

**PLEASANT PRAIRIE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
VILLAGE HALL AUDITORIUM  
9915 39TH AVENUE  
PLEASANT PRAIRIE, WISCONSIN  
6:00 P.M.  
January 28, 2019**

A meeting for the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission convened at 6:00 p.m. on January 28, 2019. Those in attendance were Michael Serpe; Deb Skarda; Jim Bandura; Judy Juliana; Bill Stoebig; John Skalbeck (Alternative #1); and Brock Williamson (Alternate #2). Mike Pollocoff and Wayne Koessl were excused. Also in attendance were Nathan Thiel, Village Administrator; Tom Shircel, Assistant Village Administrator; Jean Werbie-Harris, Community Development Director; Peggy Herrick, Assistant Village Planner and Zoning Administrator; and Aaron Kramer, Deputy Planner and Zoning Administrator.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER.**
- 2. ROLL CALL.**
- 3. CORRESPONDENCE.**
- 4. CITIZEN COMMENTS.**

Michael Serpe:

Every item on the agenda tonight is a public hearing. So if there's something that you wish to address this Commission on you can wait until that item is called. But if there's anything else that anyone wishes to speak that's not on the agenda now would be your time to address this Commission. We'd ask that you give your name and address when you approach the microphone. And whoever talks tonight please talk close to the microphone so everybody can be heard with their comments so we can properly record it. Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? We'll close citizen comments.

- 5. NEW BUSINESS:**
  - A. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A MASTER CONCEPTUAL PLAN for the request of Mark D. Eberle, P.E. with Nielsen & Barber on the behalf of Branko Tupanjac, owner of the vacant properties at 7821 120th Avenue for the development of two commercial buildings and associated site improvements. The northern lot is proposed to be developed as a Hyatt Place hotel with a banquet hall and restaurant. The southern property is proposed to be developed as the Kings and Convicts brewery with a restaurant; brew house, cellar tanks and packaging area; game rooms; private lounges; and meeting areas.**

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Trustee Serpe and members of the Plan Commission and the audience, Item A is public hearing and consideration of a Master Conceptual Plan, and this is at the request of Mark Eberle, P.E., with Nielsen Madsen & Barber on the behalf of Branko Tupanjac, owner of the vacant properties

at 7821 120th Avenue for the development of two commercial buildings and associated site improvements. The northern lot is proposed to be developed as a Hyatt Place Hotel or other similar franchise with a banquet hall and restaurant. The southern property is proposed to be developed as the Kings & Convicts Brewery with a restaurant, brew house, cellar tanks and packaging area, game rooms, private lounges, and meeting areas.

The developer is requesting then approval of a Master Conceptual Plan, and this is for the development of the 7.4 acres of vacant land south of State Trunk Highway 50 on the east side of 120th Avenue known as the East Frontage Road. This is for a commercial and manufacturing development of a hotel/conference facility and a brewery. The 5.7 acre site combined with the adjacent 1.7 acre site, which is currently being purchased from the Wisconsin DOT, is proposed to be developed with a Hyatt Place Hotel or similar franchise and a Kings & Convicts Brewing Company.

With respect to the hotel, the hotel is planned to have 124 rooms with an 8,214 square foot private suite area with three rooms on the fifth floor. The main floor of the hotel will include a lobby and reception area, restaurant and bar area, banquet and meeting rooms, kitchen and pool area. Additional banquet facilities with a terrace area will also be located on the fifth floor. Pursuant to the application it is anticipated that the hotel will employ I think he said about 20 employees, but that does not include the restaurant, the banquet facilities or any other additional employees that may be needed. Again, it's important to note that we are presenting a concept plan that's showing both the hotel complex and the brewery, but at this time we are focusing more on the Kings & Convicts Brewery with respect to the details for the project.

So the Kings & Convicts Brewery, the name Kings & Convicts derives from the two founder's heritage, an Englishman the King and an Australian the Convict who reside on the shores of Lake Michigan with access to some of the best brewing water in the world, in a town that has a rich immigrant history with an undercurrent of anti-authority and the love of the scoundrel. The foundation for the brand's personality is the love of great beer, a fun anti-authority approach to marketing and the rich immigrant tapestry of the U.S., England and Australia. Great liquid and a great story with beers that appeal to the growing craft beer market.

The brand name represents who they are, it is memorable and it is different. This brand name enables growth outside of local markets with the ultimate goal to expand the brand regionally, then ultimately nationwide and internationally. The history and the beer styles translate across the U.S. and will flourish in Australia, the U.K., New Zealand and Asia. The beer names capture a sense of American, English and Australian history that provides a deep well from which to draw in terms of marketing and beer styles.

The new brewery, taproom and patio, event center and brig will ensure that the essence of the brand is enhanced and carried throughout the customer experience. The exterior building will highlight the rich history of Kings sending Convicts to Australia. The exterior landscape at the back of the building will incorporate natural prairie grasslands of the region. The interior design will ensure that the brewery is always on display, that the experience is real and that the space is appealing and comfortable, yet rugged. The brew house and cellar tanks will be visible from the I-94 on the west side of the property through the large arched windows and the taproom, restaurant and event space which will face east and overlook the natural areas of the Kilbourn ditch and association wetlands and Des Plaines floodplain.

For the brewery, the automated brew house will be the focal point situated behind the taproom bar with the towering fermenters standing immediately behind holding the attention of patrons. The fermentation tanks will be on display internally and externally, glazed walls and lights highlighting the stainless steel. Kings & Convicts Brewing Company is investing in a brand new state of the art brew house and cellar. This \$2 million system is being designed and manufactured in Wisconsin by QTS Tanks. They will be brewing a range of ales, lagers and pilsners for sale in the taproom and via distribution into Wisconsin and the Midwest.

The taproom, the taproom will have several key sections, including a bar area with high tops and bar seating, dining area with classic table seating, communal picnic table seating, a lounge area with more relaxed comfortable seating, and a patio with fire pits, outdoor seating and family seating area. The food, class American fare served by the kitchen including burgers, tacos and pizza. An outdoor BBQ and smoke pit will be on the patio, adjacent to the taproom. Aussie Meat Pies and English Fish and Chips will be available periodically.

The event center, a 250 capacity event center on the second floor overlooking the Des Plaines River and adjoining the taproom. The brig is a 50 person capacity room adjacent to the taproom that has access to the fermentation area with a brewing focused feel will be a feature of the brig aimed at the corporate and smaller events. This room will be capable of holding smaller gatherings that is more private yet retains the essence of the brewing experience. Hours, brewery operations will be will approximately be from 5:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. The taproom will be open from 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m. seven days a week.

Estimated daily truck trips, brewery operations will require the delivery of goods and ingredients and the removal of finished product and waste products. The taproom and event space will require food deliveries. In total it is anticipated that truck trips will average about four or six per day under their full operation. Under employment, in the production area they will have between 13 and 25 full and part time staff. The taproom, kitchen and event space will generate 70 to 90 full and part-time jobs for a total of 83 to 115 jobs on site.

Type of materials and equipment to be stored on site, raw materials for the production and packaging of their beers includes:

- Ingredients: hops, grains and yeasts
- Packaging materials: cans, trays and kegs
- Cleaning materials for their equipment
- Productions materials such carbon dioxide tanks and oxygen tanks.

On site equipment includes:

- Brewing equipment,
- Cellar tanks for fermentation,
- Canning and kegging lines for packaging our finished goods,
- CO2 and O2 tanks,
- Forklifts.

The taproom will have a kitchen with ingredients dedicated to cold and dry storage areas. The primary solid waste from the production of beer is spent grain. They will be installing a spent grain silo to capture 100 percent of the grain used in production. This grain will be physically removed from site and used as feed for local farms. Yeast and hops are the two solid waste products and will both be disposed of offsite again with local farmers and organic recycling providers. Their primary objective with water is reuse and recycling. They will have several systems in place to capture water used in the brewing and cleaning of their tanks. The remaining water waste will be routed into the sewer system.

Village liquor licenses for selling or consuming alcohol will be required for each use. In addition, State of Wisconsin Department of Revenue permits for the brewery and wholesale sales of the beer will also be required.

Now with respect to site access and parking as seen on the slide, although the hotel and brewery sites may be subdivided into two parcels, they will share common access, parking and will be developed as a unified development. Two access points will be provided to the development from 120th Avenue or the East Frontage Road as allowed and permitted by the Wisconsin DOT. A Transportation Impact Analysis or TIA is in process. And they actually as of yesterday they just agreed on trip generation formulas with the DOT, and the formal submittal of the TIA is going into the DOT tomorrow. All required off-site improvements to 120th Avenue will be outlined in a Memorandum of Understanding known as an MOU between Wisconsin DOT and the Village. The developer will have a corresponding agreement with the Village to financially guarantee the construction of the 120th Avenue improvements.

Cross-access will be provided between and through the properties. The entire site provides for 492 parking spaces including 16 handicapped accessible parking spaces. Parking allocated to the brewery building is 114 parking spaces including 8 handicapped accessible spaces, and the parking allocated to the hotel is 376 parking spaces. The amount of parking is still being further evaluated to make sure that there is adequate on-site parking. If for some reason we have a final determination as we get through the final and site and operational planning that any additional parking is needed, the staff will be working with them to evaluate whether or not any underground parking is available or visible or possible I should say for the hotel.

For municipal services, public sanitary sewer and water will be required to be extended to serve this development in 120th Avenue. The developer will be responsible to pay for their fair share to utilize the Chateau Lift Station in the amount of \$23,546.26. There's a Village engineer memo that addresses this. This will be required to be paid prior to issuance of building permits. In addition, the Wisconsin DOT will require additional roadway improvements within the frontage road. The Village will draft the required Development Agreement to be entered into that sets forth the required public and private improvements and outlines the financial security including the above noted lift station fee to ensure that all the work is completed.

A Certified Survey Map will be required to show any land division, any additional right-of-way and any easements, dedications and restrictive covenants. The CSM shall be a minimum showing all of the following easements and other noted items. And, again, as you know I typically draft that language once we get a little bit further with respect to the detailed engineering and CSM plans. And that includes stormwater drainage, retention basin, access and maintenance easement areas, signage, access and maintenance areas, dedicated ingress-egress, cross-access, cross-

parking maintenance areas, dedicated wetland preservation and protection areas, as well as dedicated general utility areas.

A Comprehensive Land Use Map Amendment will be required to correctly show the location of any wetlands on the properties. Zoning Map and Text Amendments will be required to create the required Planned Development or PD ordinance and to rezone any wetlands into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District. All of the wetlands have been delineated on the properties already. The PD Ordinance will allow the Village to create an ordinance that outlines the specific uses and requirements for the development.

Under their Site and Operational Plans they will be required for each individual building that includes the site plans, drainage and grading plans, building plans, landscape plans, industrial waste survey, signage and any other plans and documents pursuant to the Site and Operational Plan requirements of the Village Ordinance.

Each building will also be required to comply with the Village's Digital Security Imaging System or DSIS system pursuant to Chapter 410 of our ordinance. Site and Operational Plans will need to be identical to the State approved plans when we get to that point. Further discussion is warranted to determine whether or not they are going to do a preliminary site and operational plan then a final in order to begin mass grading earlier than obtaining their building permit for the site. In addition, prior to issuance of any permits an Airport Overlay Site Plan Review approval from the City of Kenosha is required because of their proximity or distance to the Kenosha Regional Airport.

So with that are we doing the video first? I could introduce the guys from Kings and Convicts to add some addition flare for their presentation regarding the brewery and the concept. We also have a video that they would like to show you. So maybe we'll start with the video.

Michael Serpe:

We have a representative? Please. Just name and address for the record.

Brendan Watters:

Brendan Watters, address 1071 Valley Road in Lake Forest.

Chris Bradley:

Chris Bradley, 688 Buena Road, Lake Forest.

Brendan Watters:

So part of what we wanted to do here was have a building that represented from the roadway you can see all the tanks. So when you're driving by, you come up it makes a statement. It makes a statement about the brand, but it also has some design aspects in this that are reflective also of the old gunpowder factory. So when you're going to be inside this it will be an industrial feel but a warm feel, somewhere that you can come and stay and enjoy having a beer and having something to eat. But we wanted to make an impact from the exterior so that it's a destination.

I think the other part to this for us also is having access, great access of the interstate but also off of State Highway 50, somewhere that it's easy in and out and it's easy for locals to get to. But also when people drive by when you're going up and down I-94 people will understand that this is Pleasant Prairie's brewery. And while there are other good breweries around, and we know a lot of them around Kenosha and up from Milwaukee down to Chicago, we wanted to do things a little bit differently. So there's not a lot like this around, and this is not something new. We've based a lot of the design elements of this from some of the really good breweries that we've seen out in California, in Minnesota and in Texas. And we decided that if we're going to do this we're going to do it big.

Michael Serpe:

A very unique design. Can a convict get a job there?

Brendan Watters:

We'll have to think about that one. So the convicts elements, I'll bring in some convicts, but we'll make sure they're all under control. So this is just some of the conceptual drawings and some of what we'll see in the taproom itself. Part of this that what we wanted to do is have separate areas that people can come and enjoy it and some of the local community can come and have someplace that's separate. But one of the things that's driven us nuts about the small place we have at the moment at some of the other breweries is we never want to have the taproom shut down for people to come and have time to sit down and enjoy a beer. Sometimes when you have these events you lock down the whole taproom, and that means it's only for private events.

Everything that we've done here in trying to design this is to have separate areas that through all seasons locals and guests can come in and enjoy some good barbeque and a good beer and watch things that are going on. But that doesn't preclude from renting out some of the space and having some corporate events or whatever we want to do in there. So it's going to be a multi-use facility. But what we really wanted to do is make sure that the brewing is always on display so that it is a true destination to come and see how beer is made.

Michael Serpe:

What is your comparison food to beverage, what is it, do you have an idea?

Brendan Watters:

You mean split in terms of revenue?

Michael Serpe:

Yeah, more food than beverage?

Brendan Watters:

It will be more food than beverage. Again, this is a brewery that we'll distribute outside of. People can take to go so there will be a retail area there. But there will likely be more food than beverage.

Michael Serpe:

Okay. Anything else?

Brendan Watters:

No, unless there are other questions?

Bill Stoebig:

Is this the first in your development of Kings & Convicts, or is this a part of a chain?

Brendan Watters:

We have a small one. Our first one is actually in Highwood, Illinois so just on the lake down there with access to the water. So the water is a big deal for us having access to Lake Michigan water. And so we have the first one, and it's a production brewery but smaller and a very tiny taproom. And so that was always one of our first goals is to get it up and going, start developing the brand, developing the recipes, getting it out there into the market. And then we've spent the better part of the last 9 months, 12 months trying to find the right spot. And the right spot found us.

Jim Bandura:

You mentioned the powder plant. What are you going to do to highlight that on the interior?

Brendan Watters:

So inside there's going to be stories. So a little bit with Kings & Convicts we believe that every beer tells a story. Every single one of our beers tells a story about English sending convicts to Australia or some of the undercurrent of anti-authority thugs that are here in the United States. We plan on also telling stories on the wall with murals as well as tours. So we're going to have tours all the time that go and tell the story of beer, of Kings & Convicts and our location. It just so happens that the powder plant also has some design elements of all wood and all industrial looks. So we plan on telling the story of the powder plant in this as well.

Deb Skarda:

Will your private events be able to hold a wedding reception?

Brendan Watters:

Yes, yes.

Michael Serpe:

Jean, do you have anything else?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I don't think so at this point. I mean we're at the Conceptual Plan stage at this point. So we are working through lots of details with them at this point. So they are looking for a positive direction from the Plan Commission and the Board that everyone agrees that this is a good use for this location. Again, if you look at the drawing that Peggy just put up, all of the land to the east of this facility basically is part of the Des Plaines River Conservancy. And you can see the curve in the road as that turns into 118th Avenue as it goes north towards Highway 50. And there is a single family home currently immediately to the south. And then after that it's conservancy land as well. Again, this is all part of the original powder plant land area. And a lot of the land that's immediately adjacent was donated to the Village of Pleasant Prairie, 200 or 300 acres that were donated several years ago. And so there's a large conservancy between here and then the nearest subdivision which are Chateau and River Oaks to the east.

Jim Bandura:

Jean, just a quick question. The parcel that's on the north side of the curve is that going with this?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So where their parking lot is located?

Jim Bandura:

Right, the north side of the curve.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

No, that's going to be owned and retained by the Wisconsin DOT. It's primarily all floodplain/wetland.

Jim Bandura:

Okay.

Michael Serpe:

You want to open this up, Jean, you ready? Okay, this is a matter for public hearing. Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? We'll close the public hearing and open it up to comments and questions if you have any others from the Commission.

Jim Bandura:

I've got a question to Matt. Isn't that the lift station -- from there to the lift station how far is that? Is that really going to work?

Matt Fineour:

Actually the lift station that this sewage will go through is the lift station in Chateau right there. There's a sanitary sewer that goes across that environmental corridor, so it goes across the creek and out to the frontage road kind of I'd say just south of the development by Highway 50. And they will be taking that south as much as they can. And actually it looks like a conflict with the pipes. They will be taking their sewage with either a grinder pump or sanitary sewer and taking to that existing sanitary sewer line that goes to the lift station.

Jim Bandura:

So you are going to cross the creek there then?

Matt Fineour:

There is a sanitary sewer that already crosses the creek.

Michael Serpe:

Anybody else? What's your pleasure?

Jim Bandura:

If there aren't any questions from the Commission I recommend approval.

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Michael Serpe:

**MOTION MADE BY JIM BANDURA AND SECONDED BY JUDY JULIANA FOR APPROVAL OF THE MASTER CONCEPTUAL PLAN. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE.**

Voices:

Aye.

Michael Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it. Looking forward to this, a very interesting project. Thank you.

**B. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A MASTER CONCEPTUAL PLAN for the request of Kevin Risch with Clark Dietz, Inc. agent, on behalf of Prairie Holdings LLC, owner of the vacant property east of 9201 Wilmot Road. The property is located within the M-1, Limited Manufacturing District and is proposed to be subdivided for the development of three limited use industrial related buildings and associated site improvements. Lot 2 is proposed to be developed as Extra Space Storage building, the other two properties have no proposed users at this time, but are shown as potential building sites.**

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Item B is the consideration of a Master Conceptual Plan for the request of Kevin Risch with Clark Dietz, agent, on behalf of Prairie Holdings, LLC, owner of the vacant property east of 9201 Wilmot Road. The property is located within the M-1, Limited Manufacturing District, and is proposed to be subdivided for the development of three limited use industrial related buildings and associated site improvements. Lot 2 is proposed to be developed as Extra Space Storage building. The other two properties have no proposed users at this time but are shown as potential building sites. And as you can see the large building on the site that is 9201 Wilmot Road, so this is actually to the north/northeast. And that is at the intersection of Highway C and Highway H on the west side of the Village.

The developer is requesting approval of a Master Conceptual Plan for the development of the vacant 17.6 acres of land located east of 9201 Wilmot Road at the southwest corner of H and C for a limited manufacturing development. The property is zoned M-1, Limited Manufacturing, and is proposed to be subdivided into three parcels for limited use industrial buildings and associated improvements. Lot 2 is proposed to be developed, and that is the secondary purpose of the request this evening is to show you the Extra Space Storage building which is an indoor climate controlled building. The two other properties have no proposed users at this time, but are shown as potential building site areas.

On October 2, 2017, the Village approved a Certified Survey Map and associated Memorandum of Understanding, an MOU, for the owner to subdivide the property so that the existing 9201 Wilmot Road building would remain on one property and the vacant land to the east could be located on a separate property. The owner has removed a large unused parking lot to the east of the building and installed the required storm water retention system and other site improvements for the existing industrial development. It was the intent of the developer that the remaining vacant land with a private driveway access to Fire Station #2 would be further developed for light industrial purposes.

So if you're looking at the Master Conceptual Plan now it's kind of turned a little bit. So on the very north end is the 9201 Wilmot building, the Lot 2 is what we're going to be getting into a little bit more detail about tonight, and that's the extra space storage. And then Lot 1, Lot 3 are the proposed new buildings. And then Fire Station #2 exists adjacent to 88th Avenue.

To the west of the vacant building is an existing 22.34 acre property with a 385,000 square foot industrial building being used primarily for warehousing and storage. To the east is Fire Station #2. On the east side of 88th Avenue is the southern entrance to Westwood Mobile Home Park, a few scattered single family homes and the Hidden Oak Apartments. To the north along C are single family residential homes and the Pleasant Prairie Elementary School, and to the south is Kenosha Grounds Care.

This vacant land is proposed to be further subdivided as indicated into three parcels, and these would be zoned M-1, Limited Manufacturing Zoning District.

- Lot 1 is proposed to be 3.7 acres and could be developed with a 14,112 square building. At this time no proposed user has been identified, but the property has been laid out for this potential type of light industrial development, again, to give everyone an idea of what could develop if it does develop on the property.
- Lot 2 is proposed to be 6.2 acres for the development of a 127,000 square foot warehouse building proposed to be occupied by Extra Space Storage. Again, it's a climate controlled basically mini-storage building.
- Lot 3 is proposed to be 7.7 acres and could be developed with a 43,500 square building. No user has been identified for this property but, again, it's been laid out for light industrial development.

The lots will not have any direct driveway access to Highway or Highway C. They will have direct through private access -- they will have access through private roadways that will connect to H and C. The primary access will be through an existing north/south private drive that currently services the needs of the fire station. So you can see on the arrows that there's one access off of Wilmot Road, and then the other access is off of 88th Avenue which is Highway H. So that which Peggy just highlighted in yellow that is like the main private roadway that connects everyone and gets access to all the lots including the fire station as a secondary access.

The private roadway will connect with an east/west private road that will connect to the existing access on the property to the west which has an access to C as well. So what Peggy's just outlined is that there is a western access in yellow, and then again that connects up to C. And then privately there is a drive that connects to the east as well that goes to the Village's water tower that's on that location as well. All the private roadways on this vacant land area will be reconstructed with curb and gutter, paving, storm sewer drainage systems, roadway lighting all to service the three lots while continuing to service the fire station.

All buildings will be required to connect to municipal water and sewer within the adjacent private streets. The development of the property will also require the installation of two additional retention basins to ensure that adequate stormwater management is being provided for the development. The developer intends to grade the properties, construct the stormwater basins and

install all stormwater improvements and sewer and water improvements associated with the private roadways. So he's trying to get these sites all pad ready.

The Village will draft an addendum to the existing MOU for the remaining site improvements which, again, includes private roads, street lights, grading and storm basins and will require additional financial security be provided to ensure that these improvements are completed. Upon approval of the Master Conceptual Plan, detailed site development plans, a revised CSM and documents to vacate any existing easements that are no longer needed will need to be submitted for review and approval so an addendum can be drafted and the CSM can be finalized. The Certified Survey Map, easement vacation documents and the MOU addendum will be considered by the Plan Commission and the Village Board at the same time at a subsequent meeting.

There are some wetlands within Lot 3 that have been determined by the Wisconsin DNR to be artificial wetlands pursuant to their letter that's attached dated August 8, 2018. The petitioner is waiting for confirmation from the Army Corps of Engineers to determine whether or not they'll be taking jurisdiction. Or they could also apply for fill permits from the Army Corps of Engineers. Prior to any grading of the site all required approvals from the Army Corps shall be obtained and submitted to the Village. A Comprehensive Land Use Map Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment will be required to correctly show the location of any wetlands that will remain on the properties.

So on Lot 2 the proposed use for conceptual purposes will be identified as Extra Space Storage. And Lot 2 is proposed to be sold and the Extra Space Storage facility is proposed to be constructed. The storage building will be approximately a 127,000 square foot building. Within the building will be a 1,000 square foot office area and climate controlled storage units. And their variety in size is shown on the screen. It might be a little hard to read, but they will be from 5 by 5 feet to the largest which is 30 by 10. So 25 feet to 300 square feet in area.

All storage units are located inside the climate controlled building. All persons and businesses that may rent a storage unit would access the building in their vehicle through an overhead door on the north side of the building. Upon entering, the overhead garage door will close, and the customer would continue to drive through the large center aisle to the appropriate storage aisle to unload or retrieve items from their units and exit the building on the south. So what this means is that there's no access to the storage units from the outside of the building.

The building and the site is monitored with camera systems, and the exterior of the site will be monitored pursuant to the Village's Security Ordinance with a DSIS or the Digital Security Imaging System pursuant to Chapter 410 of the Municipal Code. The pre-cast panel building will provide for windows and a metal entry feature at the main office entry and by the required exterior man door fire exits from the building. Additional architectural details have been provided. I'm not sure if they're all included on these photos, but they've started to provide some additional details for us for the building. The facility will employ one to two full-time employees and would expect about ten trips from their customers a day. A total of 11 parking spaces including one accessible parking space will be provided adjacent to the office area of the building which is adjacent to Highway C.

With respect to Site and Operational Plans, they will be required for each individual building that includes site plans, drainage, grading, building, landscape, signage plans and all other plans as

required by the Site and Operational Plan provisions. Further discussion is also warranted with this development. I'm not sure if they're going to do it in two steps bringing a Preliminary Site and Operational Plan first and then a final. Again, oftentimes businesses bring the preliminary along with the details civil plans, grading plans, building footprint plans in order to begin mass grading to take advantage of a spring start and installation of underground site utilities and footing and foundation. But that's going to be up to the petitioner to determine whether or not they want to complete the improvements -- some of the improvements completed prior to submitting for building permits.

Either way, an addendum to the MOU does need to be prepared, needs to be detailed. We do need to have financial security, and we need to have all those details in place along with the schedule of when the work is going to be completed so that the Village can determine exactly how far Extra Space Storage can go prior to work being developed on their site. Because we need to have municipal sanitary sewer and water connections and roadway connections to their site for them to be able to adequately construct on the site.

So with that this is a public hearing. I'd like to introduce the Extra Space Storage or the developer of the property or the engineer, whoever would like to come up to make a further presentation with respect to the site. Again, the staff has vetted this out from a overreaching large scale conceptual standpoint because there are potentials for three other lots to be created. We have been in constant communication with the fire department and the Fire Chief to make sure that anything that is done here will not compromise anything that we have going on with respect to being able to provide fire protection. So we will be working continually with them to make sure that there's always adequate access in and out of the fire station from that private road. So with that I'm not sure who of the petitioner would like to come up to make part of a presentation or answer any questions first.

Michael Serpe:

And we'll need your name and address for the record as well.

Kevin Risch:

Good evening. My name is Kevin Risch. I reside at 8308 47th Avenue here in Pleasant Prairie.

Bruno Haney:

And I am Bruno Haney. My wife and I Lori she's in the audience here. We reside at 12138 North River road in Mequon, Wisconsin. We're the owners and developers.

Rich Pipek [phonetic]:

Rich Pipek, 4423 North Morris Boulevard in Shorewood, Wisconsin. I'm the architect working with the developer for the Extra Space Storage.

Kevin Risch:

I am the engineer on record for the facility at hand. All three sites are planned to be mass graded at the same time. Clark Dietz prepared the grading and roadway plans for all three of the sites as well as the site to the west, the large facility where we incorporated two retention ponds as part of that site. Where the existing site is right now, Lot 2, that was a ginormous parking lot that was dilapidated. The owner at the wish of the staff removed it and then replaced it with engineered fill for the expectation that this was going to be further developed. So most of the material that we took out for the retention ponds was retained onsite. We re-utilized the material for future years.

And the same thing is going to be done with this facility. The pond that's at the corner by the roundabout as well as the pond by Lot 3 both those ponds will be dug at the same time. At least that's the intent. And then all material that's being removed from there is going to remain onsite. We have very little haul material that's going to come offsite if we mass grade it all together.

At the same time as Jean already alluded to we plan on putting all the stormwater required pipe in the roadways in advance of Lot 3, Lot 1 and Lot 2. Overall the intent is to try to coincide the mass grading submittal with probably preliminary or maybe 60 percent plans for the Extra Space Storage so that the owner can take advantage of the mass grading contractor to do his underground work, put his underground pipes in at the same time for cost savings.

The unique thing about the Lot 2 Extra Space Storage you'll probably take note there are no retention ponds on that facility. The way we designed that facility is we took all the stormwater off of that property via roof drains into stormwater through, and that will reach the Lot 1 retention pond. We needed two lots of retention ponds because of the site topography and elevations. So primarily the south pond by Lot 3 will be used primary by that site. The other two are going to be utilizing the one that's near the roundabout. So that is the intent is to get approval for this Master Conceptual Plan so that we can develop final plans for the roadway and mass grading at the same time that the owner of Lot 2 moves through his renderings and required plans for city development.

Michael Serpe:

Jean, anything else before we open it up? This is a matter for public hearing. Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? We'll close the public -- Jean?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I do have a letter that I received that they would like to have me read into the public record as part of the public hearing comments. And it was received by the staff on January 23, 2019. Dear members of the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission, my name is Andrew Yule, and I live at 9100 Wilmot Road. I am unable to attend tonight's meeting regarding the proposed self-storage warehouse across from my house on Highway C. I was informed that letters will be read at the meeting, and I would like to express my concerns with the proposed warehouse. I've been a resident of Pleasant Prairie since 1996, and my wife has been living in this house for the past 42 years. We purchased her parents' home 17 years ago when they purchased it in 1970.

When we bought the house it was farmland and residential all the way down Highway C, then Tri- Clover building was built in 1973. I know the current Planning Commission did not have anything to do with it being there, but they do have some control and guidance with respect to development around it. All will admit the Tri-Clover building is out of place with the Village's master plan. And I remember of all the talks of wanting it torn down for residential development. It is residential on both sides of Highway H and all the way down Wilmot Road to the interstate.

The Village has tried to keep this a similar residential county road and has banned semi traffic from the Tri-Clover building west on C. With the renovation of the Tri-Clover building semi traffic has greatly expanded allowed to be used from the east, but they still sneak down Wilmot from the interstate occasionally. There has been much done to the property by the new owners, and the landscaping does look better but now they are proposing a warehouse. One was bad enough so now let's build three more.

If you look at the proposal of Lot 2 which is supposed to be developed first, the square footage of the building takes almost the entire property. Very little grass and landscaping and no retention pond for runoff and closer to the road than its warehouse neighbor to the west. Lots 1 and 3 have much smaller building footprint compared to the lot with more landscaping and retention areas. These buildings at this time are only proposals.

I'm asking the Commission to please understand while a building like this may be a good addition to the Village, it's not across from your house, and it's not that you will see your property value decrease. It's not you will get to look out at a 127,000 square foot green trimmed storage warehouse. And it's not that you have to put up with the difficulties in leaving your driveway due to increased traffic. It's already dangerous to walk out and get your mail.

If this proposal was across from River Oaks or Prairie Ridge it wouldn't probably be approved. Please consider a smaller building, more landscaping and a bigger berm with no green neon trim. Please consider the residents of the Village that have to live across from the warehouse. Thank you for your time, Andrew Yule and family.

So I'd like to have the petitioner respond to this. A couple of things that I do need to make the Plan Commissioners aware of and I think most of you know that at one point this area was supposed to be Pleasant Prairie's industrial park. So when Tri-Clover went in in '73 and expansions in '78, really this area back in '84 was all put into a manufacturing district. So we did not take that manufacturing zoning away in 2010 with the Comprehensive Plan because it was vested to that property. So it is a limited or light manufacturing area.

But what I can say is this is a min-storage facility. It's not an exterior accessed facility, it's an inside facility. They will have very, very, very little traffic, very little truck traffic because unless you're moving -- I mean you could rent a 300 square foot unit, but you actually have to come in through a garage door, the door shuts behind you. So it's not like there will be a lot of traffic generated because storage units typically are not visited every day, every week, every month, and sometimes not every year I mean depending on what people are storing there.

And so when the staff saw this particular use there are a lot of residents in this area, a lot of businesses, there are people who live in apartments in this area, so a lot of people could use some extra storage. And out of all the other mini-storage products that we have seen recently with

respect to having all the doors on the outside and having to do a lot of additional fencing and so on and so forth, we welcomed an opportunity to work with one that was a little bit more considerate to the abutting neighborhood and the amount of traffic that could be coming to a particular site.

So I don't know if the owners -- we are still working with them with respect so some design elements and things like that for this particular site. But, again, it's not intended to be a high truck traffic, traffic generating use with a lot of bright lights or anything like that. Inside the facility it will be very bright, but not on the exterior of the facility. And it's a service that could be used by the local residents and businesses.

Michael Serpe:

Anything to add on that?

Kevin Risch:

I think Jean is right. The building has very, very little traffic. There's a manager and an assistant manager that are there during the day. If somebody wants a unit they typically reserve it on their smart phone or by their computer, come in, they get a pass code to enter the building. You do enter the building with high speed doors that go up very, very quickly. You drive in and they shut very quickly. And there's LED in motion lighting in there. Typically it's not when people vacate the building all of the lights go off as you exit the building. There's jazz music playing inside there. The floors are polished daily.

So this is a very, very clean business that we operated, and there is very little traffic. Typically there's the manager's car that's parked outside and that's it. Once the building is sustained it's kind of like watching grass grow, there's just not much that happens there. People come in, doors shut, they exit out the back and that's it. It's a very, very professionally run business, very quiet and very, very clean.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you.

Jim Bandura:

Just a quick one. Are you set on the lime green color?

Kevin Risch:

Yes, that's Extra Space is our third party management company, and they have just under 2,000 locations nationwide. And when people first see that they said, wow, when you look at it on the computer screen. But this will be our third facility that we've developed and are running. And actually a lot of the public and even coming back for conditional uses into some of the municipalities now that they're up and they have just raved about how nice and how nice they look. They were actually pleasantly surprised from a conceptual to an actual piece of property

developed, and they actually raved about how nice it looked in their community. And that was the Town of Grafton.

Michael Serpe:

Let me ask anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak on this? We'll close the public hearing.

Brock Williamson:

What are your hours of operation?

Kevin Risch:

Typically -- the manager arrives at 9:30 to 7 p.m. But typically people can come in I believe at about 6 or 7 a.m., and then we're closed at 10 p.m. So we don't have any traffic at night. Everything is lowly lit. It's actually a hotel feel is the best way to describe the product.

Brock Williamson:

That's what I was going to ask so you'll go mostly dark at night? I mean safety-wise, but not like showing it off as a [inaudible].

Kevin Risch:

We are not showing off the property. It is very low lit, very soft lighting. It doesn't stand out. We're not there to advertise and get the big pops. It's their business, too, the renters, so everybody takes pride in this. The best way to describe it is really just a soft hotel feel without the traffic.

Brock Williamson:

And then how do you restrict what's stored there?

Kevin Risch:

There's contracts that the customers have to sign. So there's no motor vehicles, no paints, no hazardous material. So it's typically household goods. Or a lot of the businesses, some of the hospitals utilize our facilities also. They store some of their bedding and that type of thing in there because it is climate controlled so it's heated and air conditioned. So it's a really -- like today is a perfect day for it.

Jim Bandura:

It's going to be sprinklered, too, right?

Kevin Risch:

Yes, correct.

Deb Skarda:

What's the rent range per unit?

Kevin Risch:

It really depends for the area. Corporate sets all the prices, but for like a smaller 5 by 5 they can be as low as \$29 a month up to a 10 by 30 can be several hundred dollars a month.

Deb Skarda:

I want to go back to Brock's question. I don't know, maybe Jim asked this, but the neon green is like a corporate color that you have to stay with, or can there be subtle changes in that color scheme?

Kevin Risch:

It's a standard. It's a standard across the country and, in fact, across the world. [Inaudible] that rendering probably shows it a little bit more [inaudible] than it truly is. We'll have [inaudible] show you the true color versus the [inaudible].

Deb Skarda:

I mean I'm just looking at the Pleasant Prairie sign and figure out if it's closer to the green on that or is it like --

Kevin Risch:

That's a very good example. It would be closer to the Pleasant Prairie sign. So it's very welcoming especially with the color [inaudible] almost an LED look that I'm seeing [inaudible] very bright, very choppy. Once the building is up with the colors, the tones that we have it actually is, wow, this is a beautiful building. It's not what is that? It's a gorgeous building. We have a trend so it's not a new concept. Again, I believe there's 1,700 to 2,000 locations nationwide.

Deb Skarda:

Just trying to avoid the Mr. Yuk colored theme.

Michael Serpe:

Is there another exit other than the overhead door?

Kevin Risch:

The entry would be the big high speed door, and you drive right down through the center. And you can pull off to the side so people can pass you on the inside and then you exit out the back.

Michael Serpe:

Is there any other --

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Man doors.

Michael Serpe:

-- foot traffic door that people can enter, or if the doors don't work are they able to get out?

--:

Oh, yeah, certainly there's several versions as the exits of the building. And then at the front door in the office you can go through into the office and then transition right into the warehouse from there.

Jim Bandura:

The entry doors, the roll up doors what size are they going to be?

Kevin Risch:

We're looking between like a 16 to 20 foot wide door by 14 high I believe.

Kevin Risch:

And they're high speed. So what's really interesting until you see one of these doors it's probably one of the coolest. What I like to show off is when you hit a button it's almost they're air driven so they don't go like a standard garage door and you have to sit there and wait. When you hit the button, punch in your code, the doors actually fly up as fast as you can blink. The doors go up, you drive in and the doors come right down behind you. So they're not open. There's nothing to look at inside other than polished and clean. Inside the interiors are all stark white. It's a very, very clean atmosphere that we have [inaudible].

Jim Bandura:

Where's the closest one of these facilities?

--:

I believe the closest facility might be Franklin. We don't own that one now. Gurnee.

Michael Serpe:

Anything else.

Deb Skarda:

I'm just kind of curious what you're planning as far as the landscaping. I want to take into account Mr. Yule's comments about the landscaping.

--:

I think it's kind of conceptual now, right?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It is, in fact, conceptual. Because I've got a lot of comments in my staff comments on the color, the height variations, some painting elements, the landscaping. And they've assured me when we get to the next level, the preliminary site and operational and the final, that we will see all of those details, and hopefully we'll address a lot of the concerns with respect to the appearance. They've indicated to us that they like to over-landscape the building, and so that's what we're going to be looking for is over-landscaping.

This is going to be developed as part of a unified business development. And in doing so that's why the stormwater basin for this site -- there's three stormwater basins that are servicing these three lots. There isn't one specifically on Lot 2 because basins have a tendency to want to be in the lowest areas. So this is being developed as a unified development. But in answer to your question about the green, yes, I have some reservations and concerns. And so we have some discussions to go through with them in order to maybe tone down a little bit of that facing to the west as well as to add some additional elements knowing the proximity of where this building is located.

Deb Skarda:

Okay, thanks, Jean.

Jim Bandura:

Jean, question to the staff, the Fire Chief is okay with the circulation around the station? I know this is conceptual but --

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So it exists that way today. So when the fire department goes out on a call they go out and then they come around to the back, and then they can come down Highway C, they can come right in the back of the station. And so all the rigs are then facing east. So they use that circulation. And so that private roadway which is, again, from Wilmot Road to 88th Avenue that's the way it exists. It's been that way since the early '70s, and it works just fine for the fire department. The

key is during construction it has to be able to continue to function so they can get in and then get their rigs facing to the east on 88th Avenue.

Jim Bandura:

And he doesn't see any conflicts there?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

No, not at all. That's the way it's been operating for 40 or 50 years, and they really like the way it works especially with the bigger rigs --

Jim Bandura:

I'm just thinking of the increased traffic or whatever.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Again, there's really not going to be much traffic at this point with the Extra Space Storage. I mean he does not feel that there's going to be any conflict.

Jim Bandura:

Without Lot 3 and 1 I see that there's some semi parking shown on outlot 3 proposed.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

He's not concerned at this point.

--:

In fact I met with him on two occasions, him and the Assistant Chief and we talked about it. He does not have any concerns. Only that the road is still maintained for their use and that we work through the construction around their emergencies.

Michael Serpe:

Any other questions? What's your pleasure?

Judy Juliana:

Move to send a favorable recommendation to the Village Board pursuant to all of the comments and questions that have been raised tonight.

Bill Stoebig:

I'll second.

Michael Serpe:

**MOTION MADE BY JUDY JULIANA AND SECONDED BY BILL STOEBIG FOR APPROVAL OF THE MASTER CONCEPTUAL PLAN. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE.**

Voices:

Aye.

Michael Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it. Thank you. Items C and D will be taken together but separate action on each one.

- C. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF PLAN COMMISSION RESOLUTION #19-05 FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE VILLAGE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN to amend the southwest portion of the Whittier Creek Neighborhood Plan generally located north of 93rd Street and east of Old Green Bay Road.**
- D. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A CONCEPTUAL PLAN for the request of Dan Szczap of Bear Development LLC, agent for Creekside PP, LLC, the owner of the vacant properties north of the Creekside Crossing development and adjacent vacant properties to the west to be known as The Vista at Creekside. The development proposes 43 single family lots, one (1) two family lot, 7-20 unit apartment buildings and a clubhouse.**

Jean Werbie-Harris:

As you indicated, Trustee Serpe, Items C and D will be discussed at the same time, however, separate actions are going to be required. The two items are Resolution 19-05 for an amendment to the Village's Comprehensive Plan related to an amendment to the Whittier Creek Neighborhood Plan which is north of 93rd Street and east of Old Green Bay Road. And the second is consideration of a Conceptual Plan, and these are the request of Dan Szczap of Bear Development, LLC, agent for Creekside PP, LLC. And they're the owners of the vacant properties north of the Creekside Crossing. And this area is to be known as The Vista at Creekside. The developer is proposing 43 single family lots, one two family lot and seven 20-unit apartment buildings and a clubhouse.

Specifically, the petitioner then is proposing this development. It is to be known as The Vista at Creekside which includes Tax Parcel Numbers 92-4-122-153-0070, 92-4-122-153-0080, 92-4-122-153-0090; 92-4-122-153-0092, 92-4-122-153-0727, 92-4-122-153-0728 and parcel 92-4-122-153-0729. The items are being considered for approval which include an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan which is the Whittier Creek Neighborhood Plan and a Conceptual Plan for the development.

As some background information, the Creekside Crossing condominium including 8 unit, 4 unit and 2 unit buildings and single family residential development were initially developed in several phases by Mastercraft Builders from 2005 through 2010. Portions of the development were then sold to other contractors, and units were constructed from 2010 to 2014. The original development anticipated 24 single family lots, 36 2-unit condominium buildings, 16 4-unit condominium buildings and 19 8-unit condominium buildings. All of the single family lots have since been developed and all of the condominium units with the exception of two 8-unit buildings have been built within the existing platted condominium area. The undeveloped land proposed to be developed for condominium purposes would have included a total of 158 additional condominium units. Or in this case they would have built an additional 11 8-unit buildings, 5 4-unit buildings and 25 2-unit buildings.

Due to the recession, this area had remained vacant for several years until its purchase by Creekside PP, LLC who intended to develop the vacant properties. On August 17, 2015, the Village Board conditionally approved a Conceptual Plan to develop the remaining vacant land north and west of the Creekside Subdivision and the Creekside Crossing Subdivision and the condominium development adjacent to 89th, 90th and 91st Streets, 90th Place, 62nd Avenue, and Creekside Circle. At that time they were proposing 64 single family lots and one two family lot. The developers after re-evaluation could not move forward with this single family/two family proposal due to the extreme high cost of constructing Creekside Circle and the bridge and all the public improvements, thus the plan never moved forward.

At this time a new development plan is being proposed for the remaining Creekside vacant properties which is about 58 acres and additional vacant properties, four acres on the south side of 91st Street east of Old Green Bay Road. The proposed development includes 43 single family lots, one 2 family lot and 7 20-unit apartment buildings and a clubhouse with about 31 acres of the 62 acre development site. Because of the large amount of green space and floodplain and wetland to the north and the central portion of the development there will be a large area that still remains as conservancy.

Under the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, the petitioner is requesting an amendment of a portion of the Whittier Creek Neighborhood Plan in Appendix 9-3 as a result of the development of the remainder of the Creekside Crossing development. The project now is being referred to as The Vista at Creekside. The entire Whittier Creek Neighborhood is bounded by Highway 31 or Green Bay Road on the west, 85th Street on the north, Cooper Road on the east and 93rd Street on the south. This amendment is only for a portion of the southwest corner of that neighborhood.

As a reminder, neighborhood plans which are a component of the Village's Comprehensive Plan are intended to provide the community with a means of reviewing the patterns of existing and probable future development in and around an area proposed for land development, evaluating access to the land development and the feasibility of developing certain uses, lot layouts, roadways and parkways, open green spaces and preservation areas, schools, municipal facilities and municipal services to serve a neighborhood area. Again, oftentimes neighborhoods area bout a one mile to one and a half mile square area. It's not coming down to just that particular subdivision, but it does encompass a much larger area typically bounded by public streets. The neighborhood plan sets forth a guide for future development when a willing landowner wishes to develop his land or her land.

In accordance with the Village Comprehensive Plan, the Whittier Creek Neighborhood is classified as being within a Low-Medium Density Residential land use category having lot areas that range from 12,000 to 19,000 square feet or more per dwelling unit. This range allows for some areas of the neighborhood to have larger lots while other areas to have smaller lots, and it's designed to accommodate a variety of housing types.

As land continues to be developed, the Village evaluates proposals and amendments to neighborhood plans based on other elements of the Comprehensive Plans as well. For primarily residential neighborhoods like the Whittier Creek Neighborhood, the Housing Element of the Village Comprehensive Plan is used for guidance. And, again, this Comprehensive Plan was adopted by the community in December 2009 pursuant to the State's Smart Growth Plan and initiatives at that time.

The Village's housing goal is to provide a diverse housing supply that meets the Village's future population needs. This includes homes for new residents without prejudice as well as for long-time residents whose housing requirements might have changed because of age, household growth or decline, income or disability. To meet this comprehensive planning goal several objectives are set forth in our Comprehensive Plan. I'll just go through a couple of them for you.

- Promote the provision of an adequate number of housing units and allocate sufficient land area for housing demands to accommodate current and future populations.
- To encourage a full range of housing structure types and sizes, including single-family, two-family, and multi-family in sewer service areas to provide affordable housing options for households of all income levels, ages, and special needs projected for the Village in 2035.
- Allocate sufficient land for residential development to accommodate future populations.
- To encourage new residential areas to be located in neighborhoods served by public sanitary sewer and water and contain reasonable areas for walking or biking necessary for supporting things like parks, schools and shopping. Residents should have reasonable access to employment centers, community and major shopping centers, government centers and secondary schools and higher education.
- To encourage the flexible zoning techniques to accommodate a variety of housing options. Such techniques may include, live-work units, planned unit developments known as PUDs, planned development districts known as PDDs, cluster development and conservation developments.
- To the extent practicable, residential and employment-generating land uses should be located so as to provide opportunities for living closer to work.
- Promote a range of affordable housing choices for Village residents.
- Encourage the development of life-cycle housing for Village residents.
- Promote a safe and attractive built environment within the Village.

- Residential development should be located and designed to minimize impacts to the natural resource base.
- To prevent the encroachment of incompatible land uses and minimizing adverse impacts on the environment.

The Comprehensive Plan sets forth recommendations to achieve our housing goals and objectives. Some of our recommendations include:

- To develop land use plan maps that accommodate the projected growth in population, households and employment through the design year of 2035.
- Provide sufficient housing options so all income levels in the Village can afford housing using a maximum of 30 percent of their gross household income.
- To continue to support a variety of housing types and sizes and to designate areas for single, two-family and multi-family housing and through detailed neighborhood plans.
- The Village Zoning Ordinance should continue to allow for a full range of housing types and sizes to ensure the provision of units that are affordable for households of all income levels in the Village.
- And to continue to administer and enforce the Zoning Ordinances, land division and other ordinances of the Village to implement our plan.

The proposed amendments to the Neighborhood Plan provided in the attached Plan Commission Resolution continue to support the Village's goals, objectives and recommendations to provide for a variety of affordable housing types for all residents that chose to live and work in our Village.

Under residential development in the Village, the amendments add about five acres to the residential land area in the neighborhood. Therefore approximately 350 acres of land within this particular neighborhood are proposed to be developed for residential uses.

In looking at this screen you can see that those areas that are designated in the yellow and the light brown and the dark brown those are the areas that are identified for residential purposes. Everything else in the neighborhood that is identified in light green is a conservancy area for the most part whether it's wetland or floodplain or some type of conservancy area. And the dark green areas are either woodland conservancy areas, or in this case in the south corner that's shown on this particular plan it's the Ingram Community Park that's being developed by the Village.

Within the entire neighborhood based on this amendment there is approximately 392 existing dwelling units; 258 are single family lots, and 134 are existing platted multi-family condominium units in the neighborhood as part of the Creekside Crossing Condominiums. There are also six existing multi-family condominium units on Old Green Bay Road south of Jerome Creek, and eight two-unit buildings located on Old Green Bay Road north of the Jerome Creek. There are 396 proposed dwelling units; 254 would be single family lots, one proposed duplex which is a 2-

unit, and 140 proposed multi-family rental units. This would be 7 20-unit apartment buildings, and this would provide for affordable workforce housing for those employed within the Village.

In accordance with the Village's Comprehensive Plan, the overall net density for the neighborhood is recommended to be within that Lower-Medium Density Residential land use category with the average lot area, again, between 12,000 and 18,999 square feet per dwelling unit. The variety of housing types and the sizing within this neighborhood provides a net density of 19,348 square feet per dwelling unit. So the net density with the amendment falls outside the higher range of the density. So the overall density is lower than what is required by our Comprehensive Plan.

Population projections for the neighborhood, the vacant portions of this neighborhood will not develop until the property owners wish to develop their land which makes neighborhood planning essential for the orderly growth of the community, and establishes a framework as to how development should occur, if and when it does occur. The neighborhood plan is a guide for property owners and developers; therefore, the population will increase on a very incremental basis as the neighborhood develops over time.

Population calculations at this time are based on numbers from the 2010 census information for the Village. In the Village the average number of persons per household is 2.71, and school age children between the ages of 5 and 19 make up about 22.6 percent of the population. The Village provides copies of these developments to the KUSD to assist in their long-range planning, and this is with every residential development in the Village. Pursuant to the information provided by the KUSD to the Village, 42 percent of the new dwelling units will have new students that will attend public schools.

Again, we've got quite a few single family homes that are being proposed as part of this development, and that is where a large part of the new population for students will be coming from. Current population within the neighborhood based on the current 392 dwelling units, and approximately 240 school age children with 164 children attending public school could expect to come from the development with respect to the current population. Projected population at 788 dwelling units there's a potential of 483 school age children with 331 children attending public school. Again, we've been doing this now for about 30 years, and it has really come to prove to be true with respect to the percentage of children. And, again, because the growth has been incremental it's not like a big hit at one time with respect to the growth of students within the district.

The Vista at Creekside Conceptual Plan, the petitioner is requesting approval of a Conceptual Plan for The Vista at Creekside development which would include 43 single family lots which is primarily in the north central part of the development, one two family lot which is in the very northeast corner which Peggy is going to be identifying with red or yellow, with red. And then there will be 7 20-unit apartment buildings, five of which are located in the Creekside development that we have been talking about that pre-existed. And then two of them will be outside adjacent to 91st Street closer to Old Green Bay Road. In addition, there will be a clubhouse that you would pass as you enter off of Old Green Bay Road on 91st Street into the development. In addition, 31 acres of the 61 acres of the development site will remain as open space.

For the single family lots, the 43 single family lots range in size from 12,721 square feet to 25,694 square feet per lot. The average lot size is greater than a third of an acre. It's at 16,475 square feet. All lots would be a minimum of 12,500, they'll have a minimum of 80 feet of frontage which could be reduced on a cul-de-sac or curve. All lots will have the minimum depth of 125 feet. A majority of the lots for single family abut up to open space, retention basins, wetlands or floodplains. It's proposed that the homes will range from about \$400,000 to \$525,000 and would be comparable to the Arbor Ridge Subdivision that's currently under construction by the petitioner in Prairie Ridge. That new development is just south of the Froedtert South main hospital which is adjacent to apartment buildings and senior apartment buildings.

The two family lot, the petitioner is proposing to create one additional two family lot, and that would be as Peggy noted and as shown in white, one two family lot that would be right at the end of where the other existing two family condominiums are located. This duplex will include two ranch-style units that are similar to the existing adjacent two unit buildings.

With respect to the multi-family buildings, again, this Conceptual Plan provides for two different apartment building areas with a clubhouse for a total of 140 units. Each of the apartment buildings provides for 8 units on the first floor and 12 units on the second floor, and they will range in size from 713 square feet which is one bedroom to 1,325 square feet with 8 units in each building having an attached garage.

All units are considered condominium-style in that all units will have individual entries, no common hallways. They'll have their entries from the exterior of the building, no shared entrances. Revised elevations have been submitted and are attached in your packets, and Peggy is showing them up on the front that show a variety of building materials but primarily stone, brick and Hardie Board with a variety of grey and blue tone colors. When the developer makes his presentation he will have the materials and other documents to show you.

Each building provides a variety of options including one bedroom with one bath, there will be 11 of those, one two bedroom with one bath, six two bedroom two bath, and two three bedroom with two bath options. So, again, there's a lot of different options and varieties of unit sizes within the building. The entire multi-family development will include 77 one bedroom units, 49 two bedroom units and 14 three bedroom units. The rents, again, go from the one bedrooms will range from \$700 to \$970, the two bedrooms between \$840 to \$1,175, and the three bedrooms between \$970 and \$1,425.

Pursuant to the applicant, these rental rates are in-line with market rate rents. The petitioner has submitted and has successfully received an award of Housing Tax Credits to fund a portion of the development for Workforce Housing. There are many types of tax credits used to construct a variety of housing types. The Housing Tax Credits awarded to this project are not for low income housing. These are for Workforce Housing, and there is a difference. Low income housing typically serves area median incomes at or about the 30 percent area median income. The housing development being proposed is not low income. It is income restricted as Workforce Housing that provides for rental rates that are very similar to the current market rate area rents.

Workforce Housing is designed for active individuals and families with working parents or single working professionals. These units are dedicated to those not typically understood to be the

targets of affordable housing. The Workforce Housing requirements mandate a maximum rental rate as well as the maximum income of residents so that they can pay the rent. All tenants must have at a minimum three-times their total monthly rent in income to qualify for any unit within any of the proposed development areas. Therefore, if you are in a \$700 one bedroom unit, the tenant must have a monthly income of at least \$2,100, but that does not include their utilities. They still have to be able to afford gas and electric utilities and cable that are not included in the rent.

The goal of these units is to offer efficient and sustainable housing solutions that enable individuals in moderate income vocations and emerging professionals such as police officers, firefighters, teachers, health professionals, and service workers to live in the communities that they work in.

As a result of a neighborhood meeting the developer had with the property owners in November with the existing residents within the Creekside development, they acquired additional land to the west and moved a total of 40 apartments to the west, and they added the clubhouse at that area as well in order to provide a main entrance for the development. The new main entrance to the development will be from Old Green Bay Road and 91st Street. At this entrance there is a clubhouse with 28 parking spaces. The clubhouse will have a leasing and management office, community gathering space and an exercise room.

Adjacent to the club house on the south side of 91st Street it will be two 20-unit buildings with eight attached garages in each building, and also a detached garage with an additional 28 garage spaces and a total of eight surface parking spaces. Further east on the north side of Creekside Circle there will be five 20-unit buildings with eight attached garages in each building and three detached garage buildings with 24 garage spaces.

And then there will be some additional surface parking. The parking space calculations by ordinance don't necessarily count a parking space behind each of the attached garages. So there is additional parking behind each of the attached garages as well. And in reality that allows for additional parking. The Village requires that there will be a minimum of one enclosed space per unit to be provided, and that is what they've shown.

Population projections, again, based on the 2010 Census information for the Village the average number of persons per household is 2.71 and school age children between the ages of 5 and 19 make up 22.6 percent of the population. So within this development with their proposal with 43 single family lots and the one two unit and then the 140 units there will be a total of 185 dwelling units. It's projected that 502 persons will be added to the population upon full buildout of the development, and 77 school age children are likely to come from this development at full buildout.

With respect to the floodplain boundary adjustment, again, this takes us back. On October 20, 2003, originally the Village Board adopted Resolution #03-42 to approve the Floodplain Boundary Adjustment for the Creekside development. In January 2005, the developer of Creekside Crossing obtained all the required permits from FEMA to begin the floodplain adjustment work. The floodplain boundary adjustment work had begun in this area and done in the area that's already developed, but it had not been completed for the entire project for the area

to the north. FEMA approval is still valid and will be completed by the petitioner as originally designed and approved by the Village, DNR and FEMA.

With respect to wetlands, the wetlands shown within the outlots will remain undisturbed and protected during construction. Two small wetland areas totaling 9,321.84 square feet are proposed to be filled within Creekside Circle and 91st Street to finish those public improvements. Fill permits will be required to be obtained by the DNR and the Corps prior to approval of the Final Plat. A portion of Wetland 5 is located within a future right-of-way that will be dedicated but not constructed, and that's at the very northeast corner of the development site. In the future if adjacent property owners want to develop that area to the north or east, those developers will be required to obtain fill permits from the DNR and the Corps to extend the public improvements.

So site access, the primary access for The Vista development will be from Old Green Bay Road at 91st Street; however, Creekside Circle will be completed, the bridge will be completed, the roadway pavement and the infrastructure, and that will connect to 93rd Street at 63rd and 66th Avenues as originally proposed. 91st Street via Old Green Bay Road will be its primary building construction access and haul road access for the primary development of the subdivision infrastructure in the residential development. Temporary no construction access signs will be required at the entrance of 93rd Street during the development of the construction of the primary public improvements as well as the construction.

However, in the next few months the developer is requesting approval to allow approximately 9,000 -- in the next few months the developer is requesting approval to allow for approximately 9,500 cubic yards of clay fill material from a nearby residential site be hauled into the development site and placed in the northeast portion of the site to provide for additional fill material needed for the development because of the analysis and the balancing of the site. If this approved the Village Public Works Department would closely monitor the activities and any damage to roadways would be the responsibility of Bear Development.

The developer has explored several ways to get the material that will be available shortly using the future 91st Street from Old Green Bay Road, but the path from Old Green Bay Road to the site's low area would require a permit from the DNR, and would require the immediate installation of stone. The developer would request that this come from the south as opposed from 91st, but that will be for further discussion by the Plan Commission and the Board.

With respect to public improvements, all 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, sanitary sewer, water and storm sewer. Specifically, municipal roadways, public roadways shall be extended throughout the development pursuant to the new development standard which means that these will be concrete roads.

Sidewalks and pedestrian ways, public sidewalks shall be extended on Creekside Circle, 90th Street, 62nd Avenue and 91st Street, and private pedestrian paths connecting public sidewalks on 62nd Avenue and Creekside Circle will be provided as shown on the attached drawings and as shown on the slide at this time. The sidewalks and pedestrian pathways will be installed by the developer at the developer's cost and will not be assessed to the existing property owners or condominium association. However, once the sidewalks are installed, sidewalk maintenance and snow removal on the sidewalks would be the responsibility of the abutting land owners.

Municipal water and sanitary sewer, municipal water will need to be extended throughout the development and shall connect to the existing municipal water in Creekside Crossing and extended in 91st Street to Old Green Bay Road. Sanitary sewer will need to be extended from the existing sewer mains in the Creekside Crossing development to service the entire remaining balance of the development site.

Zoning Map and Text Amendments will be required. The development site will need to be rezoned as follows: The single family lots would need to be rezoned into the R-4, Urban Single Family Residential District; the two family lots will need to be rezoned into the R-8, Two Family District; and the lots with the apartment buildings and clubhouse would need to be rezoned into the R-11, Multi-Family Residential District. Wetland areas will be placed into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District. Outlots would be placed into the PR-1, Neighborhood Park and Recreational District. And any floodplains would be placed into the FPO District.

The entire development would be in a Planned Unit Development Overlay. The PUD would allow for some dimensional flexibility provided that there's defined community benefit. Some of the PUD variations would include to allow for more than one multi-family building per parcel, to provide for minimum lot sizes of 12,500 square feet and 80 feet of frontage for the single family lots as long as they all average at least 15,000 square feet; to provide for a minimum lot size of 17,500 for the two family lot.

Part of the community benefit is the requirement that all of the apartment buildings would be provided with residential sprinkler systems; that sidewalk interconnections would be placed in the right-of-way extending to the existing par on the south side of the Creekside development. They would be adding some additional park equipment in the public park. They are providing enhanced architectural details for the building and additional landscaping as well as additional plantings in the development areas. And, in addition, the multi-family areas will be required to be equipped with the DSIS system, so that is that Digital Security Imaging System that as you know we require in many other areas of the Village. And the DSIS agreement will require that those cameras are live fed back to the PD.

So with that that's the staff's presentation at this point for the Creekside Conceptual Plan and the Comprehensive Plan for the Neighborhood Plan Amendment. The developer is here and would like to present some additional details, building materials, and I'm sure they'd be happy to answer some additional questions as well as the staff.

S.R. Mills:

Thank you. S.R. Mills, 4011 80th Street, Kenosha, Wisconsin. I appreciate the time and the detail that staff has gone into the proposal here and all the specifics. I certainly won't look to reiterate all of those, but I will try and piece out a few of the highlights, a few of the concerns that we heard to date and provide some commentary and some thoughts as to how we're attempting to address them and ensure that it's a win-win economically for the community and for the neighborhood.

As mentioned, the 58 acre site previously Mastercraft and a condominium development there, approximately 172 units, it's 58 acres in total. We acquired it about six years from a lender and

we went back. It's a very tough site to develop. Part of the reason for that is it was mid-construction so we weren't entirely sure what went into the ground, what didn't go into the ground as far as pipe, grading. So it required quite a bit of detail and study to continue to make sense of it to ensure that it could be rectified and we didn't have a lot of pipe in the ground that was going to go to waste.

Anytime we look at a development we always break it down to a few basic principles. One, it has to be economically viable. We don't want a similar situation that something is left mid-construction, that it's an issue and problems for everybody later on. It was also very important for us to try and figure out a way to complete Creekside Circle and 91st Street going out to Old Green Bay Road. Life, safety issues, just the neighborhood, felt that would make the most sense for everybody. And also completing the neighborhood from the standpoint of just being aesthetic, to have something that undone going on for decades, wanted to have it completed and, again, have it at an appropriate scale and design for the area.

Forty three single family lots, one two family and 140 multi-family units comprised of 7 20-unit buildings. As mentioned the multi-family is direct access meaning that it's condominium style. Everybody has a front door. You don't go into a common corridor hallway with an elevator. We found that this is desirable. Overall our vacancy rates are less than two percent with the product that we've constructed and operate so we've seen the market respond to that. We think it's something that will stand the test of time from the standpoint that it's somebody's home. It feels more like a traditional home, condominium that you have your front door, you have your own porch area, and you have that sense of space that this affords you.

Also talking about the material, cement board siding, stone, brick, high quality building. I think it would look great. As we continue to build and to develop we try and make it better every time. And we certainly learn something at each development and each building we build. So we like to think this is the culmination of a handful of experiences we've had and think it will be a product that will not only look great in the neighborhood and blend different styles. But from a color standpoint and the palette we think it will also have a great neighborhood feel with the sidewalks. I think, again, it will be a real positive overall.

Total development cost on the multi-family alone would be about \$29 million. Large development. From a parking standpoint that's something that we're very hyper concerned over. We can't create parking problems for our tenants or our communities. So I think we're over parked here. I don't think that's necessarily a bad thing. In trying to balance the density issues with the amount of space that we have, to try and find that balance we're almost 2.4 parking stalls per unit. That does include an area behind the garage. But we feel that most communities that we look at we try to use the two ratio so we want to always have two parking stalls per unit. So this exceeds that, so we feel good about that that we won't have pinch points and have problems when it comes to parking.

The 43 single family lots, Arbor Ridge is a great comp because it's something that we recently worked on. Converted a multi-family to 45 single family units, a multi-family site to 45 single family units. Currently we have about half of them sold. We have 12 contracts out there right now. From a construction standpoint average \$450,000 to \$475,000. I envision that this site will continue to see escalations in the costs and the prices here with the assessed valuations and what

the end product will be. So I think the assumption between \$400,000 and \$550,000 is pretty spot on.

In the two family, the two family up in the northeast corner up there it's really to stay in line with the balance of the two family so we didn't feel it was appropriate to put a single family home back on that site, but keeping with that same two family so from an aesthetic standpoint it would be very similar to what we have on the east and the west side of that street.

Always appreciate the dialogue with elected officials, staff, neighborhood. We had a neighborhood meeting and we learned a lot. We always think that these projects are better after going through that. And while sometimes there's a lot of back and forth, but it really does make it better. We're never so presumptuous to think that we have all the best ideas and the way we want to do is the best way. We learned a lot during that meeting. It was few months ago at the RecPlex. Based on some of that information we did make some pretty significant changes.

We switched around placement of the multi-family with the single family, the community room, the clubhouse, clubhouse which Jean mentioned is the fitness area, the community room, full-time management office, kitchen area will be located off of Old Green Bay Road. It will be a positive. And it also pushes some of the density further to Green Bay Road as we heard some of the traffic concerns and issues that not wanting traffic to go back through to the southeast which I can appreciate. Trying to push that further to the northwest seems to make some sense, and I think it continues to hopefully alleviate many of the concerns here.

Some of the other concerns we heard was the density. I think it is important to remember what was there, too. This was a fully platted multi-family development from 172 units. We acquired an additional four acres to the west. So if you look just by the circumference of the map with what we have we're actually proposing less density with single family on this 58 acres. Again, it's maybe not what everybody wants, but it is something that we think is economically viable and it's doable, and we can get it done and it will be great once it's all completed.

Some of the other feedback that we've heard is the rental rates and the Workforce Housing. So I want to address that head on and what that really means and what it doesn't mean. Because there can be a lot of fear and a lot of unknown with that so we try and be as direct as we can at what it really is. So we received Workforce Housing credits. What those credits do is they allow us to build a \$29 development that we never could before because you just couldn't afford to do it. With the rental rates the way that they are we could never build something that looks this great, that has the kind of site work, cost and infrastructure without getting those credits.

What those credits do is they mandate that we keep rents at a reasonable level. We cannot increase them five percent per year, ten percent per year. We have to keep them within these tolerances. Now, those tolerances today are \$700 to \$970 for a one bedroom, \$840 to \$1,175 for a two, and \$970 to \$1,425 for a three. As Jean mentioned that's not low income here. Everybody has to have a lawful source of income that we have to -- our tenants they have to pay the rent, they have to make sure they're there. We will only have great citizens. We have significant background checks, and everybody has to be great or we're quick to evict when we have bad situations because we have to -- we have a very big vested interested here.

Who will live here are people who make between \$22,000 to \$25,000 a year and \$70,000 a year. And it's people of all different spots in their life from people that are out of high school and college and first and second jobs in their 20s to young families starting off to retirees. And we've seen this in a lot of the developments that we do, it's a broad spectrum. And in reality the rental rates here are not that different from the market rate. There's maybe some small fluctuations, but it's pretty spot on with what we see.

So this is not -- the Workforce piece of it should not be scary. It is comparable to market rate developments that are done in Pleasant Prairie and throughout southeastern Wisconsin. And it's something that we're locals, we're not going anywhere, it's something that we stand by and we're going to ensure it's a great product. Part of that, too, is we have 43 single family lots that we need to sell for about an average about \$110,000 a lot, \$450,000 to \$525,000 which is that total value of that single family product at the end of the day right across the street. So we very much have a vested interest to ensure it's great, and we would not cut off our nose here to spite our face with this product. And we're very confident that it will high quality, and it will be something that we can all be proud of at the end of the day.

Again, some of the feedback that we heard at the meeting and throughout the process here is that it's going to be impossible to sell single family lots across from the multi-family. Again, we just don't believe that to be true. A great example is Arbor Ridge where we actually have a four story development, a final development that's a rental product. We weren't involved in it, but we made the commitment after that product was up to create 45 single family lots just to the southwest of it. And happy to report that the sales are doing well and the neighborhood is looking more and more complete every day. So, again, I'm here to answer any questions you might have and I appreciate the time. Thank you.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you, S.R. Jean, do you have anything else? Before I open it up to public comments I think what we'll do is ask staff to kind of jot down the concerns and questions that the public may have. And at the end we'll address those rather than address each one as each person comes up. So with that, again, we'll need your name and address. And please speak into the microphone so everybody can hear your comments. This is a public hearing. Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? Yes, ma'am?

Karen Denhartog:

Good evening, I'm Karen Denhartog at 9203 62nd Court in Creekside Crossing Subdivision. First I'd like to say thank you for the time to give us a chance to be heard. I also want to thank the developers. We do recognize some really positive changes you've made in your plans. I particularly like the movement of the clubhouse to the west of the property. I think that's very positive. The sidewalks is a nice touch, but I'm not clear on what our ultimate responsibility will be as far as those new sidewalks right across from the single family homes. I live in the first cul-de-sac just to the south of the property right across from the park that is currently existing as a tot lot.

One of my concerns that I want to bring up is the original plan for development of the community was another park in the northern section of the property, and that's no longer there. But we have

the addition of more than double of the homes and people that are going to be living in this community without the additional park space for the kids and the community members. So I'm wondering if there's any plan to reintroduce a park in this particular community.

I also want to oppose the use of the main entrance to our community for any movement of the fill clay that is intended to start the build. Because I live in that first cul-de-sac on the corner every headlight that comes in our community hits our front window. And I read earlier on the planning that it can be up to about 30 truck loads a day which is I think quite excessive for an existing community. We also have a lot of children in our community, and I'm really concerned about that extra traffic affecting their ability to cross the street to go to the park.

Currently the Creekside Crossing street that we live on there are some concerns with the traffic. We've had quite a number of cars over the years that speed down that side right past our houses. It's a long straight shot. I'm concerned with the additional residential housing that's going in there that's going to increase the traffic flow, and I'm very concerned about that. I did see on the planning also that there's a road intended in the future to the northeast part of the property that's going to meet up with Cooper Road eventually. And I would like to know when that's going to happen. That's all I have. Thank you.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you. Anybody else? Anybody else? Yes, sir?

Bill Demo:

Bill Demo, 9285 66th Avenue. I'm also President of the Creekside Crossing Condo Association. So clearly we're concerned about long-term value of our property. Most of us have been homeowners before the big dip in 2008, and we finally realized a positive increase in the value of our property. And I understand from a density point of view they don't seem to be increasing it or they have less density with the population with the new design and the original plans for the Creekside Crossing.

Michael Serpe:

We're not picking up every word you say.

Bill Demo:

So I need to look at you? Okay.

Michael Serpe:

Bill, get as close to the microphone as you can. There you go, that will work, too.

Bill Demo:

I typically don't have a hard time being heard. Density, I know that they've made adjustments to the way that they've developed these buildings. But originally we have 19 buildings that are on

the south side of the circle, and that 19 buildings would have been mirrored with further construction had the Creekside Crossing plan been executed. So they've really taken these, and they've packed them into the corner. The other thing that they've done is they've moved a lot of the buildings into that far northeast corner which now really is concentrated to the ten buildings that we have in the back side. We have the maintenance responsibility for that pond in the northeast corner and the two other ponds in the development. So I'm concerned about any additional burden financially that might be incurred now that we have those buildings there.

We presently don't have sidewalks in the neighborhood. We're opposed to the sidewalks. All that additional sidewalks once it was turned over to the owners would now be an additional financial impact on the 114 homeowners that we have inside the association. That's a shared responsibility now to take care of snow removal. I had a question on the DSIS. What is that specifically? Digital --

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So about 12 years ago the Village decided to come up with an activity or procedure of installing Digital Security Imaging System, camera systems if you will, cameras on light posts, buildings, so on and so forth. So many, many of the commercial buildings as well as the multi-family buildings, anything built since about 2007 is required to have live cameras placed on areas throughout the site with images live back through web connections back to the PD.

And so at any point in time if there's an incident, an accident, if there is information needed because of an investigation, the individual company or in this case Bear Development will need to archive video for up to 30 days through a secured DVR system so that the PD can get access to that in order to do further investigation. You probably don't realize it, but there's literally thousands of cameras throughout the Village that are helping our PD as well as our fire department before they get to an incident or accident or to investigate.

Bill Demo:

That's good to know.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And not many people know that, but it has been invaluable for our department.

Bill Demo:

It's come up in every conversation and every project up to this point so I just wanted to make sure I understood that. I have questions for Bear. Are they the leasing agent going forward?

Michael Serpe:

They'll answer those after.

Bill Demo:

All right, another question I have is we're saying \$700 is now the low end of the rent. Can that be lowered if there's any particular case that anybody chose a need so that now we're down to a lower income threshold? And at the 30 percent level that \$700 has an annual income of about \$25,000 which would be low for the Village and where we're at. We're also concerned that there's not this type of development in the whole south end of the Village. I mean I don't know of any other examples of this that exist south of 85th Street coming down to the south or east to the lake. So it would seem that we're forcing in this unusual concept for this rounding neighborhood into this area. I understand the financial end for Bear and what they're trying to do. I just don't see where it meshes with the rest of the things that have been built and done at that end of the Village.

So I'm assuming that the additional buildings don't result in any additional cost to the taxpayers for fire protection, police protection. That's all accounted for and doesn't put an additional burden on those resources. That would be a question for later. I think that's all I have.

Michael Serpe:

Thank, Bill. Anybody else? Yes, ma'am?

Tish Tippet:

Hi, I'm Tish Tippet, and I live on 62nd Avenue, 8966. I am one of the two unit condos, the ranch styled. It's a 2,900 square foot ranch. In reality it's just split with one wall so there's two units. We have a large lot. We have a really large lot. But when I purchased here, when you pull into the main entrance you got a T, you have to go left or right. If you look on there you'll see that to the west are two story, four-unit, eight-unit condo buildings. And if you go to the right on the circle those are all homes. We're a two unit condo, but yet in reality we're really a large house.

So the subdivision is split. You have two units, two story and then you have homes. When I bought the developer Mastercraft assured me that along that pond because my backyard is with that pond there were going to be additional units just like what I have there. And their main [inaudible] would be homeowners single family. So I was really shocked when we went to the meeting at RecPlex to find out what they proposed originally, his proposal is to have 80 apartments right behind us. And now at that meeting I suggested first off we're all homeowners, why are we bringing rentals into our subdivision?

So then when they went on and talked some more and I said, okay, instead of putting these 80 apartments by us why aren't they all going on the west section where you have the two story multiple condos? And that road they're putting into 91st why didn't they put them all over there? Why don't they have houses down where they want to put the 80 which now turns into 100? We now have 100 apartments they want to put behind us. How many garage buildings with how many parking spots? And I really wonder if Bear intends to when they sell these lots off are they going to sell it without letting the people know these apartments they plan on putting into the subdivision.

Lastly, I guess my frustration is between my neighbor Bob who lives on the other side in the unit with me. Between him and I we have a large lot, a large home in reality, and we pay over \$8,000 in property taxes. I think that Bear when they said they wanted to put the houses more toward where the other houses were they were trying to show respect to those homeowners. I think we deserve just as much respect as those homeowners because in reality we are one large house. So my request is that they build them all into the west section if we have to have these apartments which I still think is just ridiculous. I don't think the Village would do this to -- I know this is an exaggeration, but Meadowdale Estates I don't think you'd ever put something like this in their subdivision, let alone I don't think those people would let you, they'd sue you. So I am totally opposed to this proposal.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you. Anybody else wishing to speak? Yes, sir?

Bob Hannes:

Yes, my name is Bob Hannes. I live at 8980 62nd Avenue. When I get up in the morning I can look out my window, it's beautiful. I got the pond behind me. Now I get up and I'm going to have to look at five 20-unit apartment buildings. I don't think that's a good idea. If they can't make money without them 20-unit apartment buildings they shouldn't have bought that land to develop. I didn't buy that place I live in now to look at 20-unit apartment buildings.

Another thing I don't understand is why do you want to put sidewalks in by us? Nobody is going to use them. All you're going to do is drive up our association fee to shovel. But that's a bad plan. We asked them at the meeting if they could take then apartment buildings, them 20 units and move them west to Green Bay Road. And at the time there was only four of them. So now they come back and they added another one and they didn't move them. I mean you people think it's a good idea but I don't. Thank you.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you.

Ken Harju:

My name is Ken Harju. I live at 9249 64th Court, Unit 162. Thanks for talking to me today and I'm going to take some time. We're going to go over a little history about Bear Development in a minute. I've been there about three years now. When I was going to purchase my condo I came to your window in the south end of this building, I said what's going to happen to me? They said don't worry, Ken, you're going to have comparable housing there. Thanks a lot, and I made an offer on my house. I had about ten hours to do that because it was a hot property at the time. I don't think it's going to be too hot any longer.

Like Bill said many of my neighbors, especially the older folk that live on the first floors have barely made it above water in the last year, and this is what they get to hear about when they finally break even, subsidized housing. We can call it whatever you want to call it, it's subsidized housing. I'll get to that in a little while, though.

Let's go to a little history lesson, Bear Development. There's seven property numbers in this development they purchased. The first two are on that west side where their one garage is, just to the right of that, one of them was .31 acres, one of them was 2.5 acres, a total of 2.88 acres they bought for \$50,000. That's shrewd. I admire shrewd. I wish I were shrewd with all my stocks. Shrewd is a good thing. That's from the transfer deed number 1827977 on the Kenosha County site just so you know where I'm getting my information.

The other five PIN numbers which are all listed here, a total of 59.14 acres they bought for a half million dollars. Another shrewd investment. At that time they knew what was zoned there. It was zoned R-8 and R-10 and R-4. Right now where they have all the five unit apartment buildings is R-8. That's supposed to be all two unit multi, two unit buildings just like the other side of the pond. That's what you're supposed to be looking at.

The middle circle is all zoned R-10 and R-8 which would be eight units and four units which is on the south end. Where the yellow buildings are on Old Green Bay Road is R-4, single family. So Bear knows all this when they buy it. I take a risk when I buy my condo not knowing what's there. Now they come and say, well, we can't be viable. You can't be viable? You only spent \$9,000 an acre, folks, \$9,000 an acre. And Mr. Mills is crying poor? Please. So, anyway, this is ridiculous.

Next, how can it be viable? The home lots at Arbor Vista let's say average \$85,000 a lot. That's pretty close, right, \$85,000. Let's say it takes \$30,000 to improve the lot. So at 40 lots we'll take off three of them for the map times \$30,000 that's \$1.2 million it's going to cost them to put the lots in, \$5,000 purchase price, \$1.7 million. Wow, big outlay, correct? Average price for the 40 house \$485,000, right in their range. We'll take off the \$85,000 per lot so now they get \$400,000 per house. The average profit by the general contractor in the house countrywide 25 percent so they make \$100,000 per house times 40 is \$4 million, \$4 million. Plus the \$50,000 they're making per lot above their cost. So we're about at four and a half million dollars profit before we even start looking at the apartments.

Then let's read from the November *Kenosha Newspaper*, this is in the legal sections, sorry about my fumbling around here, I'm a little nervous, I have copies for you when you want them, they went before the Wisconsin Housing Authority and petitioned for, as I'm going to read this, an amount not to exceed \$225 million to acquire, construct and rehabilitate for low and moderate housing. It doesn't say anything about living wage in this legal notice. For the Creekside Crossing 140 unit multi-family rental housing they acquired \$24,498,000.

Now, when I look at this I see the 1960s, I see the 1970s, I see the 1980s, dense cluster of subsidized housing. Where has that worked? Nowhere. In fact, everywhere from Milwaukee, Waukegan, Zion, Chicago they're all trying to figure out what to do. Many communities have knocked them down. So it's all brand new and nice today, but what about 25 years from now when we have subsidized housing in a dense cluster. This is the antiquated approach to our housing issue.

Let me read what Item 2 is when Bear Development went to the Wisconsin Housing Authority December 6th, 120-unit multi-family rental housing development in and around Milwaukee. And it lists nine different addresses, 100th Road, Mill Road, Milwaukee, Kenosha 101st Street, Martin

Luther King Drive, sprinkled out in the community. That's the new model. It isn't a dense cluster. So the Village really needs to look at how do we want to approach this concept.

Now, you're sitting there going how can you vote against affordable housing? It's going to look bad in the paper tomorrow. But why do we want to backwards? Why do we want to be antiquated? The Village is better than this. You professionals are great. They've helped me a lot when I've come to your window. We don't want to go this route. This is going to lead somewhere where we don't need to be. So please why don't we form a committee just like we're doing for downtown and study this problem and figure out which is correct. Like Bill said where else do we have it? We shouldn't develop policy based on a developer's wish.

Now, there's two other developments that have been approved within two miles of here that prove condominiums can be built and be profitable. The Cottages of Village Green, the Kent [phonetic] Development putting up beautiful condominiums, one and two units, they're viable, they're profitable. At your last meeting you approved the Harpe Development right at 165 and Old Green Bay Road for 46 condominium units, two and three units. That's viable. By the way, Harpe on the original plan when they bought the land it was supposed to be for 66 units, they even dropped it down to 46 and they're going to make a profit. We welcome that.

So I don't know what we can do but this isn't the way to go. There's one other Bear Development in the city that we haven't talked about. It's where Springbrook Road turns into 22nd Ave. And they came before the Village Board and Plan Commission last year and say, hey, we need senior housing, we need senior housing. And we need senior housing. But you know what, we've got to put a bunch of condos right next to them because or else it isn't going to work. Has anybody turned down Springbrook Road and turned the corner? How does that work, buys, how does it look? That's how we're going to shoehorn these things in here, and we're going to be done with it and say the same thing. What did we do here? Why did we do it?

We even questioned at the Village Board meeting last year does it really need a fourth floor on that building? And, of course, it did. We have to make money. So I appreciate your time but this is unacceptable. And we have a Master Plan, and I heard all about it. I didn't realize there was a 100 page pdf that I needed to study before I came tonight. That just hit the internet a couple days ago. Thanks whoever sent it to me. I didn't have time to study it or else we'd be here all night, folks. But if you vote yes on this you're voting against all these residents who took the risk to live here. It's a great community, don't ruin it. Thank you.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you. Anybody else wishing to speak?

Scott Hightower:

Scott Hightower, 9099 62nd Avenue. Just a question of what gets built first, if it's the apartment and then we sit on empty lots like we have in the past. Or if we're actually putting up homes and then the apartments get built. Definitely afraid if this gets approved the apartments will get built first. Of course, you get the credits and we'll sit on a half finished subdivision just with apartments that are what's earning [inaudible].

Michael Serpe:

Thank you. Anybody else wishing to speak?

Elaine Harju:

I'm Elaine Harju. I live at 9249 64th Court. And I have a letter here that on behalf of Ronald and Elsie Hale who couldn't be here tonight, so they asked if I could read this letter. This is to the Village of Pleasant Prairie regarding their Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Conceptual Plan for Whittier Creek and Creekside Crossing. I would like to address the issue above. Having recently received the correspondence dated December 28, 2018 from the Community Development Director regarding the upcoming meetings, I realized I would not be available to attend the meetings. However, I believe my comments should be presented.

First let me state that my wife and I love Pleasant Prairie and the Creekside Crossing community. When we began to look in the area in preparation of my retiring from federal service we happened upon this gem in Southeastern Wisconsin. Our son lives in the Kenosha area, however we had never been in Pleasant Prairie prior to 2011 when searching areas to build. Creekside Crossing was the community we really desired once we drove through the area. It's well maintained, tranquil and family friendly. The smokestack from the We Energy plant didn't even bother us. After doing some research and contacting the association point of contact we made the decision to build. The decision was based on the size of the community, the proposed growth as the housing market was rebounding, and the current development plan. One key factor was the nice condominium community at the entrance to the community and the ranch-style condos along 67th Avenue.

When I heard of Bear purchasing the vacant lots I spoke with one of their representatives. I was told it would be a few years before they started building due to some challenges they had to resolve with the Village. But the plan was to continue to build primarily single family homes as the plan was changed and approved in late 2015 with the change to add one two-family unit at the corner of 67th Avenue and 90th Street.

Now to be informed during the meeting at the RecPlex that Bear wants to make further changes is alarming, and to learn the change now is proposed to be primarily multi-family and income restrictions is defeating. I've already discussed relocating due to what I perceive the downward spiral of Creekside Crossing if the plan is approved. I for one as a current resident don't appreciate an attempt to change the plan now and apparently for financial gain by Bear. I question the entire process as they have been awarded \$1.03 million tax credits from WHEDA for low income housing.

But as I researched that process those credits are awarded after the developer agrees to make a large portion of the units low income. How can Bear agree to that when they haven't proposed and gained approval from the Village unless they are confident it will pass through without delay or challenge? That's alarming and speaks volumes. That aside, personally I don't want the tranquility of the community disrupted by 140 apartments, the increased traffic and associated risk to children and the potential for decreased property values due to low income and income restricted housing. I have many reservations to this proposal despite the assurances from Bear representatives that this will work.

In addition, they stated that other similar projects were working. One such area near St. Catherine's is a very different setting. While there may be similarities to what is proposed, the location, openness of the terrain, road layout, proximity to shopping, hospital and dining make that location better suited. Creekside Crossing is a closed loop community. I realize the proposed plan is to build an entrance road off of Old Green Bay Road. And as stated during the meeting at RecPlex, this new road and its significant expense is one of the reasons for changing the concept. The apartments and the WHEDA credits make it more lucrative to Bear. However, the current residents are the ones facing all the risks.

Therefore, I am vehemently opposed to any change from the existing plan. I sincerely hope that all Village representative stake the input from the residents into consideration. I know that opposition was voiced at the RecPlex and within the community since receiving the meeting notice referenced above. Respectfully, Ronald Hale.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you. Anybody else? Yes, ma'am.

Ellen Synder:

Bill, can you hear me? I'm Ellen Snyder. I live at 9284 66th Avenue, Creekside Condominiums. My husband and I bought a condo and moved in in 2015. We had looked at several locations in Illinois, and we always felt they were all too crowded, too crowded we kept saying. And then we discovered kind of by chance Creekside Condominiums. And the minute we drove in there they were spread out. When we sit on our porch we can't see anybody else on their porch because the plan is so excellent, and the way the buildings are located on the property it's private. And we love it there. We love it there.

So when I saw the proposal and I saw the proposed 140 units I've got to tell you I was pretty sick to my stomach. Because to me that is a lot of people in an area. And I know that you don't live there but we live here, and we moved there because we loved the openness and we love the privacy. And we love living in a Pleasant Prairie. And so I don't know what else we can say. I don't how better to say it than what Bill has said and Ken has said and Elaine and all these people. And I have nothing against you personally, but this is where we live. This is our money that we've spent, that we invested in a piece of property in a gorgeous location.

So I am pleading, begging that you would reconsider. Is there a way to make the numbers less? Do we have to have 140 units that are subsidized? Do we have to have that many units in a small area? I guess that's my challenge to you when you go to vote. Think about us. We live there. This is our hard earned money. That's all I can say. Thank you for listening.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you. Yes, ma'am?

Rita Hagen:

Hello, my name is Rita Hagen. My husband Todd and I live at 9228 66th Avenue. We're fairly new to Creekside Crossing. And we did our research as well. We've owned a home for over 34 years in the City of Kenosha. And we downsized and wanted to move into Pleasant Prairie. We love the community. And it would be wrong if I said you don't realize that Pleasant Prairie is a place of growth. You see it, I've seen it all the years I've lived in the city. So you know that your neighborhood is going to change. You just know that. It happens everywhere.

But I do have a couple questions because I think everyone agrees that what we object to the most is the apartments. If we made those all condo units like we have now we'd probably all be happy. Moving them east, moving them west you're still going to upset somebody. But it's really the apartments we're concerned about. And no matter what you call them they change a neighborhood. I live over in what was [inaudible] Park Vista.

There was the Cranberry Apartments. They added additional apartments. They started out as charging a lot, and then when you can't rent them out they lower them. So I guess one of my questions would be this Workforce is that, what, five years? Is that until everything's built and then you can rent it to everybody? How long is that? And really \$26,000 that's \$12 an hour. That's not a lot of money. And people work really hard for that, and they deserve to have a place to live but you can't call it Workforce. That's still not a lot of money.

The other question is if any studies have been done about aging in place. Because we have an aging population people are living longer than ever. And older people don't live in apartments. They can't do it. They can't get up to the second or third floor. Ranch condos like they're doing at the Village Green that's a great idea because then you can live with the amenities of having a condo association, but you also can maybe live in that place until you're older. So that's another idea that I wanted to just bring up.

And then I think finally my last comment is there was a really great article, if you guys didn't see it, on the Village Green Center in Biz Times which was wonderful and exciting about all the things happening in Pleasant Prairie. And it says in here that there's 120 acres available for development, multi-family, commercial, blah, blah, blah. So I guess my question to you is would you let him build those apartments in the Village Green space? Thank you.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you. Anybody else wishing to speak?

Curt Decker:

Good evening. My name is Curt Decker, and I live at 6218 92nd Place. I want to thank that one gentleman, he really touched on a lot of the points I was going to bring up. The most I initially want to just talk about the purchase of the property. When Bear bought the property the plan was in place. It had a circle drive. The bridge was part of the plan. So it should have been part of their due diligence to come back and [inaudible] we have to get apartments in here because we can't afford to build a bridge. The bridge was part of the plan. That maybe goes to their due diligence before purchasing the property.

When everybody, I was one of the first home builders, my wife and I, a lot of the condo people. When we were presented a plan by Mastercraft and we were out there looking for places to build, we were given that community plan that was single family homes, condos. But all of it was home owners or owner occupied. There was no rentals in the neighborhood. So in some ways I feel for this to be even moved on from this body to the Board is somewhat of a betrayal of what the community plan was at the time when the community was put together.

I brought a couple of studies, and these weren't just hacks from the internet. This is something from realtor.com, and it's dated March 18, 2016. And it talks about the ten worst draws on home values in the neighborhood. The first or worst we'll say, the worst draw was bad school at 22 percent. Number nine was a strip club at 14.7 percent. The number eight was high renter concentration. and that was at 13.8 percent. Then it moves on to homeless shelters, cemeteries, funeral homes and power plants, what a coincidence. So that was that.

I pulled up some more research, and this came from the Harvard Kennedy School, and this is on media politics and public policy. And their study was done from 1976 up until current time. This study was in 2015 when it was finalized. And it specifically talks about low income housing tax credits and its effects on neighborhoods. They've seen adverse effects on neighborhoods in cities like Charlotte, North Carolina. They've seen positive effects on property tax values in places like Cleveland. What the study mostly talks about is where do you start at with these type of plans?

I would hand it to Bear they're redoing that factory between 60th and 52nd along 22nd Avenue, that old factory there. So that's an example of where this type of they don't want to call it subsidized but it is rent controlled. The very definition of rent controlled is a government body dictating the amount of rent that you can charge. So if a person is making \$2,100 a month we know it's \$2,500 a year, that is just slightly above the poverty level in Kenosha County, just slightly above what's deemed as the poverty level. So when you do developments like on 22nd Avenue that's in a neighborhood that the city has always had trouble with. There's a lot of landlord homes there. The homes that were single family homes or duplex at one time, and now they're landlord homes. And you can drive through that neighborhood and you can tell which one are landlords. Garbage in the yards, unkept, plywood on the windows. So that development right there has a positive effect on that neighborhood. It's going to bring up that neighborhood. It's going to give housing for people that are probably living in some of those poor houses there.

Where have the adverse effects were in developed neighborhoods like I said. The one study was Charlotte, North Carolina. It reduced their property values by 5.4 percent when they stuck these in those neighborhoods. So nobody wants to come out here and say, hey, I'm against the guy who only makes \$12 an hour. Nobody wants to say that. I made \$12 an hour, and when I did I lived in a \$12 an hour apartment in a neighborhood, an apartment community I would say. So what really is happening with this plan is they're just forcing an apartment community within owner occupied community is what they're doing.

So we were a bit excited that in 2015, I brought the meeting minutes before this community, August 10, 2015, when a proposal as to not do the condos or the duplexes, which actually those are very nice. I have to say I work in construction, we do a lot of work in condo communities and stuff, and I have to say that the people at the Creekside Crossing Condo Association do a fantastic job of taking care of their neighborhood, probably more so than some single family homeowners

do. So there was some excitement when Bear was proposing to finish it up and just put single family homes in there.

Now, the homes that were being proposed then and are being proposed now don't match up with the size that were in our homeowners association when we built our house there. There were much stringent rules. If you had a ranch it was 1,800 square feet on the first floor. If you had a two story it was, again, a 1,200 square foot footprint but 1,800 square foot for the home. So even with these homes they've deviated from that. They're much smaller in square footage.

So I'm just going to pull up a few things from that meeting on October 10, 2015. One of the citizens had concerns about drainage. And drainage is a big deal. I'm a landowner to the north. Bear did come to me to purchase some of our property to extend this into it, but just like with some of the other ones I want to comment that was a steal, \$500,000 was a steal. No development is a slam dunk, but they certainly started at the free throw line. They got a piece of property well under market rate, it already had a footprint in place. It isn't like the Village Green project where it's a cornfield now. There's a lot of infrastructure that goes into that.

To make this thing work I almost have to laugh when I hear to make this a win-win they need the subsidies and they need the apartments. I'm in construction. We're working on apartment complexes like this within the Village that they're paying full freight. They're not subsidizing them. They paid for the land, full value of the land, and they're doing the same type of development, but they're doing them in an apartment community. They're all apartments that are going into those communities. And we have plenty of zoning within Pleasant Prairie for apartments, too. All that development on Highway H there's apartments going in everywhere. I don't know and we've, again, done a lot of construction work over there, I don't know that those got subsidies or needed subsidies. They didn't need them. They just built them. They're getting market rate. They're saying that these apartments are going to be somewhere at market rate. Then what do they need the subsidies for if they're going to rent them out at market rent.

But going to the drainage issues, and this is one of the things that I think -- and this is from Mr. Pollocoff. He says, okay, we all know that Mastercraft went underwater. And this was for the single family homes now. But as this change and development occurs the significantly downsizing and the number of units that are going to be taking place versus original design which we'll have in turn a significant impact on stormwater. There will be more green areas and the developer is proposing no more than the original development. So I guess what he's saying in there is that when they switch from having all the condos in there and they went to single family homes the footprint there was going to be more green space, there was going to be less issues with stormwater.

And then it goes further on in here which is a big concern, Tom Terwall was on the Commission I think at the time. He says as a condo owner myself I share your concerns with owner occupancy. Some citizen had spoke about owner occupancy, and that's the best way to go ahead, just don't have rentals, period. And then somewhere in here he mentions to Mrs. Werbie-Harris, Jean, can you make sure that that happens? And what he's asking her to make sure that happens is that if they do build condos in there to make sure that they can't go rental. And that is an ordinance, and that's in the condo association's bylaws, too.

So if somebody has a condo, they did well, they want to move to Florida but they don't want to lose their investment they can't rent that out. It's right in there for any kind, not for cash, not for favors, not for trips, they can't do it. So this really flies in the face of all the investors in the neighborhood to put this in our neighborhood. And I only bring up the Commission meeting from 2015 because I want to remind the Commission that at that time they were making sure to be opposed to having any rental units in this neighborhood. And that they enjoy the idea of a smaller footprint, more green spaces. And, Karen, there was going to be a park on that end of the subdivision. That's that.

I just want to bring a few things that came out of the recent *Kenosha News*. On Friday's newspaper, and there's not much left of the *Kenosha News* to be honest anymore so you really got to look hard to find some news in it, it says 2018 a boom for county job seekers. To attract some of the talent they need an increasing number of employers have begun offering bonuses and even increased wages and benefits. Last year ended with many cities and counties reporting near record unemployment rates. Kenosha as among nine cities that set a record for the lowest unemployment rates. We're lucky here in Pleasant Prairie everybody knows it. A sweet spot. That's exactly why a lot of us are here. I can tell you that's why I'm here.

Healthcare will be hot. They've got a new hospital being built out there with Aurora. We see Froedtert doing the addition on the St. Catherine's Hospital. We see Froedtert doing the four story MOB over here, and there's plenty of other, maybe not within our community but around Kenosha where you get a lot of the Zoomy Clinics. Healthcare is crazy. Okay, it says the healthcare industry is expected to be hot. Healthcare professionals top the list of most in demand jobs in 2019. The Bureau of Labor Statistics expects there will be a 47 percent growth in home healthcare jobs through 2024. And it just goes on about all the hot jobs. And we've got a great base for those hot jobs. So that was Friday's newspaper.

Saturday's newspaper comes out and says local real estate market is a tale of two realities. Real estate sales professionals sold 2,240 homes in Kenosha County last year, 25 more than they sold in 2017. But just moving further down this is the third strongest market since 2007. A lot of us were around in 2007, the housing market was hot especially across the border in Illinois. I mean these things were flying off the wall. Sluggish sales he noted are one of the byproducts of a diminishing inventory of houses to sell in Kenosha County. The shortage of single family homes in Kenosha County is the biggest draw in our real estate market. We could fill this neighborhood with owner occupied single family homes and meet the demand. There's plenty of apartments. They're all over the place. So that's that.

One last thing, I just want to talk about -- as soon as I seen it the estimated values of these homes when they're built, what I did is I simply used the Kenosha County site. I went to very -- now, I'm a single family homeowner so I didn't do anything with the condos, but I hit every tab on every single family home in this neighborhood. I'm going to back up. When we did our preconstruction with our bank before we built our house, and I'll just be honest, our house has the most square footage of any single family home in the neighborhood. Our preconstruction dollars were \$450,000. We said great. We bought the lot for \$85,000. We had exclusively used Mastercraft. I could have saved some money if I didn't have to use them as a builder. So that was \$450,000.

We built that house, we paid \$85,000 for the land, we paid \$300,000 for the construction. We were \$60,000 upside down. We were never anywhere near the \$450,000. Even with the large increase in my property assessment from this last reassessment period, I mean it went up \$40,000, but I'm still only at \$345,000. I have the largest house, 25,000 square feet on one floor and 25,000 on the second floor, and I work in construction so I know a lot about construction. Where do you come up with \$400,000 to \$525,000 for each single family house when they're not anywhere near the size of the houses that were built when we had the homeowners association, and they drove the size of the houses, the type of shingles, the colors, all that to it. So that's just bad information. And maybe they are selling them over there by St. Cat's but I doubt that, I doubt that.

Community plans, due diligence and rent control. So now we're proposing to fill our neighborhood with rent control. That's an old term from the '70s, isn't it? That's an old term from the '70s. Nobody wants to use the word subsidized so now we use different words to candy coat what the proposal is. And I think that's it for me. But I would ask the Commission to not let it go a step further than tonight. There's just no need. There's too much opposition to it. When Mr. Mills talks about a win-win situation there's only going to be one winner in this room. It's not going to be the homeowners. Our investment is going to go backwards again. We finally are gaining some ground.

And if when we first built our house and we were shopping around and they didn't have a master plan that said this is what we're going to do, if they would have laid on the table and said, hey, but in ten years from now we're going to put rent controlled, low subsidized housing your back yard, I doubt a lot of us would have built houses there. Thank you for your time.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you.

Jeff Sorensen:

Jeff Sorensen, 6299 92nd Place. Jean, if I say anything that's not correct interrupt me. When Creekside Crossing initially began it was required of Mastercraft that this was owner occupied, no rentals. Mastercraft then went out of business. The Creekside Crossing Condominium Association is now in charge. In the documents no rentals. This is not a place for rentals. This is owner occupied. I don't think there would be a person in this crowd that would be against condos or single family, owner occupied. Another thing to take into consideration if you look at the plan there is no other apartment location in the Village that you drive through a single family neighborhood to get to an apartment complex. You should be coming off of a main road such as Highway H, Highway 50. There's a big plot of land on the south side of 93rd Street that would be a perfect place for apartments. They don't have to worry about bridges. Just put your apartments in the big tract of land.

Another thing that you need to consider when you look at this plan, if you've driven down Old Green Bay Road because now this is going to be a main access, picture yourself coming out of the complex and turning south to get to 31. You know how Old Green Bay Road makes a hook before it gets to Dabbs Farm Road. I'm on Dabbs Farm Road Monday through Friday which are work days at approximately 7:15 to 7:30. The traffic is backed up at the stoplight at Green Bay

Road. How is anybody going to get onto there to get onto Green Bay Road. They'll be backed up. If there's four cars that go straight across Green Bay Road to go to the RecPlex you're in the right hand lane. Four cars you can't get into the right hand turn lane. There's a left hand turn lane. How you going to get out of there?

If you go north on Old Green Bay Road and you hook to get to 85th Street, if you've ever noticed the traffic coming off of Green Bay Road onto 85th Street how you going to get out of there? Especially if you want to go west. It's not going to happen. It's a bad layout. It's not appropriate for apartments. And like I said owner occupied. We were always told that. At the last Plan Commission meeting when the iteration was all single family I spoke and said owner occupied, no apartments. That's correct, no apartments. Here we have apartments. Don't let it happen. I highly suggest you table this until it's further reviewed. Thank you.

Madelyn Wirch:

I'm Madelyn Wirch. My husband and I live in Creekside Condos on 8934 62nd Avenue. Our backyard is on that beautiful pond in the northeast corner, the upper left corner of your map. I am very disappointed in Bear Realty, not unexpectedly so. Because three or four years ago when we met with them we were told that opposite that pond would be single family homes, and that would be fine. Then in October we had a meeting, and we were told that there would be four apartment buildings and two garages on that pond. And that's a concern. And it's more concerning now because they moved three apartment buildings that were supposed to be in the southwest corner, and they moved the two by Old Green Bay Road, and then they gave us a fifth apartment building with a third garage building.

And it's so beautiful out there, and to have to look at these large buildings it's really -- it's unacceptable. But I have a concern because on the map that we were sent we were told that Bear was going to make sure that water runoff would go to new retention ponds because we have to maintain that large pond. And on the map it's a very small pond which is now going to have to serve an extra apartment, five apartment buildings. And I ask you to consider that. And also because they're adding one more -- I have a question about the duplex, the side-by-side which will be on the cul-de-sac at the end of 62nd Avenue. And it will look supposedly like our condos. And is this going to be owner -- is this going to be part of our condo association or not? That's another concern I have. And all these other people brought up so many things that we all are concerned about. Thank you so much for listening to us.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you. Anybody else wishing to speak? Yes, sir?

Warren Denhartog:

My name is Warren Denhartog. I live at 9203 62nd Court. So why did I move to Pleasant Prairie? I worked for the City of Kenosha at the time. I wasn't allowed to live outside of the county. My wife worked in Illinois so we landed a place here in Pleasant Prairie. We had money down at the Strawberry Creek area, we chose Pleasant Prairie. I don't like to shovel stone. Please don't add sidewalks to my neighborhood. That's the reason. I want to be able to have an outside fire. That's a reason. I want to have the best, and I work for a different police agency,

the best police agency around, Pleasant Prairie, award winning. Best fire around. Sorry, Chief, about the police thing but it's the truth. Those are the things why I moved here. And I moved here with the intent of what was supposed to be.

But now all of a sudden we're adding apartments. And like Jeff and the other gentleman said apartments are what we do not want. Doing the job that I do I know that apartments bring a lot of crime. They bring a lot of people in a small area which leads to a lot of crime. And while we're speaking of crime, nobody has talked about what's called, SCPTED, crime prevention through environmental design. There's no talk about lighting. There's been no talk about police and fire access. There's been no talk about traffic control. There's been no talk about Americans With Disabilities Act, how someone who is disabled is going to get to a second floor apartment. There's been no talk about crime statistics. Those are the things that I'd like to hear before apartments come into my neighborhood.

And while it looks so far away on the map, I walk my dog to the corner and back, and obviously it's not that far if you look at my stomach. It's really not that far. So why do we want sidewalks? People have said to me, geez, Mr. Denhartog, it sounds like a nimby guy, not in my backyard. You know what, as Pleasant Prairie people ask do we want strip clubs in our backyard? No. Do we want crime in our backyard? No. Do we want things that can lead to that in our backyard? No. So I believe what the other people have said here is true, we'd be more than happy to have owner occupied residences. We'd be more than happy to have homes that are \$500,000 plus. And, by the way, if that's the case mine will be up for sale for that amount June 30th when the kids get out of school.

I don't know, this isn't what I bought into. I feel like I'm kind of taking it in the short end. No different than -- well, I won't get into politics, but no different than what happened to different people when different administrations came in. So, again, I just ask you guys to reconsider that. And I do thank you for what you do because this is an environment that I chose to live in, and I can choose to live somewhere else if it doesn't work out. Thank you.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you. Anybody else wishing to speak? Anybody else wishing to speak? We'll close the public hearing. Let me just make a comment. I appreciate how everybody approached that podium with professionalism and respect. And it's not always the case from us sitting up here that we get that. So I appreciate that. It shows that you care. And, believe me, this Commission cares, the staff cares, this Village cares. So we'll try whatever we have to do to make this thing work. So with that who wants to answer some of the questions? S.R., Jean, who wants to lead it off?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Well, I'll start off by introducing S.R., but I just want to comment on a couple of things. First of all, every development in Pleasant Prairie when it's brought to us we look at it from an accessibility standpoint, from a police and fire perspective. We would require any of the buildings in this particular development to have full fire sprinklers. I mean these are all different things for community benefit such as the camera system for security. So we really spend a lot of time in looking at building layouts, turning radius, width of fire lanes, we look at all of those

things. And we have for many, many years to make sure that these aren't developments that are not going to be able to be serviced by Pleasant Prairie and our police and fire department. So that's one thing that we do look at very, very closely whether it's this development or any of the other developments in the Village.

A couple other things I wanted to point out, and then I'd like to like I said introduce S.R. up here. One of the things that we had talked about is that, yes, there is no northern park as we had originally identified. So there were two different things that we looked at as a staff. Number one, at the very northeastern corner we had identified and worked with Bear to create a green space, and they were going to create a dog park up in that area. Again, it's not a traditional park as you'd see with children, but it would be for animals, dogs, to be able to run around and do their thing up there. So that was one element that we had looked at for park and open space.

And then the second thing that we had mentioned to them is that we wanted to see them put some additional playground equipment in the existing park. And then a third element related to all of this was to try to interconnect Creekside existing as well as the new Creekside with basically sidewalks. It's something that as a Village we've looked at over the years. But in the last two to three years we've been looking at it a lot more closely. I don't know that we've made final decisions on anything with respect to sidewalks. But we know that, for example, in our Village Green, our downtown, even just the minimal sidewalks that we've put in up to this point throughout the Village they have been used very much by a lot of the residents who live here as well as anybody who comes to the area that wants to do some walking.

So I think that we have not made any final decisions on the sidewalks, but I think we do need to make some strong policy decisions on this development and any other development as we move forward with respect to the sidewalks. Again, just like the few sidewalk areas that we do have it would require that the abutting landowners or association would be required to maintain them. The Village isn't going to be maintaining sidewalks or snow plowing them. So it's something that we have to look at very seriously if we were going to require them in this development or any other development in the Village to bring people around the community.

Again, we don't want to see any dead ended sidewalks, but we want to make sure that sidewalks interconnect. So that's why we're actually showing this interconnection along Creekside Circle because we feel that having dead ended sidewalks doesn't make as much sense as continuing a loop around a community or a subdivision or a development. So that question has not been resolved yet.

With respect to traffic, whether this is apartments or condos or single family it's still going to generate traffic. And we've looked at the interconnections of the roadways and so on and so forth. It doesn't warrant or justify any type of signals in this area. Depending what happens with the Dabbs Farm property and some of the property south, then a TIA would have to be done to re-examine those areas. But whether the housing type of the occupancy type is not going to determine whether or not additional apartments or condos are going to need signalization or people are going to wait longer to get in or out of their development. So I mean we've looked at that, we have looked at that since the '90s in this area. And I really don't know that that is something that is of grave concern. Again, as we continue the area to the south I think that that is a concern. We do need to take a look at transportation and whether or not there needs to be any additional lane movements or turning movements, but it wouldn't warrant a signal in this case.

With respect to why the developer needs to have this multi-family interjected into this particular development I'm going to let S.R. answer those questions. With respect to the trucking of fill I think that that's another issue we do have to resolve so sidewalks and the trucking of fill. The viability of the development, again, that's an S.R. question. With respect to the cost of the development, costs for new construction costs and costs for infrastructure construction, and our engineer can respond to this, but it's pretty close to \$1,000 a foot for infrastructure construction.

And in this case there is a bridge which is probably three quarters of a million dollars. So just so that everyone understands, to put in new single family homes right now that cost is nowhere near \$30,000. That's what it was 30 years ago. Now it's closer to \$70,000, \$80,000, \$90,000 a lot. Just so that everyone understands that to do this as just single family would probably not -- there wouldn't be enough funding from the developer in order to complete Creekside Circle and 91st to do it as single family. That's why he stopped three years ago because of the costs involved.

So I just want to make everyone aware I know what they would like to see, but just so that we know maybe the market's not strong enough yet because of the fact that single family lots are going for \$110,000, \$120,000, \$130,000, and that is just the land, nothing else. So the costs are significant. And then, again, Matt can probably back me up on a lot of this based on what we're seeing for infrastructure costs. It's not inexpensive to do single family. If it were we'd have a lot more single family developments under construction in the Village.

Because we now require concrete roads. We've changed our standards. They're not a traditional asphalt road. They're concrete roads with asphalt overlay. And, again, we're trying to do it to be a little bit more sustainable and to bring the overall costs to the Village down for maintenance of public roads. So there have been a number of things that have changed from the Village's perspective for infrastructure going in, and those costs we pass all that onto the developers. Because we want these roads and the infrastructure to last that much longer with less maintenance cost to the Village overall.

A couple other questions that I'd like S.R. to answer is what gets built first? Would he build the apartments first or the single family housing, and why does he need to do it that way? Could or would there ever be any changes with respect to rents? Could those rents go down? Would the rents only go up? How long would they stay with these rent restrictions. And so that's something I think that I need to have him address.

It is true that the initial phases, everything that was planned and constructed as part of the initial phases for the condominiums, the single family and the two family condominiums those were always all intended to be owner occupied. I don't know what the ultimate goal, if that would ever change from Mastercraft. The original plan was all the expansion areas would be owner occupied, but we never got that far when the economy tanked. So I don't know what their ultimate goals were, if they were every going to change that or not. But the initial plan did show this all as owner occupied.

We don't have any other developments -- someone had asked if we had any other developments where you go through a single family to get to the back area or to another area where it's multi-family. No. We only have about six multi-family projects in the Village right now.

Cobblestone, Fountain Ridge, Hidden Oak, those are all on Highway H. Skyline, Cobblestone are also in the Prairie Ridge areas. So we really just started to explore multi-family in Pleasant Prairie, and we've been pretty successful with some very nice multi-family and very high end multi-family in Pleasant Prairie.

But we've had so many people also ask if there were any lesser price points to live in Pleasant Prairie in an apartment. If all the apartments rent at \$1,200 or above we are minimizing the amount of residents that could come to our community that are making a lesser wage. So we need to decide is this the right location for them, or would there be another location in Pleasant Prairie that would be more suitable? And we are investigating all of those possibilities.

What I can say is that the apartment, the look, the feel, the design, the architecture, the building materials, the use of sprinklers, the use of cameras, all of those things are on par with the other apartments in Pleasant Prairie just so that you know. We're not scaling back on any of the architecture, the design or the materials with the construction. So from that perspective they would be the same as all the other units in Pleasant Prairie, the new ones under construction.

But I think what we need to do is bring S.R. up. And I guess I would like to hear more of a case as why here, why now, why clustered in these locations, could those rents change and the cost that -- he actually knows his costs. We haven't seen all of that yet. Eventually we would get all of that cost information. Because letters of credit and all the financial security and the contract documents and everything has to be presented to us so that we can draft development agreements and so on and so forth so that everything happens exactly the way he says that it's going to as part of the approval process. But I'll let him start answering some of the other questions.

S.R. Mills:

I took some good notes here. [Inaudible] topics first in relation to traffic. As Jean mentioned early on I think it's comparable. I believe what we're looking at now versus the original plan traffic is really on par. The park improvements also eluded to we have some flexibility there. We don't want to have parks for the sake of having parks where they're not used. We want to ensure that we have the right kind of parks and the right kind of open space. That is something as we talk about this plan and why we think it's a good fit. We do have a lot of open space. We have a lot of green space. We're trying to create high quality space that people can use. Oftentimes people just don't want necessarily a small, whether it's a neighborhood park or a smaller area that really doesn't get utilized.

Sidewalks we think are a good idea. I fully appreciate everybody's comments here. Paying for it might be a different thought process as it relates to the ongoing maintenance. But we try and make it as livable as possible in incorporating neat spaces. The pond areas and the stormwater that is something as we talk about the financial burden back to the association we don't have water draining to the northeast to the pond that I believe was referenced behind the duplex product. The general stormwater flow goes to the southwest, and so it connects through hard pipe and swales. We might have to lean on our engineers, and Matt can maybe even comment to it. And we have some gentlemen in the crowd. But it works well from a stormwater -- if there are any stormwater issues typically when we have the pipe in the ground and we finish a

development off we alleviate those. We don't create more stormwater problems. We typically solve them. So that's something that I'm very confident that at the end of the day this would do.

One of the questions was back to property management and ownership. There's a mandate that we have to actually own this for 15 years with a lot of the things that we obligate ourselves to from a debt and equity standpoint. In reality we don't sell our multi-family development. Anything can happen and I understand that. But much like all of the product that we do we're accountable for. We're here for numerous developments so we know you're only as good as your last deal. So we're accountable for who moves in, who stays in and the upkeep from a look and a feel standpoint.

Can the rents be lowered? So the lower threshold on this is imposed by us. Because much like any market rate development, the newest one that was done by the hospital could they lower their rent? They could, but that could also cause a default with their lender, and there's no benefit to lowering the rents. Now, why do people lower rents? If you're in a down time and you can't lease them those rents start to fluctuate. Right now we're certainly in a boom. I think that is one thing that we think this type of product is somewhat insulated against. Any significant downturns while we might see them at the higher end, \$1,800, \$2,000, \$2,500, if there's a dip in the market we start to see some softness there. The product here between the \$700 and \$1,300 a month we feel very good about that. We don't see the softness in this type of product.

Specifically when we have waiting lists that does a couple of things. One, it ensures that if we get into tough times we don't have to reduce our rents. The other thing it ensures is with waiting lists we always have somebody that's willing to take that next unit. So if we have a bad actor, a bad citizen, if we have an issue with somebody, again, we are the first to evict them and get them out. Now, there's always problems. I mean there's problems with condominium associations, there's problems in single family subdivisions. There's problems in all kind of communities, and it's really management and how you address it. I think we pay close attention to that and the Village certainly does, too, with a lot of the policies and procedures. And nothing is ever perfect, but we're here and we're accountable to make sure it's really nice. Again, we stand by what we do.

One of the questions goes back to the aging in place. This isn't an age restricted development. As it goes back to the aging in place we see a large percentage of seniors, retirees, widowers, etc., move into a rental product. By 100 year old uncle in Peoria, Illinois just moved in about two years ago to the first floor flat of a rental product. And while that's a bit of an extreme example given the age, that is absolutely indicative of who we see here. And so it will be a mix of people in their 20s and people in their 70s and everything in between. And that's part of what makes a good community at different socioeconomic points.

I'm not big on the fearmongering as we talk about low income. This isn't low income. People can say it is but it's not. And when we talk about strip clubs and crime and things like that it's not this. And things like that can happen everywhere. You can always have crime. And certainly we have a large enough footprint that crime happens. We do everything we can to mitigate it. We work really hard, we have all the security systems. Again, we're very, very diligent. But I do take exception to saying that whether it's a two bedroom that's owned as a condominium or as a rental that we're going to have criminals in there. That's not the case.

Again, I think it will be a high quality development. As we go back to the bricks and the sticks and the look and the feel the staff does an exceptional job. We look forward to having a great, great development that fits in well.

One of the other questions goes back to the duplex, that one unit in the northeast corner. Currently we could not have that product be part of the existing association given the State of Wisconsin condominium laws. So that would actually be a fee simple unit. So it would be two sides that would be whether it's owned individually or owned by the same person, but it would not be part of the existing association. So we can't do that unfortunately with Wisconsin State Law. But we would have it as a for sale product.

Relative to the ADA and all of the other programs, the Americans With Disabilities Act, we comply with all of that. We're diligent on it. There's a lot of details that still go into the construction documents and working with the Fire Chief, the Police Chief. We've had a lot of those preliminary discussions to make sure that we flush out as many of those issues as we can on the front end, but certainly there's further work to do in going through that. Jean, did I miss anything?

Oh, yeah, so as far as the timing the multi-family -- so all of the infrastructure will go in at once. So it's \$6 to \$7 million worth of infrastructure that has to go in out of the box. And then the multi-family would start immediately. So there would not be a phasing with the 140 units. And the single family going down from the southwest making the loop, the only part of the single family that potentially would be phased would be the two cul-de-sacs coming in the east going to the west. But all of the infrastructure to get the traffic circulation, etc., would be completed.

As far as the actual construction and going vertical with the single family homes, right now as eluded that's really not a concern. We don't have too many vacant single family subdivisions, but there's a lot of available lot product. I think it's probably a three year absorption period, three to four year. We used those same numbers at Arbor Ridge, and we're probably going to exceed that. It will be done quicker, but that's what we're anticipating right now.

One of the other points was brought up just on the sale prices, and I do have some information here as to where we're at at Arbor Ridge. Custom contracts, \$424,000, \$555,000, \$540,000, \$395,000, \$494,000, \$489,000, \$457,000. So these are deals that have been inked, and I do think it's very indicative of what we're going to have here from a single family standpoint.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you, S.R. Jean, anything else?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

There were a couple of other questions regarding someone's concern about speeding on Creekside Circle. Any concerns with respect to speeding or traffic control those really should be addressed directly to the Police Chief. And then he would take the appropriate actions. Whether or not there's some type of speed control advice or monitoring advice that gets put out there, or there's an officer that gets stationed out there to do something, but that should really be addressed

directly with the police department. And whether it's currently or in the future that's how we address it in all the new subdivisions and all the existing subdivisions in the Village.

Someone else asked a question about an 89th Street connection to the east in the neighborhood plan. It showed that there is a potential to connect 89th Street at the very northeast corner of Creekside, and then it would go all the way to the east towards 89th and then towards Cooper Road. Again, there's no immediate plans for that. Again, it's just at this point we have a neighborhood plan that outlines where it could possibly go and where possibly a connection could be made on the north side of the park to make that east/west connection from Cooper Road to this development. Again, it's based on willing property owners wanting to develop their land. The Village isn't going to go in and put in each segment of that roadway. It's when and if those areas develop then those connected pieces get put in. No different that Main Street going from Village Green all the way out to Old Green Bay Road. It's when those specific areas start to develop that's when that infrastructure starts to be put in.

Nathan Thiel:

S.R., there was a question regarding a point or comment that was brought up with duplexes along the pond and the change in landscape that they originally had identified that they'd be seeing single family lots. Can you just talk briefly kind of how you're addressing the back side of that pond?

S.R. Mills:

Certainly, back to the site plan, so I think it's important to look at the proximity of where we're at with multi-family buildings west of the pond and also in relation back to the duplexes to the east. So certainly sensitive to obstructing view or having something that isn't -- no matter what the situation is we don't want back yards facing each other where somebody is looking in at somebody else's living room. So one of the ways that we're -- regardless of the product what we've tried to do is have a large berm that will extend on the west side of the pond. It will be heavily landscaped. So we don't want -- just like the duplexes don't want to have anybody looking in, we want to create that separation there.

And so we would look to have a four to five foot tall berm but with significant greenery that would run up the balance of that side of the pond. Then we would actually have a walking path west of the berm that would lead back to the dog park up there to the north. So that's a feature that we think should alleviate any real concerns once it's up and constructed that it would block any of those views and also any lights. Headlights coming in into the development we want to ensure that those do not shine into the back of anybody's windows or would be a hindrance.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So, S.R., why 140 units? Why did you look at that?

S.R. Mills:

So we tried to -- the main reason was to stay in line with the density that was already there. So when we looked at the 172 units that it was entitled for we went back and said, okay, we don't want to do anything that's anymore dense. So when we think about the number of bedrooms and the product and how is that going to work we don't have any additional traffic issues that weren't contemplated originally, we want to try and make it better. We think that going from the 140 units acquiring the land to west so it's not quite an apples to apples comparison because we do have additional land, but when we look at the 172 units on the 58 acres now I believe we have just over 150 units with the inclusion of some single family.

So trying to balance that out, the 140 we felt it fit well, but we could, again, keep that density comparable. Where from a look and feel standpoint when we look at the eight unit building versus the 20 unit building here the size is pretty comparable. The 700 square foot one bedroom apartment I believe we have 55 percent of the units are one bedrooms. Only 10 percent are threes, the balance made up in twos. So when we look at the actual fit it's not that different from a larger eight unit condominium-type product. So we wanted to do something that fit well, decrease the density. We wanted to ensure it was walkable, and we created the buffer between the multi-family and the balance of the development.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So did you look at trying to put some of that multi-family more on the west side and splitting it up into three areas or four areas?

S.R. Mills:

We did. And originally within the first plan as we see the single family that kind of goes from the southwest to the north we had multi-family on that side. And some of the feedback was, well, there was more of a concern about the traffic going through Creekside Circle to the southeast. And so based on that feedback, this was something that came from the meeting at the RecPlex, we thought it was appropriate. And decided let's try and shift those buildings further to the west closer to Old Green Bay Road. That way we could really alleviate any necessity that if somebody is going back to the south there's no reason that they would want to go back through the development to enter and go to the southeast and then further to the east. So trying to lay out it to path of least resistance for homeowners, for anybody that lives there, any resident, we want to make sure we understand those traffic flows as best we can. So that was part of the reason that we shifted and pushed additional multi-family north and west.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Someone had asked the question, I'm not sure if you answered this, who would be the leasing agents and who would be doing the evaluations and so forth.

S.R. Mills:

We do all of that. So that's within our control, that's our company or the Bear Real Estate group. We have strict criteria. We have all of that. We have to adhere to federal guidelines. There's equal housing just like anybody has to. Certainly we have to be consistent with our restrictions. We are consistent. And so that's all done at our shop.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you, S.R. Okay, comments and questions from the Commission?

Jim Bandura:

S.R., don't go anywhere.

Michael Serpe:

Stick around. Jim?

Jim Bandura:

Just out of curiosity did you look at any other additional properties like for Jean's concerns to split them up, the multi-family units?

S.R. Mills:

You're talking within the site?

Jim Bandura:

Yeah, or even a little bit off the site on Green Bay like say north or south of what's proposed by the clubhouse?

S.R. Mills:

Sure, we did. And that's part of the reason that we actually acquired the additional four acres, too, is to be able to better push the density back and forth, get it to align properly and to be able we think have it work well. We certainly looked at a lot of different sites to the north, to the east, to the west to get it all to align. We felt that this was a pretty good fit given the prior density and some of the traffic patterns. But we did look at a lot of different options. Again, we've been working on this one for about six years to try and find something that fit.

Jim Bandura:

So going to the demographics you're looking at pulling people from -- the people that are working in the park, the industrial park?

S.R. Mills:

The demographic will be when we think about it it's one bedroom, two bedrooms, three bedrooms, smaller amount of threes. We did a bit of a study looking at the school age children in comparable developments that we have. It's about one child for every six units is kind of what we found. And I think it will probably be a little less here because we don't have a lot of two bedrooms and three bedrooms. Primarily what we're going to see we think are seniors. I think we will have quite a few seniors where if somebody wants to age in place, they don't want to leave town after they retire because they can't find something that makes economic sense. We've seen that as a big push. And then we also see somebody that makes between, again, that \$25,000 and \$55,000, that when they're coming into the area they don't want to maybe purchase a home yet, they don't know exactly where they want to be.

Jim Bandura:

You're basically restricting the seniors to the lower level then, am I correct?

S.R. Mills:

Correct. And that's just part of having the two story.

Jim Bandura:

Hypothetically say my 90 year old grandmother wants the second floor that's not going to happen.

S.R. Mills:

That's not going to happen. And that's all in line with the ADA compliance. We have a great spot down the street where we'll have an elevator to accommodate them. This will not be that type of development that would accommodate somebody with issues walking or stairs living on the second floor.

Deb Skarda:

S.R., how many first floor single bedroom units will you have? Because I'm going the same place. I mean it seems like there's a lot single bedroom units, very disproportionate. And I'm going where Jim was going as far as if you're thinking that your population is going to be elderly how are you managing that?

S.R. Mills:

And I don't think it's going to be elderly either. I think we're going to have a mix. And so I want to make sure I don't overemphasize the fact that we will have seniors. Because I think it's something as we talk about aging in place that is something we will accommodate here, and we will have some of that. But the majority, probably 70 to 80 percent will be from 25 to 60 years old. So when we look at the floor plans the first floor is all the way to the top. We have a

combination of primarily two bedrooms. We've got a couple one bedrooms there, too. So it's a mix between the twos, ones, twos and threes on both the first and the second floor.

And what we've tried to do it's more art than science. We have a big portfolio to choose from to try and figure out those percentages of the one bedrooms, the two bedrooms and three bedrooms. We're always tweaking it, we're always trying to make the product better. We feel very good that this product will lease. We're talking 140 units. And the way that we would look to have this absorption work over time we typically deliver about two buildings a month, one to two buildings a month. So we think it would -- we found the other development that works well, and this is a pretty good mix. There was concern we heard early on about having too many three bedrooms with having too many kids. So we tried to limit that a little bit as well. And so we're trying to find that balance in here.

Bill Stoebig:

So, S.R., I guess there's an HOA in place for the current owners, right? So the apartments, the seven 20-units is that going to have any HOA to it?

S.R. Mills:

No, it would not. So one of the -- again, this really goes back to that State of Wisconsin condo law. Because there was such a gap from when the original development was platted and the association took place, if it's over a decade we could not join that association even if we wanted to. So really it is completely separate and distinct. Now, it was platted going back to the Village process the condominium plat, as far as that association is concerned it's separate.

Bill Stoebig:

And so even the new single families will be a new HOA?

S.R. Mills:

That's correct.

Deb Skarda:

I have another question related to kind of from a Bear management perspective. You were talking a little bit about that if you've got a problem resident or renter, whatever you want to call them, they're quickly dealt with and evicted. What's your eviction rate and how does that compare to other property management companies?

S.R. Mills:

I don't know our eviction rate. From the standpoint, though, that being local and we have developments in other areas and other states as well, and we certainly see outside rates and private equity groups that have developments here, from a management standpoint we have a centralized office platform which means that we have a main office, we're located here in the

Kenosha area. Now, we also have onsite managers at each one of these developments. But it's a little bit different where if we owned a random development in Georgia and we had our property management company down there, it's really one office, one person dealing with that. So we do have some additional backup here because it's part of a central office management.

Deb Skarda:

So for the group that is here managing it do you know how you compare to other organizations?

S.R. Mills:

I know that right now we have a 98.6 occupancy rate. So we have one of the highest occupancy, when you look from southeastern Wisconsin to the state we have significantly higher occupancy. Now, that can mean a couple of different things. One, we could have happier tenants that just want to stay longer and we have less turnover. Or it could mean a variety of things, but it is one of the main barometers that we've looked at that over time if we continue to have higher than average occupancy it means that people are generally happier. We do a lot of surveys.

And we know that it's tough to pull back exact data about our eviction rates. You can get good tenants and you can get bad tenants. And that is definitely more art than science. I can tell you, though, that we fully understand that if you get a bad tenant it is poison in the development because they will drive good tenants away. And unlike a condo association where the rules and regs are individual, we still have a lot of control. Now, we have to follow federal and state guidelines, etc., with how we evict. But we are very, very diligent on that because we've seen developments. We've come in on turnaround deals where others have kind of screwed things up in the past, and we've stepped in to try and rid problem tenants and go through and it's tough. So we want to make sure there's an ounce of prevention and a pound of cure scenario going into it that we do not -- we do our best to make sure that bad tenants don't take root in there and we get them out so we don't lose good tenants.

Michael Serpe:

Anybody else? Brock?

Brock Williamson:

So the density that you're proposing is that the only way to make this work?

S.R. Mills:

It is.

Brock Williamson:

And the same thing with apartments?

S.R. Mills:

Yeah. And it was a bit of a sweet spot where we try to find that balance. We try to look at it from a good land use plan standpoint, too, to say, okay, what's going to fit within the Creekside Circle. How do we get that density to fit to balance with the existing development, to balance with what was platted before to have it work.

Jim Bandura:

Do you have any WHEDA other buildings under your control?

S.R. Mills:

We do, many. We have a considerable -- we've done a lot of developments with various state housing agencies over the years.

Jim Bandura:

Once that restriction of 15 years goes off where do you see the rent amounts going?

S.R. Mills:

Historically they go up, they don't go down.

Michael Serpe:

Anybody else? Well, this is a Conceptual Plan that we're looking at right now. I think the people have brought out good, good concerns, great concerns. Just a little background if I could. Our Community Development Director has been with the Village for 30 years. I've been on the Board for that length of time as John Steinbrink, Mike Pollocoff, they're not here tonight. We've approved a lot of developments for the Village. And I challenge anyone to point out a development that we failed on whether it be commercial, industrial or residential. Whether or not we approve this in the ultimate end, not tonight, whatever we do tonight, whether or not we approve this, the last thing this Commission will want to do or the Board is approve a development that's going to be negative on you. That's not what we're all about. And I think we have 30 years of proof standing behind that. I want somebody to point out where we have failed. We don't do that.

Jean Werbie-Harris is a person that will stand up to big money and big influence, and that's a benefit to any one of us in this room. We can have developers come in here just push us over, it doesn't happen. It just doesn't happen. So have a little faith in our Community Development Director and her staff, this Commission and the Board. There's a lot of things that still have to be resolved as far as I'm concerned on tonight's meeting. Sidewalks is one of them. Maybe we can tweak some other things that people have brought up. But we're a part of this Village as well, and we're not going to give you a bad product. That's not what we're about. With that I look for a motion on Item C as 19-05. What's your pleasure?

Jim Bandura:

Mr. Chairman, I realize that this is a tough, tough thing to go over, and I really have faith in Jean and the staff in working towards a good relationship with everybody and the Village. I don't want to stop this process, and with that I would recommend it moving forward subject to working with Jean and getting everything addressed.

Michael Serpe:

Jean, just for clarification tell the audience how many more meetings will take place before this becomes final.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

So there's multiple steps in the planning process. The initial step would be tonight before the Plan Commission that deals with the Neighborhood Plan and a Conceptual Plan. The next meeting it would go to the Village Board for them to evaluate the same thing, the Conceptual Plan and the Neighborhood Plan. The next step for the developer would be to put together the detailed engineering plans and to bring back a Preliminary Plat, and that would involve a public hearing as well before the Plan Commission and then a meeting before the Village Board. And then the next step after that is the final plat, again, another public hearing before the Plan Commission and then the Village Board.

So traditionally there's at least six meetings, three before Plan Commission and three before the Village Board where all the other details are ironed out, vetted out, concerns are addressed with respect to the legitimacy of the plan. The key is that there needs to be some direction given to the developer by the Plan Commission and by the Board in these initial steps as to whether or not he continues to move forward or are some things that just need to be tweaked or adjusted or removed or added, and this would be the time to kind of address some of those other things as we start to continue to refine the project as we move forward.

Michael Serpe:

I strongly suggest that we work together with S.R. Mills and address some of the concerns that some of the people have here. I think they're legitimate. I think we can probably maybe make some adjustments here and there that will make this a little bit more easy to accept, sidewalks being one of them. It sounds like they don't want them, a couple of things that were brought up. Let's work on this thing and see if we can just make it acceptable to everybody. Is that a motion?

Jim Bandura:

I would make a motion for the resolution of 19-05 to send a favorable recommendation to the Board.

Michael Serpe:

Second?

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Michael Serpe:

**MOTION MADE BY JIM BANDURA AND SECONDED BY JUDY JULIANA FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 19-05. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE.**

Voices:

Aye.

Michael Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it. Item D, public hearing and consideration of a Conceptual Plan. This is a Conceptual Plan. There's many more steps before this becomes final.

Jim Bandura:

Could be a lot of changes. With that I would recommend approval.

Brock Williamson:

Second.

Michael Serpe:

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

Voices:

Aye.

Michael Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it. Thank you.

Jim Bandura:

Thank you very much.

Michael Serpe:

Okay, let's move on.

**E. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A FLOODPLAIN BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT for the request of Matt Fineour, Village Engineer, on behalf of the Village of Pleasant Prairie for the proposed culvert replacement crossing of a tributary to the Des Plaines River which is located on the access road to the Pleasant Prairie Residential Recycling Center located at 8000 128th Street.**

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Item E is public hearing and consideration of a Floodplain Boundary Adjustment for the request of Matt Fineour, Village Engineer, on behalf of the Village of Pleasant Prairie for a proposed culvert replacement crossing of a tributary to the Des Plaines River which is located on an access road to the Pleasant Prairie Residential Recycling Center located at 8000 128th Street.

Michael Serpe:

Excuse me, Rocco, could you go to the back of the room, please. Thank you.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

The Village is proposing to replace culvert under the existing driveway access to the Residential Recycling Center at 8000 128th Street and to add an additional pavement layer to the roadway. These culverts allow for floodplain waters to flow under the access driveway. For information, this access driveway is proposed to be dedicated as a public street known as Greenway Court as a condition of Prairie Produce Farm development.

The culverts replacement and additional pavement layer will not amend the location of the 100-year floodplain boundary, but the hydraulic analysis shows that the modification would increase the one percent annual chance event water surface elevations by 0.20 feet on the downstream side of the culverts, the west side of the roadway, about ten feet west of the culvert on the Village's property within the existing 100-year floodplain as further outlined in the attached Hydraulic Analysis dated November 28, 2018. As a result of this water survey elevation increase a Floodplain Boundary Adjustment is required.

The Floodplain 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. Permits would be obtained from the Wisconsin DNR and FEMA prior to the proposed work commencing, and when the work is required a Letter of Map Revision or a LOMR will need to be obtained. After the LOMR is obtained public hearings to correct the Zoning Map and Zoning Text will be held. This is a matter of public hearing. The Village Engineer is here if you would like to hear any further explanation or comment with respect to the request.

Michael Serpe:

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

Jim Bandura:

Mr. Chairman, I recommend approval.

Deb Skarda:

Second.

Michael Serpe:

**MOTION MADE BY JIM BANDURA AND SECONDED BY DEB SKARDA FOR APPROVAL OF A FLOODPLAIN BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE.**

Voices:

Aye.

Michael Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it.

**F. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE VILLAGE LAND DIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL ORDINANCE to Section 395-72 G related to basement level sewer service for residential developments.**

Jean Werbie-Harris:

The Village staff is recommending that Section 395-72 G of the Village's Land Division and Development Control Ordinance be amended to clarify that all public and private sanitary sewer mains shall be designed and constructed to provide gravity basement service. Further, new residential homes and units shall be connected with gravity basement sewer service unless approved by the Village Engineer based on a practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship. This clarification would allow for existing lots that have municipal sanitary sewer within the adjacent street to have hung plumbing or an injector pit if the existing sanitary sewer cannot provide for gravity basement sewer service.

Again, we had a strong provision in the Land Division Ordinance that something shall be this way with respect to the sanitary sewer. In some cases sanitary sewer was put in many years ago, and based on its depth or the soils it made it very problematic and almost financially impossible for connections to be made to that sewer especially on 116th Street where the soils were so poor. So we wanted to work in some flexibility into the Land Division Ordinance and give that flexibility to the Village Engineer so that on a case-by-case basis if, in fact, there is some unique circumstance that would prevent that connection and require hung plumbing or an injector pit or some type of grinder pump if you will that they would be allowed to approve of it as opposed to a

variance being obtained by the resident from the Village Board from the Land Division Ordinance.

Michael Serpe:

This is a matter for public hearing. Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? We'll close the public hearing and open it up to comments and questions. Don't we already have provisions in place for grinder pumps in areas?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

No.

Michael Serpe:

We don't?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

No, not really, no.

Michael Serpe:

On 47th Avenue we have a couple homes out there that have grinder pumps?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Right. As Peggy is reminding all of us we had variances that needed to be granted. Special exceptions or variances were needed to be granted by the Village Board. And we want to not have to bring those situations again back to the Village Board each time and hold up the property owners from being able to pull permits and start their construction. We just feel that we have a professional engineering staff that would review each situation on a case-by-case basis, look at the elevations, look at the home and try to work with the property owners. Again, it's not typical because it's not how things are designed in Pleasant Prairie. But it does happen occasionally.

Michael Serpe:

Would this be a good fix for Cooper Road south of 80th?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Well, that's a little bit different situation because --

Michael Serpe:

John, would that be what we're looking at?

[Inaudible]

Michael Serpe:

Comments or questions?

Jim Bandura:

I would recommend move for approval for the amendment to Section 395-72 G.

Deb Skarda:

Second.

Michael Serpe:

**MOTION MADE BY JIM BANDURA AND SECONDED BY DEB SKARDA FOR APPROVAL OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE VILLAGE LAND DIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL ORDINANCE. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE.**

Voices:

Aye.

Michael Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it.

**6. ADJOURN.**

Judy Juliana:

Move to adjourn.

Brock Williamson:

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, people. Thank you very much.

**Meeting Adjourned: 9:35 p.m.**