4 is 3.9 acres with over 190 feet of frontage on 77th Street and over 600 feet of frontage on 104th Avenue. The reason why that Lot 4 is so big is because it encompasses all of the wetland and open space areas within that particular area.

With respect to some of the easements, modifications that need to be made yet on the CSM, we want to get some clarification on the cross-access easements, M and L, and that’s kind of detailed in the staff comments. We need to get some clarification on the vision triangle easements. These are kind of new easements for the particular property. In addition we’ve got the common open space access and maintenance easement, the private water main access and maintenance easements, the dedicated entry monument sign easement and the public utilities access and maintenance easements. These all need to be shown on the CSM. We just want to go through that language with them. And most language is shown, but I just want to make sure everyone’s clear with respect to what the purpose of these easements are.

Also, some things that are new include the public sanitary sewer access and maintenance easement. Sanitary sewer is going to be public, so we’ve got to make sure that that easement is stated. The storm water management access and maintenance easement, they’re giving us an over access easement for storm water. The Village will have the right but not the obligation to do anything with respect to those. And then they come to find after doing their survey work that they needed to expand a dedicated entry monument easement on the property. As you know, there is a monument kind of over int his location that identified Target, Dick’s and Penney’s. And the whole thing is not quite in the easement, and so they need to expand it in order to address the concerns. Instead of requiring that monument to be moved, they’re just expanding that easement for that monument to stay.

Again, a couple of other easements that need to be modified with respect to their language one is the public/private storm water easement, the dedicated wetland conservancy easement which we talked about with respect to reflecting not a dedicated basin on that site. And then storm water detention easement language. So they just received all these modifications, and I know that their engineering is working on clarifying some of this language before the next Board meeting.
Easements E and F could be vacated prior to the recording on the new CSM. A couple of things. First of all, there is an existing storm water easement that runs north/south right here from the Olive Garden parking lot. Obviously that runs right through the center of this Lot 3 which would cause a problem for the building. So they are looking to cap that off and then redirect that storm water kind of through this Lot 2, and then it will exit out into their storm sewer that they are redesigning for the development.

With respect to the site because we do have public sanitary sewer, some public sidewalk, some public street trees, we are doing a development agreement for this. Most of the infrastructure will be private, and the development agreement addresses all the private work that does need to be done, but the public work does need to be secured by a letter of credit or cash payment from the bank. And we will be working through that, and that’s all set forth in the development agreement that they have. Again, the zoning map amendment I mentioned previously modifying the C-1 boundaries as well as placing that PUD on the entire property, and then those areas that are not wetland will be also placed into the B-2, Community Business District.

There’s a comprehensive plan amendment as a result of this, and this is due to the fact that we’re modifying the wetlands to be filled in that entrance driveway area or private driveway area. So we just need to make some slight modifications to the comprehensive plan to address that filling of the wetland in that area.

With respect to the preliminary site and operational plans the petitioner is requesting that preliminary approval this evening before the Plan Commission so that they can begin the installation of sanitary sewer, water and storm sewer mains along the north/south portion of the shared access driveway. The key here is that they do need to begin the mass grading and start getting these pad ready sites put together in order to get that infrastructure put in for the future developments in these areas. I made some reference and discussion about the storm sewer and the Olive Garden property and that one storm sewer that’s going to be vacated, redirected with respect to the storm sewer.

One of the other thing specifically as it relates to the construction site, and I know we’ve talked about this in the past, but there is existing an old single family house right at this corner along with some outbuildings. All of those structures including the house and all the utilities that are to that house and to that site needs to be razed, cleaned, site graded, get it pad ready, and we’ve got a deadline now of everything needs to be done, done, done by December 31st of this year. Hopefully sooner if they’re working with a future user for that particular property.

And then just in more detail, the digital security imaging system in the staff comments addresses the fact that there are five users that are going to be tied into this DSIS. One system there needs to be a secured lot location for the DSIS and the DVR in the system. There needs to be a Time Warner Cable connection. All of these users will need to be responsible for the costs associated with this system. It’s intended that this system once it’s been designed, installed and inspected by the Village it’s intended to be dedicated to the Village, and we will maintain that system no different than we maintain The Shoppes at Prairie Ridge and Prairie Ridge Commons. However, the owners are responsible for all of the ongoing maintenance costs and any future camera or line replacements for this system into perpetuity as we moved forward. And that is all detailed in the DSIS agreements that have been already drafted in their draft form for this development.
And one last thing with the DSIS that I might have mentioned is that we have identified that either the DSIS system can go into a secured room within one of the multi-tenant buildings, or the Village will support a separate hut or building, and it can be very small, but it has to be able to house this equipment that the Village, police department, IT department has direct access to but it’s not a direct accessible building that is generally accessible by the users on the property.

So with that the staff recommends approval although this is a public hearing and I’d like to continue that public hearing. And, again, we’ve got six items: The comprehensive land use plan amendment, the conceptual plan, the certified survey map and development agreement and related documents, the preliminary site and operational plans and the zoning map and text amendment, specifically that PUD, C-1 and the B-2. So with that I’d like to continue the public hearing. And there are representatives here regarding this project, and I didn’t know if they wanted to add anything to the discussion.

Tom Terwall:

Anybody wishing to speak? Does the developer wish to be heard?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yes, they do.

Mark Eberle:

Hi there, Mark Eberle, Nielsen, Madsen Engineers. Here today with me is John Holborow from Evo Development representing the developer, representing the bank, excuse me. Jean, just want to say thank you. You always do a wonderful job of presenting that, better than I could ever do in a million years. That’s a lot to get out for one development. But we’re really just here to answer any questions you may have. It’s a somewhat complicated site to put together but it’s coming together I think very well. We’re getting towards the last leg of it here. There’s some issues to iron out regarding security systems and public sanitary sewer mains and a couple other things. But it’s coming together very well. I’m just here to answer any questions you may have.

Tom Terwall:

I wouldn’t ask you to divulge tenants, but do you know who any of the possible restaurants may be? Are you discussing that with anybody at this point? I’m not going to ask you who.

John Holborow:

John Holborow with Evo Development. My address is 5375 North 118th Court in Milwaukee. I’m representing the bank as their developer’s consultant. The bank is currently negotiating one purchase and sale agreement with an end user. It’s a national retail restaurant chain that currently has no presence in Wisconsin. Pleasant Prairie would be their first location in Wisconsin. They’re not ready to divulge the information yet because they don’t have a signed contract. But obviously we’d be happy to share that with you sooner rather than later as soon as we have that contract wrapped up. We are having other conversations with other national restaurant users as
well as other retail, office, commercial users for the remainder of the project. And obviously as those come in as well we would divulge that information to you.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. I’ll continue the public hearing. Just be prepared to answer any questions as they come up. Is there anybody else wishing to speak? Anybody else? Hearing none I’m going to open it up to Commissioners and staff. Jean, I have one question. Access on 014th Avenue is there any thought given to how that’s going to line up with Lynch’s ultimate entrance point on 104th Avenue?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It actually doesn’t because 77th Street is the east/west roadway that takes you into the Chateau Eau Plaines area. So that driveway on 104th right there lines up with a solid median. So that’s why it’s going to be a right-in, right-out only. What I can tell you is the DOT has reviewed this plan and recently, just recently late last week, we received comments from them. And they’re actually looking for a considerable amount of dedication along the east side of 104th. It looks like it’s not going to impact the buildings or the parking lots because they’ve made even some minor adjustments here, but there is some wetland impacts and other impacts right here. And the DOT asked us to consider whether or not that this driveway could be close, and in the staff’s opinion –

Tom Terwall:

No.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

– closing that driveway would be very detrimental for this development. With the number of parking spaces, the number of users, the number of users right here we need to make sure there are multiple opportunities for access in and out. And, again, there is no median cross-over right here, so it should not have any direct impact on the crisscrossing of traffic at that location. And it really is outside of the sphere of influence with respect to the construction zone for the right hand turn lane movements when Highway 50 is reconstructed in 2017.

Tom Terwall:

Will Lynch’s ultimate access then be north or south of that driveway?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Well, Lynch is kind of way over here because there’s a whole corner right here of potential for commercial development. Like going off this is 77th and it keeps going, keeps going, and then over here is where 109th Avenue is, and Lynch is actually on the west side of 109th Avenue with entrance onto Highway 50 and 77th. So they’re a ways away. I don’t want to say a half a mile but a quarter mile maybe to the west.
Jim Bandura:

Just a quick question, Jean. I have a little concern with the curb cut for the smaller parcel on the corner of 77th. How close is that to the corner?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It has to be a minimum of 150 feet from that intersection. I don’t know if either of you know right off the top of your head without scaling it where it is. 150 feet.

Jim Bandura:

So the start of it is at 150 feet?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

No, center line to center line, and that’s what’s required by ordinance. And there’s a maximum of 21 parking spaces there. So it can’t be an intensive retail use at that location. It probably won’t be a restaurant use. I mean it would be very difficult because restaurant and some other uses – more of an office use. Less parking spaces, less impact, less in and out.

Michael Serpe:

Jean, do we know the parking situation with reference to the Olive Garden on a Saturday night?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Do I know about the parking situation? What I can tell you is that there’s oftentimes that they’re in need of additional parking. But I can tell you according to their manager this is one of the most successful Olive Gardens that they have. But what they are finding out now after almost two years of being open is that many of the people that go to the restaurant are starting when are the busy times and least busy times, and people are spreading that time out so it’s not becoming as much of an issue as it did before. Obviously restaurants typically will cross-access, but I know that they need to make sure that they accommodate for their parking onsite. The question is how long are people willing to wait to go to that restaurant.

Michael Serpe:

And how does this development, this larger restaurant here compare with the Olive Garden as far as size and parking?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It’s much larger. And I think their minimum parking is 170 or 180. They require more parking.

Michael Serpe:

And what does the Olive Garden have, 140?
Jean Werbie-Harris:

Something like about 140. They require more parking, and that’s why specifically on their site plan there is specifically at least that 180 that has been designated. And then that is why also this additional parking lot has been identified that goes above and beyond the requirements for each of the users.

Michael Serpe:

This is great news, don’t get me wrong. We just want to make sure that we do have enough parking because we’re restricting the parking on the streets.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And the other thing I do have to mention, and I guess each of these users if they find that they’re that successful there is some opportunity. There’s a lot of vacant spots that are at the very north end of 77th Street as part of the Inland property parking lot area. Again, that’s something that would have to be negotiated or discussed between the projects and the developments to see if they could actually identify some parking spaces for cross-access. But there is some opportunity there as well as behind the southeast corner of that development as well for parking is what I’ve noticed over the last several weeks.

Michael Serpe:

I guess based on tonight’s agenda I guess that the economy is turning around.

John Braig:

If nothing else the staff is busy.

Don Hackbarth:

I make a recommendation that we approve Resolution 12-10 for the amendment to the comprehensive land use plan.

Jim Bandura:

Second.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Tom, did we close the public hearing? I’m not sure if we did or not.

Tom Terwall:

No. Is there any further comment? I’ll close the public hearing. Now your motion.
Don Hackbarth:

Alright, I recommend that we approve Resolution 12-10 for an amendment to the comprehensive land use plan.

Jim Bandura:

And I will second it.

Tom Terwall:

MOTION BY DON HACKBARTH AND A SECOND BY JIM BANDURA TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 12-10 FOR AMENDMENT TO THE COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

Michael Serpe:

Move approval of the conceptual plan.

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

MOTION BY MIKE SERPE AND A SECOND BY JUDY JULIANA TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Can I just clarify that for the conceptual plan, the certified survey map, the development related documents all of these specific related items I would like to see a 60 day conditional approval so that they have at least 60 days from the Village Board meeting in order to make sure that all the conditions are satisfied. We’re working towards that end and I’m sure we’ll meet that with plenty of time, but I’m not sure if I put that in the staff comments or not. So I just want to make sure there will be 60 days from the Board’s approval.
Tom Terwall:

But that’s something for the Board to approve, not for the Plan Commission.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

That’s true, but actually I want to bring it up to you as well at this point.

Tom Terwall:

I UNDERSTAND, OKAY. WE HAVE A MOTION BY MIKE SERPE AND A SECOND BY JUDY JULIANA THEN TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered. Then we need a motion to send a favorable recommendation to the Village Board to approve the certified survey map, development agreement and related documents.

John Braig:

So moved.

Andrea Rode:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

IT’S BEEN MOVED BY JOHN BRAIG AND SECONDED BY ANDREA RODE TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE CERTIFIED SURVEY MAP, DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AND RELATED DOCUMENTS SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.
Tom Terwall:

    Opposed? So ordered. Now we need a motion to approve the preliminary site and operational plans.

Don Hackbarth:

    So moved.

Jim Bandura:

    Second.

Tom Terwall:

    MOVED BY DON HACKBARTH AND SECONDED BY JIM BANDURA TO APPROVE THE PRELIMINARY SITE AND OPERATIONAL PLAN SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

    Aye.

Tom Terwall:

    Opposed? So ordered. Then, finally, a motion to send a favorable recommendation to the Village Board for consideration of the zoning map and text amendment.

Michael Serpe:

    So moved.

Judy Juliana:

    Second.

Tom Terwall:

    MOVED BY MIKE SERPE AND SECONDED BY JUDY JULIANA TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE ZONING MAP AND TEXT AMENDMENT SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

    Aye.
Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered. We’re waiting for you guys to open that restaurant. Thank you.

I. Consider the change of the official address of the property located at 11121 4\textsuperscript{th} Avenue to 11027 4\textsuperscript{th} Avenue as a result of the address being out of sequence.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission, this item is to consider the change of the official address of the property located at 11121 4\textsuperscript{th} Avenue to 11027 4\textsuperscript{th} Avenue as a result of the address being out of sequence. It has been brought to the Village’s attention that the addresses of the homes on the east side of 4\textsuperscript{th} Avenue in the Carol Beach Subdivision are out of sequence between 11001 and 11145 4\textsuperscript{th} Avenue. In reviewing this information, it appears that the home located at 11121 4\textsuperscript{th} Avenue, Lot 20 of Block 20 in the Carol Beach Estates Subdivision Unit #2 owned by Gomez and Gisela Hernandez and further identified as Tax Parcel Number 93-4-123-293-1045 is located between 11021 and 11101 4\textsuperscript{th} Avenue.

These address issues could create problems for emergency response personnel, deliveries and other persons trying to locate the properties. Therefore, on July 16, 2012, the Village Board had adopted Resolution 12-22 to initiate the change of the official address of this property pursuant to Article IV of the Village ordinance. The Village Board of Trustees is going to be holding a public hearing to consider the changing of the address for this property, again, from 11121 4\textsuperscript{th} Avenue to 11027 4\textsuperscript{th} Avenue to resolve the aforementioned concerns. Staff is still looking for recommendation from the Village Plan Commission on this matter. We need to confirm exactly what date it’s going before the Village Board. So we need to confirm that date. But the staff is recommending that the Plan Commission consider approval of this official address change with the public.

Tom Terwall:

Has the property owner been involved in any of these discussions?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

We have sent notification to the property owner. We have not heard from them yet. We will send notification again to confirm the public hearing date, and hopefully they will respond to that.

Don Hackbarth:

November 1\textsuperscript{st}?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Well, the November 1\textsuperscript{st} date would be the effective date. We typically give 30 to 90 days for an effective date. But the public hearing date we need to confirm whether or not it’s August 20\textsuperscript{th} or it’s going to be September 17\textsuperscript{th}. 
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Don Hackbarth:
   Move approval.

Michael Serpe:
   Second.

Tom Terwall:
   
   MOVED BY DON HACKBARTH AND SECONDED BY MIKE SERPE TO SEND A
   FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD APPROVING A
   CHANGE OF ADDRESS SUBJECT TO THE PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE
   VILLAGE BOARD. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:
   Aye.

Tom Terwall:
   
   Opposed? So ordered.

7.  ADJOURN.

John Braig:
   
   So moved.

Michael Serpe:
   
   Second.

Tom Terwall:
   
   All in favor?

Voices:
   Aye.