

**PLEASANT PRAIRIE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
VILLAGE HALL AUDITORIUM
9915 39TH AVENUE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE, WISCONSIN
6:00 P.M.
April 23, 2018**

A meeting for the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission convened at 6:00 p.m. on April 23, 2018. Those in attendance were Michael Serpe, Chairman; Wayne Koessl; Jim Bandura; Bill Stoebig; John Skalbeck (Alternate #1); Brock Williamson (Alternate #2) and Michael Pollocoff. Deb Skarda and July Juliana were excused. Also in attendance were Tom Shircel, Interim Village Administrator; Jean Werbie-Harris, Community Development Director; and Kristina Tranel, Community Development Department.

1. CALL TO ORDER.

2. ROLL CALL.

3. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN OF PLAN COMMISSION.

Michael Serpe:

I'll accept nominations.

Bill Stoebig:

I'd like to nominate Mr. Mike Pollocoff.

Jim Bandura:

I second.

Michael Serpe:

And is there any other nominations, let me ask you that. We'll ask that nominations be closed.

Wayne Koessl:

So moved.

Michael Serpe:

Okay, nomination closed. All in favor of Mike as Vice Chair say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Michael Serpe:

Opposed? That's about the easiest election we've ever had.

4. CORRESPONDENCE.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I do have one piece of correspondence, but I'll read it as part of the public record for the item on the agenda.

5. CITIZEN COMMENTS.

Michael Serpe:

We have a number of public hearings tonight. if there's something that you wish to say during one of the public hearings you can hold your comment until that item is called. But if there's any other comments that you wish to make that's not on the agenda now is your time to talk. Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? We'll close citizens' comments.

6. NEW BUSINESS

Wayne Koessl:

Mr. Chairman, I see we're taking Item A and B under one presentation, but I move we do separate votes on them.

Jim Bandura:

Second.

Michael Serpe:

MOTION MADE BY WAYNE KOESSL AND SECONDED BY JIM BANDURA TO TAKE ITEM A AND B TOGETHER WITH SEPARATE MOTIONS. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Michael Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it.

A. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF PLAN COMMISSION RESOLUTION #18-12 FOR THE FOLLOWING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS for the request of John Heller, agent on behalf of Interstate

Partners II-WI LLC related to the development of the vacant land generally located at the southeast corner of 116th Avenue and Corporate Drive for a mixed use development including apartments and potential restaurant and retail development: 1) To amend a portion of the Lakeview West Neighborhood Plan; 2) To amend the land use plan from the Freeway Office Commercial land use designation to High Density Residential with an Urban Reserve for the following Tax Parcel Numbers: 92-4-122-302-0161 and 92-4-122-302-0162; and 3) To update Appendix 10-3 of the Village of Pleasant Prairie Wisconsin, 2035 Comprehensive Plan to include said amendments.

- B. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A CONCEPTUAL PLAN for the request of John Heller, agent on behalf of Interstate Partners II-WI LLC related to the development of the vacant land generally located at the southeast corner of 116th Avenue and Corporate Drive (east of Premium Outlets) with 3 33-unit apartment buildings and 6 19-unit apartment buildings for a total of 213 apartments with a club house to be known as Breeze Terrace.**

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Item A is consideration of Plan Commission Resolution #18-12 for the following Comprehensive Plan Amendments for the request of John Heller, agent on behalf of Interstate Partners II-WI LLC related to the development of the vacant land generally located at the southeast corner of 116th Avenue and Corporate Drive for a mixed use development including apartments and potential restaurant and retail development: 1) To amend a portion of the Lakeview West Neighborhood Plan; and 2) To amend the land use plan from the Freeway Office Commercial land use designation to High Density Residential with an Urban Reserve for the following Tax Parcel Numbers: 92-4-122-302-0161 and 92-4-122-302-0162; and 3) To update Appendix 10-3 of the Village of Pleasant Prairie Wisconsin, 2035 Comprehensive Plan to include said amendments.

And Item B, consideration of a Conceptual Plan for the request of John Heller, agent on behalf of Interstate Partners II-WI LLC related to the development of the vacant land generally located at the southeast corner of 116th Avenue and Corporate Drive just east of Premium Outlets with three 33-unit apartment buildings and six 19-unit apartment buildings for a total of 213 apartments with a club house to be known as Breeze Terrace.

These items are related and will be discussed at the same time, however separate actions are required.

Interstate Partners II-WI LLC, the petitioner, is requesting two approvals at this time to develop the two vacant properties generally located at that southeast of the corner of 116th Avenue and Corporate Drive just east of Premium Outlets Shopping Center Phase V for a multi-family residential apartment development. The items being requested at the meeting include amendments to the Village's 2035 Comprehensive Plan which also includes and amendment of the neighborhood plan and a conceptual plan.

The first item, the Comprehensive Plan Amendments which is Plan Commission Resolution #18-12. The following amendments to the Village Comprehensive Plan as noted below are being considered:

1. The first is a Neighborhood Plan Amendment: The petitioner is requesting an amendment to a portion of the Lakeview West Neighborhood Plan in Appendix 9-3 as a result of the proposed development for properties specifically located east of 116th Avenue and north of 110th Street. This is east of the Premium Outlets regional shopping center.

Village Neighborhood Plans are components of the Village's Comprehensive Plan and are intended to provide the community with a means of reviewing the patterns of existing and probable future land uses in and around the area proposed for land development, for evaluating the compatibility of land uses, reviewing access to the land development and the feasibility of developing certain lot layouts, roadways and parkways, open spaces and environmental preservation areas, schools, municipal facilities and municipal services to take care of the neighborhood. Not all neighborhoods within the community can or should contain all land uses.

Neighborhood plans provide detailed information about the neighborhood and serve as a development framework to be utilized by the Plan Commission and the Board in their decision making process when evaluating for future development, when a willing landowner wishes to develop his or her land. Neighborhood plans are also relied upon by the Village for making community infrastructure budgeting and design decisions, by property buyers and their lending institutions when making land purchasing and financial and construction decisions, and by local assessors and land appraisers when evaluating and valuing properties.

The Neighborhood Plan Amendments requested for Tax Parcel Number: 92-4-122-302-0161 also referred to as Lot 19, and Tax Parcel Number: 92-4-122-302-0162 referred to as Lot 20 could allow for the development of the 16.75 acres with 213 multi-family residential apartment units. AS specifically proposed by Breeze Terrace this would be six 19-unit buildings and three 33-unit buildings. Six of the buildings would have individual entries with interior and exterior attached garages, and three of the buildings would have common entries with underground parking in addition to the nearby surface parking areas.

The Neighborhood Plan Amendment for Tax Parcel Number 92-4-122-302-0160, this is referred to as Lot 18, there are two different alternatives that were put together for this particular area. Alternative 1 which shows a 4.36 acre property to the north which could be developed with an additional 71 apartment units, one 33-unit building and two 19-unit buildings, while Alternative 2 shows that this property could be developed as commercial retail/service within the newly created B-6, Freeway Oriented Business Center District, as preferred by the current land owner. Our staff note: Neither the petitioner nor the land owner are proposing to develop the northern property, this parcel 18 at this time which is owned by WisPark. Again, we're showing it to you because it's part of the overall neighborhood for this vacant land area at this southeast corner.

It is for government services and infrastructure planning purposes that the Village staff is requiring the petitioner to illustrate the potential land uses layout for all three properties in order to examine the relationship and compatibility of the proposed land uses, to review the availability of government services to serve the proposed development and to

evaluate the public and private driveway access connection locations due to the planned reconstruction of the adjacent roadways for the Corporate Drive/108th Street/116th Avenue roundabout. And I'll refer to that intersection as the LakeView West Roundabout.

Over the past several years there have been amendments to the LakeView West Neighborhood Plan as portions of this neighborhood were planned to be developed. The most recent amendment was granted in 2017 to the LakeView West Neighborhood Plan, and this was to accommodate the Fairfield Inn and Suites Hotel currently under construction. This amendment required the Village to more closely examine and to address planning for that future LakeView West Roundabout including the driveway improvements for the nearby intersections as well as connecting roadways.

The Village has been working for several years on planning for the intersection and roadway improvements for this roundabout. The traffic studies were based upon projected comprehensive land uses, recent traffic counts, and analysis by the Village Engineers, its consultants, local area developers such as Riverview LLC and the Wisconsin Department of Transportation or WIS DOT.

A Traffic Impact Analysis was completed and then updated based upon traffic forecast projections prepared by the WIS DOT and based upon: 1) the existing regional commercial retail, office and service land uses, primarily the Premium Outlets Shopping Mall, Double Tree and Fairfield Hotels; Culver's, McDonalds and Chancery Restaurants; corporate offices, the WIS DOT Tourist Information and other office/retail/commercial land use designations on the remaining vacant land, and also the proposed industrial land uses proposed to the south in the recently approved Stateline 94 Corporate Park development. While the modified traffic counts have been contemplated by the engineers for the Breeze Terrace multi-family residential development, residential traffic counts were not originally included at the time of the TIA completion, rather commercial traffic counts were used.

Based upon the TIA, the Village has determined that the LakeView West roundabout and the roadways leading to the roundabout are in need of these improvements as development continues in this area. A more detailed engineered design of the LakeView West Roundabout is proposed in 2018/2019, with a possible construction in 2019/2020. The Village is examining Amendment #1 to Tax Increment District #5 in order to assist with the LakeView West roundabout improvements, in addition we're also looking at Wisconsin DOT grant assistance and possible landowner assessments.

There will be restricted or modified access to the existing and proposed development of all properties for the LakeView West Roundabout. Specifically for the Breeze Terrace project one access point to 116th Avenue and one emergency access to 110th Street have been identified. One access point has been identified for Parcel 18 with respect to the property to Corporate Drive. And going back I think we also possibly had one other connection that was a cross-access to a private driveway that led into that development. We can go back and discuss that further if we need to.

As detailed engineering is completed for the LakeView West roundabout the exact locations will be finalized. With limited access, the interior vehicular traffic patterns between the properties will need to provide for internal site circulation and emergency access. Also, further discussion is warranted regarding whether 110th Street shall be constructed as a Village roadway with public infrastructure by the abutting developers or whether the 110th Street right-of-way would be considered for vacation. And the road that I'm talking about with respect to that is the east/west roadway.

So Kristina is just going to show you where 110th -- it's at the very south end of their development. Again, 110th Street was platted by certified survey map for a future road, but the roadway was never constructed. Portions of it were vacated to the west as it led into Premium Outlets. But this road, again, the right of way was identified. It has like a private gravel driveway leading all the way back very far to the east to the Conservation Education, LLC property. So there needs to be further discussion as to what needs to be done with respect to that roadway. As whether or not it's an official access into this site or a secondary access or an emergency access and what happens with respect to that road construction

With respect to compatibility with adjacent land uses, there have been Village staff concerns raised with the developer over the past several months as to whether the placement of this one 213-unit requested multi-family residential apartment development land use would be compatible with the surrounding freeway oriented regional retail shopping center and retail/service uses and specifically adjacent to an outlet mall which generating over eight million visitors a year just due to the noise, the traffic, the lighting and all the people coming to and from as well as the restaurants and hotels.

While it is true that certain well-planned, mixed use developments are hugely popular and very successful when located in a central core of a community due to their proximity to other commercial, residential, governmental services, libraries, parks and schools, it is not entirely clear that this single residential multi-family development meets that same assessment.

Residential density proposed within the neighborhood, currently there are no residential areas shown within the LakeView West Neighborhood. Under Alternative 1 however, there would be 284 units depicted on 21.11 acres. This number could be reduced slightly to remove that wetland area for a net density of approximately 13.45 units per acre with average lot area per dwelling unit to be approximately 3,238 square feet per dwelling unit.

Under the Alternative 2, that would be to have the residential and the commercial, there would be 213 units on 16.75 acres. Again, this number will be reduced slightly to remove that wetland area for a net density of approximately 12.7 units per acre with an average lot area per dwelling unit to be approximately 3,425 square feet per dwelling unit.

Population and school age children, current population is zero since there are no residential units within this LakeView West Neighborhood. Projected population under Alternative 1 within the neighborhood, based on the 2010 census information, there could

be up to 665 persons which could include 186 school age children, wherein 120 are estimated to attend public schools. And my calculations below explain how I came up with that number.

And then projected population Alternative 2 within the neighborhood, based on the 2010 census information, there could be 499 persons which could include 139 school age children wherein 89 are estimated to attend public schools. So I have to explain that I have a note there for a very good reason. Based on the 2010 census for Pleasant Prairie the average number of persons per rental housing is 2.34. And school age children between the ages of 5 and 19 make up 27.9 percent of the population. Pursuant to the information provided by KUSD for Pleasant Prairie, the students that will attend public school is about 42 percent of the dwelling units.

So this is where I need to clarify even further that although the Village expects these numbers to decrease with the 2020 census, the numbers presented are based on the most current information available to the Village. Also depending on the market demographics of the families or individuals who live there and wanting to locate next to a regional freeway oriented commercial district, this number will likely be much lower or even lower.

2. Comprehensive Land Use Map Amendments: The petitioner is also requesting to amend the Village of Pleasant Prairie 2035 Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map 9.9. Specifically the Amendments would include:
 - To amend the land use plan from the Freeway Office Commercial land use designation to the High Density Residential with an Urban Reserve which would allow the average lot area per dwelling unit to be lower than 6,200 square feet per dwelling unit, and that would be on the two tax parcel numbers as referenced on Lots 19 and 20. And this would be to accommodate 213 multi-family residential apartment units in nine buildings to be known as Breeze Terrace; and
 - To update Appendix 10-3 of the Village's 2035 Comprehensive Plan to reference said changes to the Land Use Plan Map 9.9.

And then the third area for discussion this evening is the Conceptual Plan. The Conceptual Plan is a further refinement of the Neighborhood Plan, and the petitioner is requesting approval of a Conceptual Plan for the two vacant properties, again with Tax Parcel Numbers ending in 302-0161 and 302-0162 south of Corporate Drive and east of 116th Avenue for the development of 213 apartments, three 33-unit apartment buildings and six 19-unit apartment buildings also with a club house and associated parking and site improvements. And this would be on 16.75 acres as shown on the Neighborhood Plan amendment.

There are four small wetlands on the properties that have been field delineated as wetlands on April 21, 2016 by Dave Meyer of Wetland and Waterway Consulting. A copy of the wetland report shall be submitted with verification that the biologist was an assured biologist and delineator in 2016. In addition, a Zoning Map Amendment and a Comprehensive Land Use Map Amendment will also be submitted to correctly identify the location of the field delineated

wetlands on the respective maps. If any of the wetlands are proposed to be filled then proper permits shall be obtained by the developer from the Corps of Engineers and the DNR.

In addition, they are requesting to fill 3.5 acres located within the Primary Environmental Corridor, and approximately 0.25 acre is proposed to be removed from the PEC in order to allow for this development. There is a small area of the site that is also located in the 100-year floodplain. The exact location of that floodplain shall be delineated to ensure that this area is not being disturbed even through grading.

The three 33-unit buildings will provide for a 12 2-bedroom units and 21 1-bedroom units with common entrances and hallways within a three story building. The buildings will also include 33 underground parking spaces, one underground space for each unit. The specific floor plans and square footage of the units has not been provided.

The six 19-unit buildings will provide for a six 2-bedroom units, 13 1-bedroom units with individual entrances within the two story buildings. And, again, when I'm talking about individual entrances there's going to be a total of 11 of the 19 that will have entrances from the garage unit to the building, but they all will have their own individual entrances to the building themselves, to the units themselves. So just to clarify at least I think it's five of the garages do not have direct access to the apartment unit. I'm not sure if that's right. We'll have Fran confirm that. The specific floor plans and square footage of the units have to be further clarified and worked through.

A clubhouse building is proposed at the main entrance of the site. The entire development is proposed to be gated with a secure entry adjacent to the club house and a second gated emergency access provided to the south. There's also some further discussion that the developer would like to have with the Plan Commission as to how much of the site actually has to be fenced. And so we can talk about that further in the meeting. Under rents, the developer has identified that there is a need for multi-family apartments in the Village due to several economic development projects recently being announced in Kenosha and Racine Counties. He further indicated that the rental rates would be based upon market rates. Under site construction schedule, the developer has indicated that he would like to begin the site and excavation work for the apartment portion of the project this summer in 2018.

Under public and private improvements, any required public and private improvements shall be made by the developer, at the developer's expense. The entire development shall be provided with and serviced by municipal roadways, 116th Avenue which is existing and 110th Street. Sanitary sewer, water and storm sewer/storm water basins with public easements granted to the Village shall be provided. In addition, the Village will be constructing a new sanitary sewer lift station and related improvements in 2019 to service the remaining vacant lands west of the Des Plaines River, between Highway C and the State Line including lands west of the I-94 in Pleasant Prairie and Bristol per our Boundary Agreement with Bristol. The Lakeview West Roundabout is also proposed to benefit this development. The owner may be responsible for their fair share of the cost for these required lift station and roundabout improvements if they are not included in TID 5, Amendment #1.

With respect to the vacation of 110th Street I touched upon earlier, the Village needs to evaluate whether 110th Street as shown on the slide which is to be located south should be vacated or the

roadway or a portion of the roadway shall be completed as part of the requirements of the Village Ordinance. It has been discussed in the past and with the development of TID #7 that the 110th Street right-of-way could possibly be vacated. However, there is a private property lying to the east, and Phase 3 of the Stateline 94 development is located immediately to the south. And at this point that's been designed not to have access off of 110th Street. But until they have a user for that particular property there still remains a question as to whether or not there could be a secondary access to 110th Street. Further discussion related to 110th Street shall be discussed with the staff and the Plan Commission and the Board. A Development Agreement would need to be entered into which addresses any public related improvements and private related improvements for the project.

TID #2: The proposed Breeze Terrace multi-family residential project is located within the existing Tax Increment Finance District, TID #2. While no further expenditures are anticipated in TID #2, the property tax revenues generated from this residential development will not be put into the general operating expenses of the Village, put towards the operating expenses of the Village, but rather would be utilized to repay the outstanding debt of TID #2 until TID #2 is closed, which is anticipated for about five years from now or 2023 unless it retires early.

There has been a Village policy that no residential land be part of a TID because the taxes generated typically do not provide the required payback for the public improvements within the TID. Further, since the Village will not be collecting taxes for Village operations to assist with paying emergency personal and providing other municipal services until 2023, developing the site as multi-family residential project may put a financial burden on the Village rather than if the property was developed for commercial uses due to residential development generally having a higher demand for municipal services than commercial development.

TID #5, Amendment 1: It is anticipated that the Breeze Terrace multi-family residential development, along with the adjacent commercial and industrial land uses would all be beneficiaries of TID #5, Amendment 1, LakeView West roundabout and lift station improvements, if approved by the Village. With respect to their Zoning Map and Zoning Text Amendments, these would be required for the proposed residential development of this property. The petitioner would be proposing to rezone the property from a B-5, Freeway Office District, to the R-11, Multi-Family Residential District, and the wetlands would be placed into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District.

The entire multi-family project is proposed to be located within a Planned Unit Development or a PUD Overlay District. The PUD Overlay Zoning Text Ordinance would require approval of detailed Residential Development Plans which include Site/Civil Plans, Architectural Plans for the buildings including the club house Landscaping/Berming Plan, Fencing Plan, Lighting Plan including parking lot photometric plan, a Certified Survey Map to reflect all of the dedication and easement provisions and restrictive covenants and if there's any 116th Avenue right of way dedication needed for the roundabout, as well as a Digital Security Imaging System or DSIS, and that's pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 410 of the Municipal Code. Developing the apartment building and clubhouse sites as a PUD could allow for some flexibility with some requirements of the Village Zoning Ordinance provided there is a defined community benefit.

The following modifications from the Zoning Ordinance are being requested. Additional changes may be requested and may be needed when the detailed plans are submitted and finalized with the staff.

- To increase the net density;
- To allow for multiple buildings per parcel;
- To increase the number of apartment units allowed per building; and
- To increase the building heights.

In consideration of these PUD modifications to the Ordinance, the following community benefits are being identified and offered and have been discussed with the developer.

- This will be a fully fenced and gated development. I know the developer would like to have further discussion with the Plan Commission regarding that matter;
- A minimum one parking space per unit will be provided in an enclosed garage attached to the building with some have direct entry to the units and some do not, but they would still be garage units attached to the major part of the building. And some would be actually underneath because three of the 33-unit buildings would all have underground parking;
- All of the units will be offered at market rate rents;
- All apartment buildings and the club house will be fully sprinklered, regardless of State requirements;
- The landscaping and exterior turf will be irrigated;
- An on-site security system, a DSIS will be installed and made operational, and a DSIS Agreement will be executed by the parties. And in addition the developer would be required to grant the DSIS Access, it's a blanket easement over the property, which meets the Security Ordinance Chapter 410 requirements for the entire development; and
- Pet free apartment units in certain entire buildings will be provided and identified. And what the staff was initially recommending was a minimum of four of the nine buildings shall be pet free, and we are suggesting that two of the 33-unit buildings and two of the 19-unit buildings be pet free. A maximum number of two pets or possibly one pet depending on their size, but definitely a maximum of 40 pounds per pet. Again, the developer would like to have further discussion with the Plan Commission with respect to that.

With respect to the spot zoning analysis, the development of this parcel and the eventual request to rezone the property into the R-11, Multiple Family Residential zoning district could be considered to be spot zoning. Note: Pursuant to the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, spot zoning is when a zoning ordinance is amended to zone a relatively small area for uses significantly different from those allowed in the surrounding area in order to favor the owner of a particular piece of property.

Spot zoning is not necessarily illegal because such zoning is not necessarily inconsistent with the purposes for which zoning ordinances can be passed. However, rezoning should be consistent with long-range planning and based upon considerations which affect the whole community. Therefore, spot zoning should only be indulged in when it is in the public's interest and it's not solely for the benefit of the property owner requesting the rezoning. And that's *Bubolz v. Dane County*, 159, and that was Court of Appeals 1990. Pleasant Prairie has not previously supported spot zoning and has consciously and deliberately identified specific areas for commercial and

residential throughout the Village's Comprehensive Plan that are consistent with the Village Zoning Map.

Specifically, this area of the Village as identified in the Village Comprehensive Plan is for regional and freeway oriented businesses with industrial uses on the periphery. The Village has limited areas identified and suitable for commercial development. This really is not considered a mixed use development. This type and density of multi-family would be better suited and supported in areas identified as residential in the land use plan or within the Village Green Center which has been identified clearly as a mixed use area. Furthermore, the Village Comprehensive Plan has specific and limited locations for commercial development, and these areas should be maintained for commercial development.

Recently with an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance and the creation of the B-6 Freeway Oriented Business Center District, a number of new developments are now being proposed or are under construction in the area including the Fairfield Inn and Suites, Kessler's Jewelers and two potential retail/restaurant buildings. In addition, The Gateway at LakeView West commercial project is also working its way through the approval process, and there have been several other inquiries and potential developments discussed for other commercial parcels within the Lakeview West area.

Now my staff note. The developer requested amendments deviate from past Village adopted land use and transportation plans and the previous direction provided by the Village Plan Commission and Board. For several months, the developer has been requesting to construct apartments on these two properties rather than develop the sites with commercial land uses as indicated on the adopted land use plan. Although the Village staff has not been overly supportive of the project at this location, because the apartment project has merit, the Village staff has been meeting with and providing direction to the developer so that if the Plan Commission and Village Board decide to approve the project, then several changes and conditions of approval have already been incorporated into the proposed development plans.

Some examples of modifications and agreements made by the developer include: 1) providing attached/covered parking-not stand alone banks of garages; 2) providing the installation/operation of the DSIS camera system and access easement; 3) agreeing to install fire sprinkler systems in each and every building including the club house; 4) agreeing to the installation of an emergency gated access to 110th Street; 5) making adjustments to the plans so that the garages are all internal to the site, the garage doors; 6) placing garbage dumpsters in less visible locations; 7) modifying the layouts of the apartment units; 8) keeping some of the buildings totally pet free and limiting the size and number of the pets per apartment. I guess we probably still need to talk about that; 9) agreeing to fully fence the project, and we probably still need to talk about that; and 10) increasing landscaping/berming on the site.

So with that I'd like to continue the public hearing. Fran Brzezinski, the developer of record is requesting to address the Plan Commission to talk about the project even further.

Michael Serpe:

Fran, name and address.

Fran Brzezinski:

I think it's on, right? Can you hear me all right? Fran Brzezinski, I'm with Interstate Partners. What I'd like to do is take a couple minutes, literally one minute to tell you a little bit about Interstate Partners. And then I want to take a couple minutes and tell you about how we got here and why we are where we are. And then a couple more minutes, as Jean pointed out, just to clarify a few items that Jean just went through.

So Interstate Partners, quick version, formed in 1999. We develop real estate. We develop, own, manage and lease real estate, all product types, office, medical, retail, industrial, warehouse and, of course, multi-family which we're here for today. We have operations and offices in three states, Minnesota, Illinois and here in Wisconsin. And our petitioner today, John Heller who is here with me, my partner and I are the owners of the petitioning Interstate Partners entity. Our philosophy is generally one of long-term ownership. We like to keep what we build. And toward that end we typically try to develop to the top end for that long-term type hold. So that's in a nutshell in one minute Readers Digest, that's Interstate Partners.

What I want to do next is just take a couple of minutes to kind of tell you how we got here because I think that's pertinent to the request whenever you're asking a change or to amend a zoning code. We look around throughout all our markets to try to figure out what we ought to build and where we ought to build it. And we peg it a lot to demand, not a surprise. And so we look for demand, whether it's a demand for an office, medical, whatever, we try to pair up the site with where we think the logical use ought to be for for that demand.

And it's clear with the success Pleasant Prairie has had in attracting users and bringing jobs to the area that one of the demands, again, not a news flash is housing. And so we started to look around in the Kenosha County and Pleasant Prairie in particular for possible sites that could work here, and we came across this site in part because of our knowledge of the areas as a whole. But specifically because we thought it made sense.

Now, always just because we think some location makes sense doesn't mean everyone else thinks it makes sense. So when we honed in on the LakeView West area and we started going to our institutional lenders and the like to talk to them about a project like this, they came back and said, look, we trust your instincts but we'd like verification. So what we did was we ended up hiring a company called Tracy Cross. You may not have heard of them but they're actually the gold standard in market studies to see for any particular use how it matches up.

And we did our first one actually in March of 2017, so we've been kind of at this and looking at this for a while. And Tracy Cross came back, and we asked them the specific question if we want to do high end apartments, and we want to do it in a location that right now does not have apartments, and we want to know what the absorption would be, and because we're going high end can the market rates validate our decision to locate there. And as you might suspect they came back with, yeah, it can. They talked about quick absorption, what's happening in the market. Talked about the great interstate accessibility and the fact that that's where the jobs are. This site made sense notwithstanding its zoning.

We then updated it and actually got reports back ten days ago, an updated report. As you might suspect with Haribo coming in, with Aurora coming in and not to mention Foxconn since our last request, the project has even become more viable in their eyes. Now, just because it's viable in their eyes and the general market and the physical characteristics of the property makes sense, it doesn't mean it's still going to work because it needs to be compatible with the neighborhood.

So what we did next, and this is typical for us, we went into the neighborhood to make sure that if we're going to ask something does the neighborhood agree? Obviously we've been working with WisPark to buy the property so WisPark was on board. We then went to JHT, and that's the former Snap-on building, a little office building in the northeast corner adjacent to our site. We met with, gosh, I forgot his name, he's counsel there, showed him our plans, what we wanted to do, and asked him if he had any objections or questions about it. He came back a couple days later and said we only have one question: Will the woodland area that we are near are you going to take any of that away? We told him no. He said, well, good, we have no more objections. We don't have any objections. We think it makes some sense.

We then went across the street, and this is not going to be a news flash, we went to Simon Company who owns the retail center. We met with a guy name Phil Witson who is the general manager. As you might suspect he's all about it, more rooftops, good for retail, not a surprise there.

We then went to meet with Brian, can't remember his last name, the manager of the Double Tree and asked him the same thing. Same comments, showed him plans, and he thought it made sense and worked. But we asked him a followup question. We said, look, being located next to the retail center have you had any ill effects of that. He asked what we meant. We talked about vandalism, things like that. Because this would be kind of a yellow or red flag for us if there's a lot of problems as a result of the retail center. He said actually not one. That's what he told us. He said, but, the only issue we have is that the Friday after Thanksgiving and the Saturday Thanksgiving the son of a bitches all want to park in my parking lot and that's a problem. I said, well, okay, if that's your only issue we're probably okay. But that was a relief to us to know that vandalism or any other effects do not exist.

The last person that I met with is a guy named David Moore. David Moore is the landowner of the couple hundred acres to our east, the conservancy area that goes all along our east boundary and the comes up along the south. David Moore is a successful businessman and a conservationist. We walked our site, talked about where the location would be. And then we ended up doing some four wheeling through his site to kind of show us where the marsh is, the wetlands and the rivers flow and those kind of things. And he had no objections.

And Jean and I spoke a little bit earlier today, we were fairly confident you wouldn't have any objections, and I don't think any of the neighbors have any objections. Now, so we know the site physically makes sense. We know that there's a demand that's probably a highest and best use. We know now that the neighbors are okay with the site, very important. I'm sure you hear a lot of times people come in and there's objections to zoning. So the third issue then, of course, is can we work it through with the municipality, obviously in this case the Village of Pleasant Prairie. So it's been a bit of a bumpy road. But I think whenever you go into a plan like that you put together a proposal that you think makes the most sense and that you know you can control, be

economically viable and be successful. And that has to match up with the Village. And I'll say at first it didn't. And Jean went through the litany of ten changes or a number, listing ten of them, actually there were a few more in there that we made to get to the point we are today.

But what I'd like to do is share a little insight as to why we did the product type that we are doing. See, it's a combination of three story buildings and two story buildings. First of all, besides compatibility it's scale. Except for the hotel there are no other buildings that are higher than three story. Even across the street though it's a bigger three story, even Uline is a three story. So we liked the scale of fitting in in the neighborhood.

And an interesting thing that happens in our market when you ask residents, brand new building where do you want to be, there's usually two answers, first floor. A lot of people like first floor, convenient, easy in and out and the like so first floor makes sense. And the other one is usually the top floor, whether that's the third floor, fourth floor, they say top floor. They like it a little bit for the view but they like it as much because they don't like anybody above them. They just don't like the noise. That's a huge issue. So for us the middle floors not that we discount them significantly, but we like first, we like top and to have one in the middle makes some sense. So it scales with the area, and it also makes sense from a marketing directive as well.

The other product that we really like is our two story product, and we like that for a couple of reasons. Jean touched on it. They have individual entries and they have garages. Individual entries you can create a little neighborhood within your complex. People walk in, they open the door, they're in their unit. It feels like home. People like that. They don't like common corridors, okay, it works for some people. Common entry some people are fine with it. But many people we have found with this product just like coming into their own unit. It takes them a little away from a rental unit, makes it feel, like I said, more like a house or a home.

The second thing, not a surprise to me, but I was surprised that the market as a whole everybody likes garages. The underground parking that we have in our three stories is going to be terrific, happy to do it. Modify it to even make a few more parking stalls to match up one for one. But what people really like are garages, and they like them for their cars, but what they really like them for is their stuff, bikes, golfing equipment, camping equipment, kayaks, canoes, tools, equipment. There's just a lot of stuff that goes in there, and they like to have a place to do that. In fact, if you look at national surveys onsite storage, outside unit is always one of the highest rates items.

The other thing people like it for is there's a lot of projects that you do that you don't want to do it in an apartment. Just a little bit bigger, take a little bit of time, take up too much space or something, and you end up in the garage. People like that. The other thing is a lot of people just like to get the hell out of their apartment, and the place to go is the garage and putz around. I mean maybe that's me, but that product really hits the nerve and has really been successful with it.

And one of the things I should mention now that Jean mentioned she has it on here, as long as the picture is up here I'd like to point out for that two story product that you're looking at there we have kind of a roof, that line here, that we think gives it some interest, puts a little cap on it and makes it feel a little bit bigger and stronger. One of the suggestions that Jean, in fact requirements that she's having is that we make that a flat roof which is like the roof on the three

story. I'm just telling you the flat roof, we've gone around on it, just makes it look squat, and it just takes away some of the feel that we like. We respectfully ask not only staff which hasn't been working too well with that, the Plan Commission consider us not having to do a flat roof on this particular product type. I think it just doesn't work for us as well.

We've made a lot of other changes to design everything. One of the first meetings we had, this isn't on the list, Tom Shircel came, we showed him some of the elevations, and the first thing he said, more stone, more brick, no vinyl. We didn't have vinyl actually, we agree with Tom on that. But one of the things that's also not on the list that we did is added those elements to the project, and it will make it certainly a better project.

One other thing that's not on the things that we wanted to do but couldn't do I want to mention is a swimming pool. Swimming pool you can argue, hey, up north do we need a swimming pool a lot? And the answer is, no, people think they're going to use it more than they do. But we wanted to have a swimming pool in part because just about every top tier, first class project has a pool. And we were going to put it in next to the club house. We were advised it's an attractive nuisance and you should use the RecPlex. We didn't get very far on that so we have no pool. We don't totally understand that but there's no pool there.

So that takes us to where we are. So the office uses highest and best use in the '80s. I think this came in the late '80s, '90s, we built a lot of suburban office buildings. Worked very well. The music stopped. Why did the music stop? A lot of reasons. Just the way offices are structured, technology a lot. People now the workplace environment is different. They work remotely, they work from home. So the office market as you've seen WisPark would have sold some of this land if they could have. We're sitting on land in Wisconsin that's zoned office. It's just a tough product. I would suggest to you and respectfully request that we now have the highest and best use. We have a use that makes sense in this marketplace. There's high demand. The neighbors are good with it, and we think we have a plan that work.

The last thing I'd like to do is just go through just a couple of small items that Jean went through as she read through her report which is quite impressive. But there's only a couple things I want to chat about and clarify and, as Jean said, just talk about little things that I didn't remember the same way as the staff did. And there really is nothing until she started talking about -- and she has to do this as part of the presentation, I understand that, but she talked about the population, school age children. And she talked about how multi-family frequently doesn't pay for itself or costs the Village more, and a lot of it is because of school age children and the need for schooling.

Here's what I'm going to tell you. Two thirds of our units, 142 out of the 213 in the first phase are one bedroom units, high end, expensive one bedroom units. I'm going to suggest to you that no one is going to pay top dollar and have a lot of kids and move into a one bedroom unit. Now, we won't discriminate against anyone. If someone wants to bring their whole family into a one bedroom we understand that. But we will market it as to young professionals as an adult community. We don't have daycare, we don't have playgrounds, we don't have that kind of thing.

Even the two bedroom units I would suggest to you typically two reasons people come into a two bedroom unit. One is two roommates, makes sense, a lot of them like that. And the second

reason is that we're finding more and more individuals or couples that come in and use a second bedroom as a business office. And that kind of goes back to what I was talking about why the office market has changed to a large extent. So I think if I had to bet a ham sandwich with each of you on how many school age children that are going to be here at any one time, I'd bet under for nine, not 139 or 189. There just aren't going to be -- now, there may be people that suddenly have an infant or a toddler, but once you get to school age children Jean's right. They're going to move to another rental place near a school or something. That stress or that burden just does not uniquely fit this location.

So let me go through just a couple of other things that my recollection was not the same. Jean talked about the garages and how they match up. That's right. Talked about the TIF. There were a few things that went through here, and the two items Jean mentioned that were offered by us that I did not remembering offering, and I'm glad that this slide is up, is to fence in the full project, fully fenced. We have come around to realize that we're adding the fence for the security of that.

Now, the fence if you would look at one of these pictures here on this conceptual plan for Breeze Terrace, what we suggest is that you have a fence all along 116th Street. And on the south side all along where 110th Street is going to be vacated until you get to the dark green area, the dark green area is wetlands and the like. And the same thing on the north side, the light green goes all the way until the light green stops and the woods which is where the dark green stops. I would suggest, and I told Jean that's a lot of fencing, but that's the fencing you need. You can't get a vehicle through these wetlands. There's ponds, wetlands, lakes, trees, forest. You almost need to be a Navy Seal if you want to get in behind it from the east.

And I'm going to suggest to you that you don't need fencing all around, and it would be difficult to fence. I don't know how we'd go into the lakes, to the wetlands, to the stormwater. We'd have to dig up trees. I respectfully request -- and Jean said that we could meet with the Police Chief which I'm happy to do to see what he thinks. But I'm going to respectfully request that this fence stop at the light green and not the dark green.

The second thing, and it seems trivial and perhaps it is, we've had an issue with pets. Quite frankly we're a little surprised you're so interested in how we manage our product that you want to manage the pet situation. And we're not a huge -- we'd rather not have pets, but the fact of the matter is a lot of people have pets. Two pet maximum no problem with it. That's our policy anyway. I suggested to staff that what you might want to do instead of doing weight do species. I mean that's what we do. We don't allow -- we don't care how much they weigh. We don't want pit bulls, we don't want rottweilers, we don't want German shepherds. Take those uses away. And then limit it in that way.

We do in our projects have a 60 pound limit instead of a 40 pound. And I'm asking you to consider a 60 pound limit. Even if it's a 60 pound total limit if they have two dogs kind of thing. We just think 60 pounds makes more sense than 40 pounds. That's big, but it allows a small yellow lab in and things like that or a golden retriever, some of those kind of uses.

We also asked instead of four buildings the two three-story buildings and one two-story buildings instead of four. So we'd like three. We respectfully ask for three buildings instead of four, one less of the two story buildings. The reason pets kind of work more favorably in the two story

quite frankly is because you have your own individual entry. You don't have pets roaming up and down a common corridor. That's why we try to keep them out of the three story but move them more in that direction as well.

We got this whole set of plans, engineering plans and the like Friday at 4:30. Talked with our engineer today. The engineer is JSD who works well, I think Matt can verify, you work often and well with JSD. We had them go through it. In just such a short time we can't tell if there are any issues. We know there will always be little grading issues and things like that. And I'm just going to assume that we're okay working with Matt to his satisfaction as opposed to have certain requirements.

So the last thing that I want to do, and I'm sorry to drag on like this, but on the last page the staff put it together, the following changes shall be incorporated. And this is why we came up with these, shall be. So I know if I say yes and you approve it I've committed. But a couple things I want to talk about is that the architecture on the 19-unit buildings will be flat. That's a shall be. We're asking please let us do it the way it looks better. It takes away the squatness. Let us do it as we designed.

The second thing is the site plan shall be fence, and in reference earlier fully fenced. Please let us fence to where it makes sense. To have to go through the DNR and the Army Corps for a damn fence in a wetland and in lakes and things, in woods, we respectfully ask that that be eliminated. And then finally the pet issue, not a big issue, but give us 60 pounds combined as a compromise on that.

Otherwise I'm sure there are things that we tried to absorb. I know we won't have any -- I don't think we'll have any problems on the engineering. I'm sure we won't have any problem on the building standards. And I don't see an issue, we haven't had them in any other municipality with all the things. So as I said I understand it's zoned office. I think you have a better higher and best use. I don't know that you'll ever be able to sell and develop this in office in the near future. So we request that change. And we think we have a plan that works with the neighborhood and works in the market for sure. So thank you for your time, and I appreciate the opportunity.

Michael Serpe:

Thanks, Fran. Jean?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So the first thing I wanted to mention is we would so support a change in the zoning from the B-5 which is Professional Office to B-6. That was the whole reason why we made all those changes with the B-6 District regulations and out in this area. So we would not be expecting that this would develop as an office district because we know the challenges that have been faced out in this area. So our understanding and what we anticipated was that there was going to be a petition both by Jerry Franke for his property to the north as well as these properties right here that it would go into the B-6, not stay at the B-5. Because B-5 is a tough district in this area for professional offices.

The second thing with respect to the fencing DNR approval is not needed to put in fencing in a wetland or through a wetland. You just can't totally destroy the wetland when you're putting in the fencing just so you know that.

The third thing with the swimming pool we were just very, very concerned about placing a swimming pool right at that south intersection by Premium Outlets next to the roundabout and having a swimming pool. I mean it might be a nice attractive way to look at things as you're leaving the shopping center. But we felt that if a swimming pool did go in it should be internal to the development. It should be private to the people that are living there, not on display for people leaving the mall to see.

And then we also did mention that we do have a pool at the RecPlex as well and we have the beach at the RecPlex. So it was a combination of a number of factors, but we just didn't want that pool right up at most visible corner unless that was going to be a selling point, I don't know. But it just seemed like that should be more private, internal for those that would be using it.

And Fran is correct there must have been misunderstanding. Because for this product we don't want a flat roof. We do not want a flat roof. For the other product it was a flat roof. So this roof we would like to see that at a 6:12 pitch. I'm not sure what it is here, if it's 3 or 4, but we would rather see it at least a 6:12 for the two story individual entry buildings. If it gets approved we would prefer to see it with a great pitch at this location. Again, flat roof for the other buildings. When we were talking about flat roofs we were talking about much bigger buildings here at one point, and then they would have flat roofs, similar to the more urban style apartments that were being looked at. So I agree with him there those flat roofs they look very squatty, and we should raise those roofs.

With respect to access we talked about that. Again, I can only tell you with respect to school age children that that's the formula we use. We don't have access to the individual multi-family users and what they have for demographics. I can tell you that I know how many children are coming out of some of the other projects that we have done, and it's not a tremendous amount. But I still have to report consistently how we've done it in the past. But even when other developers have come in and we've proven it, yeah, there has been a lot fewer children. And this would be a very problematic area I think for a lot of children at these apartments. And I don't think that they're going to frankly get them at this location.

With respect to the pets obviously I still have issues with respect to the pets. And I feel that there needs to be equally the people who don't want pets in their building versus people who want pets in the building. If these are all dual income households and they're going north and south and they got a pet at home all day long sitting in that unit, and some of these units are efficiencies and one bedrooms, you know, 800 square feet and that pet is in there all day unless there's dog walkers, I'm not seeing the value to that unless it's somebody who works from home all day. Again, this isn't a residential neighborhood here. They're going to be only walking like in the internal development until and unless we get sidewalks all around that area. And I'm not sure -- we're trying to head that way, but I don't know if we're going to head that way or not. So I'm still very concerned about the pets.

As you know we've had a number of incidents with pets in the Village over the last several months, and we've had a few projects that have pets. And for those that are good pet owners it's

wonderful. For those who are not good pet owners it's not so good. And it's not good for a pet if people work and they're gone all day. And they just have to be cognizant of the fact that dogs that are left alone bark a lot when people go by and they need attention.

I think that those are my comments. The other thing we do really need to get a handle on is what we're going to do with, if this project goes forward like this, what we're going to do with 110th Street. I think that maybe is a Plan Commission recommendation, Village Board decision, but we do need to figure out what we're going to do with that roadway.

I also did receive a letter from Conservation Education, LLC which you also have a copy of. And they are supportive of this project as Fran had indicated. And I just want to put his letter into the record. I'm not sure if Fran got a copy of this.

[Inaudible]

It's very complimentary. And, again, as part of a development like this we're down zoning, we're going the opposite direction so that all of the other more intense uses are all the way around, and now we're bringing in a use that none of the users that are there will complain about the apartments I doubt. I think the people who will live in these apartments could complain about garbage collection at two in the morning at Premium or not just snow plowing because that's everywhere. But garbage collections and deliveries being made. I mean that development came in long before we had all these rules and regulations.

And that's why mixed use developments are so critical when you put them together. Because we want to make sure that everybody can work together. I mean if this project moves forward I'm actually going to meet with the general manager and say can we work something out so you're not doing all these pickups and deliveries and garbage dumpsters and compactor. I mean that's annoying for the people who live there, and it's not annoying for the commercial. So, again, this is the use that will be more annoyed with the traffic and all of the congestion and the noise from the neighboring mall. It's not really going to be the mall that cares because these are customers for them. So they're probably pretty excited to have these folks there.

So it's a balancing and the Plan Commission, and eventually the Board will have to look at that to see if this is a good thing. I can honestly say that we need multi-family. I'm probably meeting with five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten multi-family developers right now. It's not unique. I mean a lot of people want to be here, mostly multi-family, some single family. But multi-family developers want to be here, not just here but all over the Village because we do have a need especially with our continued industrial growth.

[Inaudible]

Fran Brzezinski:

I was doing math in my head and my partner was as well. A 6:12 pitch on a roof gets it like this. So now I've gone from too squat to it's got a top hat on the damn thing. So I really request that -- time, money and expertise went into our design. We'd rather not have a 6:12 pitch. That's like you have on a house. That's the only comment that I have.

Michael Serpe:

Open it up. This is a matter for public hearing. You can comment on both Item A and B. Matter for public hearing. Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? Jerry?

Jerry Franke:

Jerry Franke, consultant to WisPark, Franke Development Advisors, LLC, 6342 Berkshire Lane, Mount Pleasant, Wisconsin. A couple things. First of all I have known Fran Brzezinski since 1986. He probably doesn't remember the first time we met but I do. I worked for and with Fran for ten years. I've continued a strong, professional and personal relationship with him for the years since he left WisPark back in October of 2000. He is a developer of the highest caliber. He will do a project that will be an asset to the community.

I'm going to deviate a little bit here. But I'm just shocked that we would be opposed to a use that's probably going to generate somewhere around \$25 million in tax base on property that we all agree right now has sat for years unable to be sold because there's no demand for the product. That will pay that TIF district off faster, and then you will have those additional revenues to pay for the public services that you need to have throughout the Village. So just thinking that by not having the apartments there because of the tax value issue I'm sorry, these apartments will generate a lot of tax dollars to support the community's prepayment of the TIF and then into the future for public services that are needed.

A little history for the members that haven't been here. WisPark bought this land in 1988 not because we wanted to have office sites near the interstate, but we bought it because we needed to get the interchange constructed for what was then Highway Q, to get to the main reason we were here and that was LakeView Corporate Park. Unfortunately as some of you remember George Connelly owned a lot of the property, things like that. It was you buy it all or you don't get any of it. So we stepped up, we bought it. And, oh by the way, some of that land we bought became the Des Plaines river, The Nature Conservancy which is a true asset to the Village. I think the Village may own it now. It's gone through -- the DNR had it after the -- or The Nature Conservancy has it. It's an asset.

The Lake Andrea, WisPark bought it and gave it to the Village. The park office, they did us a favor, but it was a WisPark property. RecPlex we gave \$4 million to the construction of that project. Did we get a TIF in return? Absolutely. It was a great partnership. So this land is not something that we even really wanted to have back then. Nonetheless, for 20 years the plan was to develop suburban office buildings. You can sit there and say, well, look at Uline and look at this. Yeah, Uline needed a huge campus. But in terms of office buildings for small users there is no demand. And, in fact, this is no longer a suburban location. This is ex-urban. People that are working in office buildings if they're not working at home want to work downtown. Just take a look at where Milwaukee and Chicago have been getting a number of those.

No financial institution would lend money to build a speculative office building that could accommodate small, 10,000 or 5,000 square foot users. And nobody is going to wait for somebody to develop speculative office space of that size for them. So we're caught between a whipsaw there. You can't finance it. If you don't have it to show them right off the bat they're not interested.

We have two well respected brokers that have been representing the property, Jones [inaudible] LaSalle from Chicago has been trying to find office users, and Mid America from Milwaukee one of the leading commercial real estate brokers in Wisconsin has been leading the effort to find retail users for the land. By the way we've had one letter of intent, Aurora. And as it turned out it wasn't big enough, but it's across the street now on land that the Village owned. That was the one letter of intent. No offers, no purchase and sale agreements. That's been it except for the one that Fran had.

We have had some activity on the retail on the north side. We did not request the B-6 designation when we got the north side rezoned because quite honestly we didn't think that we'd get approved for it. Secondly, I do not share the community development department's perspective that there's not enough B-6 zoned land. There's plenty of it. If we were short of there would be some indications of it and there's not.

Regarding spot zoning, I've been involved with a number of mixed use projects. I have seen a number of mixed use projects in suburban Milwaukee where the uses that are adjacent to those mixed uses are far more intensive, I'd even say offensive, than what Fran is going to be locating next to. Take a look at it. You've got wooded area and wetlands to the east. Sure, there's the outlet mall back to his west. But go up to Drexel Town Square which we did in Oak Creek, there are residential units being developed immediately adjacent to the loading docks of Meier, 190,000 square foot user generates a lot of traffic in any given day. We've got people living on top of retail. Yes, they understand that there's disruption, but some people are looking for that now. But they're not looking for the single family home. We've had no trouble leasing up the apartments.

Take a look at what Scott [inaudible] is doing at Project 84 right along the interstate. His apartments are in the middle of a parking lot for retail establishment, Kohl's store, any number of them. This is not an unusual situation. And if we just did the planned unit development, what is a planned unit development? It's a series of spot zonings that are put together. And quite honestly the way the Village oversees plans, everything has to have an approved site plan. You can almost say that this would drop in very easily as a mixed use or planned use development. Is it done a little bit different? Yes, but that's because the planned use of the land just hasn't borne out as we had hoped.

Every time I turn around we're losing land at this spot, and yet I'm supposed to try and get my shareholders' money back from less and less land. We have now the roundabout tonight. I'm hearing that may be built in 2020. But yet the very fact that that roundabout has been established has made it next to impossible. Jean, could you please put that map up that shows that? Thank you. I'm sorry, there's just no way in God's green earth that that curb cut in the middle of that property on the [inaudible]. I can't foresee anybody approving that. I'm surprised that the Village would even allow us to show that. That is not a safe curb cut. And it's one curb cut for retail. Police and fire will come back and say, no, we need two points of ingress and egress for that property. You can't get it without going off of a private driveway. Is the Village going to condemn that access off of a private driveway.

Now as a part of this effort that we found out you remember the land that Snap-on bought for the original JHT building was very similar to that wooded parcel that we are told, no, you won't do

any cutting of trees and that. I understand that, but that's four acres that we've lost again. So we're losing the four acres to the wooded site. We are losing the land that's adjacent to the roundabout because it has horrible access and that's being [inaudible] to access. So this is just -- it's becoming very frustrating for us to be able to get anything that can work at this site.

Finally, the Village and Wis DOT have required the construction of pedestrian bike paths. With no office uses out here, with no apartments, who is going to use these? People that stop at a gas station or a restaurant, no, they don't get out and walk those paths. This could be a very nice addition that provides additional use for some public amenities that have put in probably wisely. But right now they're not being used. And when they do go in hopefully in the future on the north side those uses are not going to generate a lot of demand for pedestrian walkways. So, again, I think the Interstate Partners have put together a tremendous project. I would hope that it would gain favorable consideration.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you, Jerry. Anybody else wishing to speak? Anybody else wishing to speak? We'll close the public hearing and open it up to comments and questions from the Commissioners. Mike?

Mike Pollocoff:

I just have few questions. Jean, how close is the next closest multi-family development?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Well, there's to that I'm thinking of. One is the Skyline project which is in Prairie Ridge just off of 94th Avenue. And then there's a project that's being proposed by Wangard at the intersection of Highway 31 and 165 at the southeast corner for Vintage Park. Those are the two closest multi-family to this one.

Mike Pollocoff:

Each one of those are roughly three miles away?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Correct.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. Brzezinski, I've got a couple questions for you. You've indicated you've done a lot of multi-family, and Jerry has indicated you've done it in areas that would be challenging. Do you see any need for any extraordinary construction techniques for those dwellings that are right along behind the --

Fran Brzezinski:

I'm sorry, do I see the need for any extra what?

Mike Pollocoff:

Extraordinary construction techniques like --

Fran Brzezinski:

No, the site is [inaudible], we've done soil borings and we're pretty satisfied. It gets a little tight on the east end where we have the stormwater and on the perimeter. So one of the issues that I think Matt came up with is like a three to one grade. And we want to talk with them and get out there and make sure. It might need to be four to one or three and a half to one. We were told by JSD in past working with the Village that those kind of things can be talked about. So nothing exceptional. We think the berms as they exist at least on 116th Street are good. But anything extraordinary, Mike, no, not really. Like I said the stormwater is a little tight to the east, but it doesn't impact -- we've had some great droppings so we might have to export some dirt but, no, I think we're good.

Mike Pollocoff:

Do you see any need for any added insulation or soundproofing along the --

Fran Brzezinski:

No, no. I'll tell you that's why the three story works as well. Because you start getting up in the fourth and fifth story which we talked about early in our discussions kind of thing, the noise travels horizontally. And also the freeway noise starts to impact it. But, no, and that's why the club house is up front as well. No, actually we feel pretty good about that.

Mike Pollocoff:

Okay, thank you. Jean, in your analysis on the PUD you went through some public benefits that would be accrued by putting together a PUD. And in consideration of the modifications to the zoning ordinance the community benefits are being identified and offered by the developer. And one is a fully fenced, gated development. Has there been an alternative other than no fence that's been suggested to tighten it up so that it's not as difficult to build?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So the alternative is they don't want a fence to continue beyond Building C which is at that northwest corner of the wooded area. And so we have not had an opportunity yet to talk through what any other alternatives might be. Again, the front part up to the light green in the corner at the northeast corner of Building C would be where they want to stop it. And then they want to be able to stop it at the light area at the very south end. No, we have not talked about any other alternatives to that. But we just felt that a gated entry would prevent or keep people who should not be in this development that might be just wayward shoppers or whoever from getting into the development. And we just feel that it needed to be as secure as possible due to the proximity of the regional shopping center across the street.

With respect to the PUD just to clarify, a PUD is not spot zoning. A PUD is a zoning overlay that gives a developer some flexibility with respect to dimensional variations of the ordinance, period. So it allows you more units per property, more apartment units per building, the height of the building, the setback of the units to the adjacent right of ways. It's things like that. It's not spot zoning. It's never been spot zoning. What it is it just gives some opportunity for the developer to may consolidate or try to create a more dense development in a certain area, but it's not spot zoning. And we have used them.

Jim Bandura:

Jean, can you show where the Conservative Education property is in relationship to one of these maps?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Kristina, you have to turn to the right. It's at the very end of 110th Street. And you can see he's got a barn back there. Kind of the red circle goes over that. He doesn't live back there to my knowledge. I think that he has a barn and some outbuildings, and he hunts back there, and he brings groups back there for environmental education and things like that. But he's like right at the end of 110th Street. You can highlight that. 110th Street, again, is the east/west road at the end of their development. It kind of dead ends before it goes to -- that's too far south. It dead ends because it just extends. It's a gravel driveway all the way back for him.

Jim Bandura:

So 110th Street dead ends into this property?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yes, yes.

Jim Bandura:

And that's kind of butting up against this residential then?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It would travel the whole southern distance.

Jim Bandura:

And they allow hunting on that property according to this letter?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It's not a public facility, it's private hunting.

Jim Bandura:

Correct. But there's hunting on it?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yes, I believe he hunts.

Jim Bandura:

Okay. So if something happened to that road, I mean if we vacate it or abandon it --

Jean Werbie-Harris:

As a public road it still would need to remain as a private access driveway or a private road in order to have access to him back there as well as to be able to provide an ability for an emergency access for this development and State Line 94 to the south.

Jim Bandura:

Okay, I'm a little leery of putting residential up close to a place that is hunting and shooting. I've had people hunt in the back of my property, and it gets a little scary at times. And bringing up the issue of pets on this residential, if one happens to get loose or whatever, I really hate to say this but you can't always trust the hunter. So this being close to residential I'm not -- it just bothers me.

Michael Serpe:

Wayne?

Wayne Koessl:

I've been following some articles in the *Wall Street Journal*, and one of them is that bike paths are not in favor anymore in a lot of municipalities. They're too expensive, they don't serve the purpose, and a lot of states are starting to abandon them. Also that the marketplace is changing for development because of the way business offices are looking out in other ones. And 110th Street I thought that just served the back of the Premium Outlets.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Well, actually I mean most of that has been vacated. It's been vacated in at least two or three different pieces. At one point it went all the way to it was a GTC substation in there, and most of that's been vacated as you can see to the east.

Wayne Koessl:

And as far as a hunt club back there I don't think it's a real working hunt club is it? The only one I know that's working is the Halter Wildlife.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It's private so he brings people up there.

Wayne Koessl:

He only has his friends on it.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It's not a public hunt club. It's not a membership club. It's a private hunt club so he brings people up there to hunt, and he has that right on his property.

Michael Serpe:

I'd like to make a comment. Spot zoning is not highly recommended by too many people for municipalities to engage in it. But I feel it's not an illegal thing but sometimes there's exceptions. And I think right now this may be an exception on this parcel. I think Fran hit it, he took the words out of my mouth. We have 213 apartments in an area that across the interstate is Uline with over 1,000 employees. You have Aurora coming in with a couple hundred and some employees, Haribo coming in with a few hundred. And five miles down the road you have Foxconn with all the spinoffs that are coming from Foxconn. So having people being able to live within just a few minutes driving distance of where they work is kind of a nice plus.

There's a couple things here that I have to question. Not that it has anything against the development itself but the pet situation. Here's my problem on the pet situation. Dogs like to bark when they hear noises. And if the apartment renter is gone for the day and he has a dog that's going to bark that's going to come to the attention of the police department. And when the police department goes out there they haven't got access to this person's apartment so they're not going to be able to solve the problem right then and there. Size of the dog I think has something to do with it. Big dogs need to be run, and there's not that much here that you can allow a dog to run in. I question the pets. I'm not against dogs. I've a dog lover. But I question the amount of dogs that you're asking for, Fran. I think we have to address that and reduce it to a manageable number.

I see this as a good fit for this area, I really do. I don't know much about a 6:12, 4:12, 18:12, I don't know what you're talking about in a roof pitch, but make it look as classy as possible without being ugly. So I think the fencing issue we can address. Is there a necessity to have a fence bordering conservancy area, wooded area, wetlands, maybe not. I do believe that it should be a gated community. I do agree with Jean as far as the pool not being at the front of the development where people can gawk in. And in the middle of a summer night somebody want to jump the fence and dive in the pool that could be a concern. But if the pool didn't happen it wouldn't bother me in the least. But if it's going to happen put it in the right place. So with that I'll ask anymore comments. Wayne?

Wayne Koessl:

Mr. Chairman, I agree with you. I think that this project is the right fit for that site. And I will support it subject to the conditions outlined by staff. I now the next item is a conceptual plan, and that's where some of the issues get resolved before it comes back to us for our final zoning. So unless the Commission has more questions I would move --

Michael Serpe:

I have just one. Do you want us to make a decision on alternate 1, alternate 2?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

No, I think that you could approve both of them if you choose to. And then as the landowner or new developer submits something that they can do that at that time. And I would like to get some direction on the pets. Again, I'm still recommending at least pet free buildings, and a maximum of 40 pounds of pet per unit and up to two pets. That's still what I'm recommending.

Fran Brzezinski:

We're okay with that. Rather not, but let's be done with the pet.

Jim Bandura:

[Inaudible] the fencing.

Michael Serpe:

The fencing is an issue yet. Jean, I don't know how you feel.

[Inaudible]

Michael Serpe:

Okay, well, we'll let you work that out. Get the opinion of the Chief of Police.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I can do that.

Michael Serpe:

That can be worked out. We'll talk to the Chief and get his input on it and we'll look at it.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And I think that the pitch on the roofs need to be raised a little bit.

Michael Serpe:

I'm sorry?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I think the pitch on the individual entry roofs need to be raised a little bit.

Jim Bandura:

What's indicated on these drawings here? What's the pitch on the roofs on these drawings?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Probably only about a 4:12 maybe.

Michael Serpe:

Is that acceptable?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

No. That's what I'm saying.

Tom Shircel:

Trustee Serpe with the magic of Google here according to what I'm reading here a 6:12 roof pitch is a 26.57 angle. Does that sound correct?

[Inaudible]

Michael Serpe:

What is that pitch again that's shown?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

That's four, could we go to five?

Michael Serpe:

You're asking the wrong guy. I think that looks nice, but that's just my opinion.

Jim Bandura:

I wouldn't have a problem raising it a little bit, give it a little depth and make it stand out a little bit.

Mike Pollocoff:

Take a look at the difference between Skyline, Prairie Ridge [inaudible] right next to each other. It does change the look of it [inaudible].

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So what are you suggesting?

Bill Stoebig:

Is a 6:12 pitch just aesthetic, is that what you're looking for?

Jim Bandura:

I know when you start getting wider your roof line is going to be a lot higher. However, to compromise on that and give it a little bit of character to it I think a little higher pitch would be fine.

Brock Williamson:

Yeah, Skyline looks really nice. It's coming along well. It looks really good.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Skyline is like six or seven.

Brock Williamson:

It looks really nice.

John Skalbeck:

Yeah, I'm still just a little conflicted by the isolated nature of the development. I think, okay, there may be some kids that live there. And how do they get to school? I mean are there any buses that go down that way now?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

No.

John Skalbeck:

Or would they be on their own to get to school? So I've seen some places where I've been around where I've seen these mixed uses that seem very awkward. But I don't know. I guess I'm still a little hesitant. I'm curious about south of there we're going to have more basically industrial-type things. Across the street we got hotels. I mean did you look into any other hotels? I mean I don't know. It just seems like kind of a strange place to have a neighborhood.

Wayne Koessl:

Mr. Chairman, if the Commission doesn't have anymore comments I'd move that the Plan Commission send a recommendation to the Village Board in regard to the Comprehensive Plan amendments, the Neighborhood Plan and the Land Use Plan.

Mike Pollocoff:

Second that. From my old hat I used to wear as Administrator, and I forget who said it, but when there's a problem with the dogs typically the landlord will hear about it second, and the Village will hear about it before that. We have a whole apartment complex that has allowed any kind of dog in it. And it's just been one police headache after another. We're resolving dog disputes between neighbors, we're resolving disputes between dogs. It's a headache. And I really don't totally blame the developer of it because we haven't had a look see at the dog ordinance since we were a town. At that point you could have as many dogs as you wanted and there was no limitation to it. Now the ordinances will let you have four dogs with no restrictions on how big they are in a single family home.

So I really think that from a policy standpoint the Village Board should come up with some language that's manageable that, one, will get the Village out of the enforcement of dog disputes or at least find a way to minimize those. And secondly have some common sense recognition that a one bedroom apartment right now could have four dogs in it unless there's a lease prohibition on it, and we really can't stop it. So I think that has to be addressed because we need to find a way to extricate ourselves from it. Once this is approved it will be Fran's problem two steps after it's been our problem. And if you're going to tie up a police officer out there fighting over dogs, it's not productive time.

And everybody has a great dog. Everybody's dog is nice, everybody's dog won't bit you, everybody's dog won't bite another dog. I mean I've hard all of it, and it just doesn't happen. I think the best way to control this is going to be, and I want to be straight with Mr. Brzezinski and say I think has got to come from the top down, and we've really got to get a common sense approach to how we're dealing with dogs in multi-family situations. Because we've got nothing but ten years of bad experience with dogs in apartments.

The ones where the apartment owners have decided to not have them those apartments buildings have been little effort or little problems to us. But when the dogs are there, I mean people when they're in tight quarters will be fussing with each other, but all you need to do is throw a dog in there and then it's a whole new game. So I would just -- my recommendation is that the Village Board takes that up and Fran be aware of that that we're going to be going after -- cutting those dog numbers down in multi-family situations because historically it hasn't worked out for us.

Jim Bandura:

I agree that having the police worry about it --

Michael Serpe:

Mike, maybe after this vote on these two items we can request the staff to look into the dog ordinance. I didn't realize it's been since we were a town, and I think it should be looked into.

Jim Bandura:

I agree.

Michael Serpe:

Okay, we have a motion and a second for approval of Resolution 18-12. Jean?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I just had a question. The comment that John had brought up, I think it was John, about the school buses, is that a concern that we should have, or is that KUSD's problem? Because they're going to have to bring a school bus three and a half, four miles all the way out here for a handful of kids?

Michael Serpe:

That's a school district concern.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Obviously we don't have walking, and the closest elementary school is Prairie Lane maybe on 165 right down here. So the closest school will be pretty far away.

Michael Serpe:

I think that's the school district's problem.

Wayne Koessl:

I agree.

Jim Bandura:

I agree.

John Skalbeck:

I just had one more question, too. Is there a Village ordinance about distance from shooting a gun to a house?

Michael Serpe:

Yes, there is. We've had complaints in other areas of the Village about hunters only because they were concerned in the hunters in their area as Jim was talking about. But there haven't been any incidents of anybody being shot, any Village --

John Skalbeck:

No. But I'm just saying if we're now putting residential adjacent to a hunting ground, is there enough distance there that it would be okay?

Michael Serpe:

It still has to be I think 500 feet from that --

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Three hundred feet. It's 300 feet, 100 yards.

John Skalbeck:

And this would be 300 feet away?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I don't know. I guess we need to -- what's that distance, Fran?

Michael Serpe:

Okay, back to our Resolution 18-12. All those in favor say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Michael Serpe:

Opposed?

John Skalbeck:

No, opposed.

Michael Serpe:

Two opposed and five in favor. Motion carries.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I think the first item you were just considering was the Comprehensive Plan?

Michael Serpe:

That was the first item that we just voted on, yes.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So that was the Comprehensive Plan. So Jan just needs to know by show of hands which Plan Commissioners voted no so she can put it in the record.

Michael Serpe:

Those that voted in favor please raise your hand. And those that were opposed? Just one opposed. I'm sorry, I thought there were two. Okay, motion carries. Item B, what's your pleasure?

Wayne Koessl:

I'd move approval, Mr. Chairman on the consideration of a Conceptual Plan.

Michael Serpe:

Is there a second?

Jim Bandura:

Subject to the comments from staff.

Wayne Koessl:

That's always included, yes.

Michael Serpe:

MOTION MADE BY WAYNE KOESSL AND SECONDED BY JIM BANDURA FOR APPROVAL OF THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Michael Serpe:

Opposed?

John Skalbeck:

Opposed.

Michael Serpe:

The ayes have it. And one opposition, John Skalbeck. Thank you. See you at the next juncture.

C. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A FLOODPLAIN BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT for the request of Matt Carey, P.E. of Pinnacle Engineering Group on behalf of the Village of Pleasant Prairie to fill 66,671 cubic feet of 100-year floodplain and create 84,067 cubic feet of 100-year floodplain for the proposed Goldbear Drive and 120th Avenue (West Frontage Road) public roadways and a bridge crossing of an unnamed tributary to the DesPlaines River within proposed 128th Avenue in the Prairie Highlands Corporate Park.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

This is a consideration of a floodplain boundary adjustment for the request of Matt Carey, P.E. of Pinnacle Engineering Group on behalf of the Village of Pleasant Prairie to fill 66,671 cubic feet of 100-year floodplain and create 84,067 cubic feet of 100-year floodplain for the proposed Goldbear Drive and 120th Avenue which is the West Frontage Road public roadways and a bridge crossing of an unnamed tributary to the Des Plaines River within proposed 128th Avenue in the Prairie Highlands Corporate Park.

The Village of Pleasant Prairie is developing the 458 acre Prairie Highlands Corporate Park west of 120th Avenue between County Trunk Highway Q or 104th Street and County Trunk Highway C or Wilmot Road on the north. The Floodplain Boundary Adjustment will allow for the Village to construct public roadways and utilities to support the Park. The development will modify the current, existing floodplain located on the property. Specifically, the Village proposes to fill 66,671 cubic feet of floodplain and create 84,067 cubic feet of floodplain, again, for the proposed construction of Goldbear Drive and 120th Avenue. This is all outlined in the attached Floodplain Boundary Adjustment Report dated March 6, 2018.

The Floodplain Boundary Adjustment is consistent with the purposes of Section 420-131 of the Village Zoning Ordinance and is not in conflict with the applicable rules of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources or the Federal Emergency Management Agency. As evaluated by staff, the proposed Floodplain Boundary Adjustment shows that the 100-year floodplain modification complies with the following Village requirements:

- The floodplain boundary adjustment is consistent with Section 420-131 of the Village Zoning Ordinance and is not in conflict with the applicable rules of the Wisconsin DNR and FEMA.
- The areas being removed from the floodplain are contiguous to land lying outside the floodplain and the flood storage capacity being removed from the floodplain has a corresponding equal or greater volume of flood storage capacity in the vicinity of the removal to compensate for the lost flood storage capacity.

- The land removed from the floodplain will be filled to an elevation at least two feet above the elevation of the floodplain.
- Areas of compensating flood storage capacity are draining to the receiving stream.
- Land removed from the floodplain will be filled, again, to an elevation above the elevation of the floodplain.

Permits will be obtained from the Wisconsin DNR and FEMA to fill the floodplain as depicted on the application so that prior to work commencing a Conditional Letter of Map Revision or CLOMR is obtained and ultimately a Letter of Map Revision or a LOMR is obtained after construction is completed. In addition, to the floodplain boundary adjustments, the Village has submitted an application to the Corps and to the DNR to fill a portion of the wetlands, .65 acre, as shown on the attached map for the construction of Goldbear Drive. After these approvals are obtained public hearings to correct the Village Land Use Plan Map and the Zoning Map will be held. This is a matter for public hearing, and so I'd like to continue the public hearing at this time.

Michael Serpe:

This is a matter for public hearing. Is anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? We'll close the public hearing and open it up to comments or questions from the Commission.

Bill Stoebig:

Anytime we increase floodplain I'm always happy about that. I motion to approve.

Jim Bandura:

Second.

Michael Serpe:

MOTION MADE BY BILL STOEBIG AND SECONDED BY JIM BANDURA FOR APPROVAL OF THE FLOODPLAIN BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Michael Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it.

- D. Consider the request of Matt Carey P.E. of Pinnacle Engineering Group for approval of a Certified Survey Map to combine two parcels for the development of a speculative industrial building at the southeast corner of STH 165 and CTH H.**
- E. Consider the request of Matthew Mano of Stephen Perry Smith Architects for approval of Site and Operational Plans for the proposed development of the vacant properties generally located at the southeast corner of STH 165 and CTH H for the construction of a 196,300 square foot speculative industrial building and associated site improvements to be known as Parcel 32 Industrial Building.**

Jean Werbie-Harris:

The Village staff received an email and I had a discussion today from Mark Lake with Wangard, and they have decided to relook at their petition for a speculative building in the LakeView Corporate Park at the intersection of H and 165. And I think that the way they looked at it I think they're looking to flip the building the opposite direction. And by doing that they need to submit revised plans to us, revised engineering and so on and so forth. So because of that they are requesting to have their items tabled until the next Plan Commission meeting. Again, these are not public hearings, but at this point I'm recommending that they be tabled until May 14th. And if for some reason we don't have time to review them by that point it would go to another meeting of the Plan Commission. But I would ask that Items D and E at Mark Lake's request today be tabled, and that's both the Certified Survey Map and the Site and Operational plans until they can resubmit.

Wayne Koessler:

Mr. Chairman, I'd move that Item D and E be tabled until May 14th, is that correct?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

At this point it doesn't have to be to a date certain because it's not a public hearing.

Wayne Koessler:

Okay, I just move that it be tabled.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

But we'll just table it at this point.

Jim Bandura:

Second.

Michael Serpe:

MOTION MADE BY WAYNE KOESSL AND SECONDED BY JIM BANDURA TO TABLE ITEM D AND E. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Michael Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it.

F. Consider approval of Plan Commission Resolution #18-13 to initiate zoning text amendments related to the M-5 District to correct a reference to the Wisconsin Administrative Code related to performance standards for odors.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Item F is consider approval of Plan Commission Resolution 18-13 to initiate zoning text amendments related to the M-5 District and correct a reference to a Wisconsin Administrative Code related to the performance standards for odors. The Plan Commission with Resolution 18-13 may initiate a petition for amendments to the zoning ordinance which may include rezoning of property, change in zoning district boundaries or changes in the text of the ordinance. The Village staff is proposing to amend or clarify some requirements related to the M-5, Production Manufacturing District, and also to correct a reference to the Wisconsin Administrative Code related to performance standards for odors.

The Plan Commission by adopting this resolution initiates and petitions to amend and clarify these district areas and the regulations in the text as I've just discussed. Proposed changes in the zoning text are hereby referred to the staff for further study and recommendation. The Plan Commission is not by this resolution making any determination regarding the merits of the proposed changes, but is rather only initiating the process by which the zoning text amendments can be presented at a public hearing and discussed by Village Plan Commission and Board. We are looking to finish that review of these various sections of the ordinance and bring it promptly back to the Village Plan Commission at the May 14th public hearing Plan Commission meeting.

Michael Serpe:

What's your pleasure?

Wayne Koessl:

I'd move approval of Resolution 18-13.

Jim Bandura:

Second.

Michael Serpe:

MOTION MADE BY WAYNE KOESSL AND SECONDED BY JIM BANDURA FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 18-13. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Michael Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it.

Wayne Koessl:

Mr. Chairman, before we adjourn I hate to put more work on the staff, but I can request with the Plan Commission a review of our pet ordinance?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yes, we will bring the pet ordinance back to the Plan Commission and the Board at the next meeting.

Wayne Koessl:

Thank you.

7. ADJOURN.

Jim Bandura:

So moved.

Mike Pollocoff:

Second.

Michael Serpe:

Motion made and seconded to adjourn. All those in favor say aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Michael Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it. Thank you, gentlemen.

Meeting Adjourned: 7:46 p.m.