

**PLEASANT PRAIRIE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
VILLAGE HALL AUDITORIUM
9915 39TH AVENUE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE, WISCONSIN
6:00 P.M.
March 27, 2017**

A regular meeting for the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission convened at 6:00 p.m. on March 27, 2017. Those in attendance were Thomas Terwall; Michael Serpe; Wayne Koessler; Deb Skarda; Jim Bandura; Judy Juliana; Bill Stoebig; John Skalbeck (Alternative #1) and Brock Williamson (Alternate #2). Also in attendance were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Tom Shircel, Assistant Administrator; Jean Werbie-Harris, Community Development Director; Peggy Herrick, Assistant Village Planner and Zoning Administrator; and Kristina Tranel, Community Development Department.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER.**
- 2. ROLL CALL.**
- 3. CONSIDER APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 13, 2017 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES.**

Wayne Koessler:

Move approval in its printed order.

Jim Bandura:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY WAYNE KOESSL AND SECONDED BY JIM BANDURA TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 13, 2017 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING AS PRESENTED IN WRITTEN FORM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

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

Tom Terwall:

If you're here for an item that appears on the agenda as a public hearing we would ask that you hold your comments until that public hearing is held. However, if you're here to discuss any other issue or raise a question on the agenda now would be your opportunity to do so. We'd ask you to step to the microphone and begin by giving us your name and address. Is there anybody wishing to speak under citizens' comments? Yes, sir?

Mike Hughes:

Thank you, sir. I've got a copy of something that you're going through tonight that I was hoping I could hand out to the Commission.

Michael Serpe:

Name and address, sir.

Mike Hughes:

Oh, sorry. Mike Hughes, 9957 48th Avenue. I'm sorry, I apologize, my mistake.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

You'll be the first item.

Tom Terwall:

Is there anybody else? Anybody else? Hearing none we'll close citizens' comments.

6. NEW BUSINESS:

A. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A CONCEPTUAL PLAN for the request of Doug Stanich for the vacant property located north of Main Street at 47th Avenue for the development of 72 condominium units including 38 single unit buildings and 17 two unit buildings to be known as The Cottages at Village Green Heights.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Item 6A, public hearing and consideration of a conceptual plan for the request of Doug Stanich for the vacant property located north of Main Street at 47th Avenue for the development of 72 condominium units including 38 single-unit buildings and 17 two-unit buildings to be known as The Cottages at Village Green Heights.

With respect to some background information, I'll begin that on March 10, 2003, the Village Board approved the Preliminary Plat for the proposed development of this property. At that time it was for 50 two-unit condominium development or 100 total units to be known at Village Green Heights Townhomes North. The Preliminary Plat was consistent with the Village Green Neighborhood Plan and the Village Green Heights Conceptual Plan as conditionally approved by

the Village Board in 2001. The Village Green Heights Subdivision and the Village Green Heights Addition #1 Subdivisions were approved in 2004 and 2006, respectively, and most of the single family lots have since been developed. And what you're seeing on the screen right now is specifically that Neighborhood Plan that was approved back in 2001.

The Conceptual Plan: At this time, the petitioner also referred to as the developer is requesting approval of a Conceptual Plan for the development of the remaining vacant property that was formerly known as the Village Green Heights Townhomes North, now to be known as The Cottages at Village Green Heights. The land area is located north of Main Street at 47th Avenue and east of the extension of 98th Street. The petitioner is proposing to develop a total of 72 condominium units, which would include 38 single family buildings and 17 two family buildings. The Conceptual Plan is consistent with all previous approvals granted by the Village with the exception that there is a reduction of the number of units from 100 units to 72 units, and it now is proposed with a mixture of one- and two-unit homes.

The development will have four different ranch models ranging in size from 1,460 to 1,830 square feet and two story or Cape Cod style units ranging from 1,900 to 2,200 square feet. The housing units will provide for two or three bedrooms with first floor master bedrooms, two or 2.5 bathrooms, full basements, two car garages and covered porches. The site will be fully landscaped with lawn irrigation. It is anticipated that the units will range from \$270,000 to \$370,000. The developer anticipates starting construction on the required public improvements by the end of this summer and projects that the development will be completed within two to three and a half years. In addition, the developer has submitted draft Deed Restrictions, Covenants and Easements, along with conceptual elevations and floor plans for the proposed condominium buildings. And those elevations are shown on the screen right now.

With respect to Comprehensive Plan compliance and density, the proposed development is consistent with the Village's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, including the Village Green Neighborhood Plan. This development has a net density of six units per net acre. After the Preliminary Plat is approved and at such time that the Final Condominium Plat, required Certified Survey Map and Zoning Text and Map Amendment applications as noted below are submitted, an application to amend the 2035 Comprehensive Land Use Map will need to be submitted in order to remove the Urban Reserve land use designation and to correct the map to reflect the field delineated wetlands to ensure that the zoning map and the land use plan map are consistent.

With respect to the zoning of the property, the property is currently zoned R-8 (UHO). It's an Urban Two Family Residential District with an Urban Landholding Overlay District. At the same time that the Final Condominium Plat is considered, the staff will also recommend that the field delineated wetlands be rezoned into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, and the non-wetland areas of the development be zoned R-8 Urban Two-Family Residential District with a Planned Unit Development Overlay over the entire property. The R-8 District allows for no more than two units per building, and the PUD will allow for the creation of the condominium by having more than one building per parcel.

As originally discussed for this property, developing this site with a PUD overlay will allow for a modification of a few of the Village Zoning Ordinance requirements provided there is a defined benefit to the community. The PUD will allow for more than one building per property and slightly reduced setbacks provided that the multi-unit buildings are condominiums. All units

have individual entries with no common hallways. Exterior materials are maintenance free and include elements of natural stone or brick materials. Building types provide a common theme without being monotonous. Other community benefits include increased landscaping, improved quality of architectural standards, concrete sidewalks and concrete roads.

The Village staff will begin preparing a detailed PUD Ordinance for review by the developer and the Village Plan Commission and Village Board when the Final Plat is proposed. The required public hearing for the PUD will be held at the same time that the Plan Commission and the Board consider the Final Condominium Plat.

With respect to the wetlands on the property, on October 27, 2016, Lesley Brotkowski of TRC Solutions had field delineated the wetlands on the property as shown on the Conceptual Plan. There's .952 acre of wetland. The copy of the wetland delineation report and a copy of the written verification that the biologist reviewed from the Wisconsin Natural Resources Assured Biologist shall be submitted to the Village. The larger wetland area in the southeast corner of the site serves as the existing stormwater retention facility that was originally constructed in the mid-2000 by the previous developer, Land and Lakes.

The Village staff is recommending that the petitioner request a wetland exemption from the Wisconsin DNR for this retention facility to allow the retention facility to be maintained so it can continue to function as a retention facility as originally designed prior to applying and obtaining the Final Plat approval. If this exemption is obtained then the stormwater facility will not be rezoned into the C-1 designation as discussed above. It would be placed into the PR-1 designation.

Municipal Improvements: Municipal sanitary sewer and water shall be provided to serve all of the housing units within the development. As part of the Village Green Heights Addition #1 Subdivision, sanitary sewer was installed in a portion of this area to service the development including within Main Street and along the main north/south roadway which connects to the sanitary sewer to the Meadowdale Estates Addition #1 Subdivision to the northeast. So it essentially went to the north, and then it kind of curved to the east and then went directly north towards Meadowdale. So that sanitary sewer had been put in. The sanitary sewer is located within easements and will be located within the dedicated public right-of-way. Sanitary sewer infrastructure will be extended within the western extension of 98th Street and the looped roadway within the development.

Municipal water infrastructure will be installed within all of the public streets to service the development. The stormwater retention basin facility for this development has already been constructed and is located within the southeast corner of the site. The developer will be installing the public storm sewer main and drainage system improvements to serve this development. As discussed above, the developer shall request a wetland exemption from the DNR in order to allow this retention facility to continue to function as a facility as originally designed.

The Public roadways will be constructed pursuant to the Village specifications as noted in Chapter 405 of the municipal code, again with a slight adjustment with respect to the placement of the sidewalks as shown on the Conceptual Plan.

Transportation Improvement Fee: Pursuant to the attached Memorandum of Understanding that was executed with the Village in 2004 regarding the contributions of 165 transportation improvements, the developer of this property is responsible for the payment of \$50,000 at the time that the Village approves the Final Condominium Plat. In addition, at the time the building permit is issued the remaining \$50,000 shall be paid at \$694.44 per unit to the Village for future improvements to Highway 165.

Construction site access to the development for installing the roadway and the utility infrastructure and the buildings shall be from Highway 165 and should go north on 47th Avenue directly into the development. The other minor roadways with the Village Green Heights development shall be avoided with any and all heavy construction equipment.

With respect to platting and Certified Survey Map, in addition to the required Preliminary and Final Condominium Plat, a Certified Survey Map will be required to be approved to dedicate the public roadways, the required easements and to set forth additional restrictive covenants language. As part of the Final Condominium Plat and CSM approval, the developer shall execute the Development Agreement, provide all exhibits and provide a Letter of Credit as financial security to the Village as a guarantee for the installation, inspection and warranty of the public improvements. A draft of the CSM has been provided that shows the property will be divided into four parcels. Lot 1 will be 2.955 acres, Lot 2 will be 5.462 acres, Lot 3 will be 1.129 areas and Lot 4 will be 3.369 acres. These lots all correspond with the proposed phasing of the development.

Again, this is an area that we have looked at for a number of years since we started planning the Village Green Center and the downtown area of the Village. We started actually looking at that in 1992/93, and at that time we had made a very conscious decision that the area surrounding the downtown would have the most dense development, residential development. And as you continue to move outward from the downtown it would become less and less dense.

And when we looked at the development of this Village Green Heights development, we had looked at it very closely, and we had identified that not only the area that is on the east side of 47th Avenue south of Main Street would be developed with a condominium type product, the area north of that area would also be identified with condominiums. The intention, again, that they would be owner occupied but the units would be smaller, but they would still be maintained at a certain price point and still have quality development. But it would start to create a little bit more density as we get closer to the downtown. And a copy of the Village Green Neighborhood Plan is up on the screen as you can see right there.

We have worked, like I said, with Land and Lakes for years on this project. And in fact, I think we first met with them maybe in the year 2000. Obviously at this point they have an interest in selling this last quadrant of this development to somebody else to complete the project. And that developer is here this evening. He would like to make a further presentation to the Plan Commission to talk about the project, the timing, the units themselves and what they intend to create. He'll also go into some detail. He's done another project in the Village that we've all seen. It's called the Prairie Village Condominiums. A very nice development just north of this area. And it was very successful with respect to its development and maintaining of its property values. So with that I'd like to introduce the developer and his team to make a further presentation to the Plan Commission and the audience.

Tom Terwall:

We need your name and address, sir.

Doug Stanich:

I have one. Doug Stanich, and I live at 9125 Prairie Village Drive right now. Thank you for the opportunity to present this new product to you. And I just want to tell you and walk you through a little bit of what we plan on doing here. As Jean had mentioned, we were the developers of Prairie Village which comments made by people that currently live there and other people that are trying to live there that is one of the most successful condominium developments in Kenosha County. And my hope is that not only will this be as successful, but I honestly feel it will even be a little bit more successful.

One of the things that we're doing, a couple of the things that we're doing different here, when we started with Prairie Village if you remember from years back we had four-unit buildings, we had three-unit buildings and we had duplexes up front. And then as we moved through the phase we went to the back portion of it. And the last 55 units that we built there we built with only duplexes. And in the process I managed to squeeze in five single units back there.

And one of the things that I discovered in marketing it is those five single units, or the first four and a little cul-de-sac immediately popped and were sold immediately which gave me thought to the future. If I ever had the opportunity of doing this again and the market were right, I would come back with a little different type of a setup somewhere where I would present more of the single condominium units. But yet in the condominium association so that even those that have the single units don't have any exterior maintenance.

The exterior of the buildings will be completely maintained by the association which would include painting, new roofs, snow shoveling, snow plowing, lawn maintenance, vegetation maintenance throughout. And all of this would be part of the association itself. Something that we did with Prairie Village, and if any of you have driven through it you realize that that has turned out to be just a beautiful place to drive into.

A couple of the other things that we wanted to do here is that we wanted to make this more of a homey type of a thing. And know the Village now in their plans wanted to put in sidewalks. And we thought that was a good idea and something that we wouldn't fight. The other thing that we wanted to do was bring these a little bit closer to the street. And so we moved them a little bit closer. And in addition to that we put porches on every one of them. And the idea here is a little cafe table, something out front, and bring more of a feeling of community to this area. So that if you're out walking the dog or just out for a stroll that people will have a place to sit out in front under the canopies on the front. There are only a couple buildings that it doesn't have that feature.

Also on all of these there's a covered porch on the back of each one of these units. And another thing that we wanted to do and from the development that we did at Prairie Village and a couple other condo projects I've done, we wanted to make entrance egress to these units a little more simple. And one of the things that we've done is that there are no steps from the garage going

into the unit, no steps from the front porch going into the unit. You'll literally be able to walk up there on a slightly incline and step right into the unit. So if you get to the point that you need to push your little cart or a wheelchair or something like that, these units are easy in and easy out.

All of our units, even the two story units, will have all the master suites on the first floor, and roomy master suites. And that goes also with the ranch units. We are also planning on putting nine foot basements in these units. So if a person wanted to they could finish off the lower level. We'll rough in a bath in the lower level so if people wanted to do it they'll be able to finish them off.

The garage size is another thing. I happened to move out of my unit which has a very spacious garage and moved into a unit across the street that a neighbor allowed me to live in while we're moving. Hopefully we'll move into this sometime next spring. I noticed that one of the things I wanted was more larger garages. And all of these units have bigger garages than I had at Prairie Ridges. With the larger garages some of them will be a little bit larger than a 20, a 24 by 24, so plenty of space. And the idea there, too, is that you don't want stuff cluttering in the yard and leaving cars out where you can't get your grill and bicycles and other things. And this will bring everything in.

A couple of the other features that we're going to do is that we've created four different elevations for each one of these units. So a person can pick and choose the elevation that they want on the front of the unit. And we come in with the contemporary or arts and crafts, sort of a French provincial and a colonial unit so that they'll have different units that they can pick.

The other thing that I'm doing a little bit different here, and I picked up this idea from what we did in Phase 1 out at Bristol Bay, if you ever drove through there we had some very strong colors. And we varied them. But we were trying to create a whole different feel with that unit. Here we're going to have different colorations, different stone, brick and stuff where we stayed with one theme in Prairie Village, so there will be some variation from it. Our driveways will be concrete driveways so it gives more of an upscale feel to it.

And one of the things that I'm concerned with is if we're putting this into a neighborhood that already has a range of value let's say from upwards of maybe \$600,000, \$700,000 is you want to bring a product into that neighborhood that's not going to distract from it but actually will enhance it. This is just part of the whole neighborhood concept, bringing in a different product, something that for people that are empty nesters or whoever it may be, people that don't have children and want something where there's no maintenance. This type of a product will give them that feel.

So we feel that we're presenting and we have something that's going to be extremely unique. And the people that I've shown this to so far have been very, very enthusiastic about it. So a little more of an open concept than what we had at Prairie Village. Your kitchens and your living area will have an open feel to it. Bedrooms will be divided from side to side on the home. So it has a little bit different feel than what we have. It is a completely new product. I'd be open to any questions that any of you have. I'd also like to introduce Fouad Saab. There he is. And Fouad is the designer of these units. And I'm going to have him talk a little bit about what we did as far as engineering and the units that he designs. Fouad?

Fouad Saab:

Good evening. My name is Fouad Saab, Saab Designs, 1630 Church Street, Wauwatosa. Doug didn't leave anything for me to say. Way too much. I do want to go back a little bit to point out a few things that we have to work with on the site plan if possible. What we did is basically the existing site plan was platted originally for all two-unit condominium throughout. And we had some restrictions to work with.

One of the restrictions that some of the utilities were already in the street. The road were already kind of carved out. 47th Avenue was already in all the way up to the cul-de-sac. 98th Street was already in. The utilities that I'm talking about and the roadway, so the only thing we could carve out, and there was two cul-de-sacs. One is on Provence Court on the end, and one where that eye drop where you go into the court. So there were two cul-de-sacs. So what we did is we took the cul-de-sacs out trying to make it easier for people to maneuver rather than just going in and circling. And that's what I want to point out because we tried to pull as much as we can away from the single family areas as much as we can, but we were also bounded by what's in the street. And so those are some of the confinement to the site that we had to work with.

Also what we tried to do is knowing that we want to do something a little unique, two-units and single units, and we introduced the 28 single family units as the condos it's also to create a little more dynamics within the subdivision itself, yet make an extension of the single family subdivision. So kind of transition slowly to it. So we dispersed the single and the double throughout as you can see wherever we can. Again, there's so many circles and radiuses throughout this, this is the little tiny subdivision that had so many circles and radiuses, that when you do the radiuses you loose so much on the setback and the site setbacks as well. So we were also trying to be conscious about how we place all these units to the best that we can and give it a little bit more variation. So you'd have single, double, whatever as you go out and kind of give it a different feel.

We also wanted to make it more of a pedestrian so for walking. So we introduced the sidewalks on both sides of the road, not just one side. And we brought the units as Doug alluded to closer so to give it a bit more urban feel. So we can concentrate the landscaping in the front rather than just a bunch of grass and one tree or a light pole. So we're trying to give it a bit more of a year round vegetation so it's much more friendly to the eye and more pleasing for people to walk and meander around.

Going back to the units themselves, we tried to create a different architectural theme for all the units, yet make them smaller in scale, not to be tall. So most of them they feel like ranch, and we've added almost it feels like a bonus room on the second floor rather than just a big monstrous roof lines. So we tried to keep the pitches of the roof at 6:12 except in the French country style where it's more 12:12 pitch to give it a little bit more of that feel.

So we created a different variety of architectural themes. So as you walk around, you live in there, you're not going to the same, oh, I think I live here, oh, maybe I'm here. So we create different looks so people don't get confused. Also, we tried to design them in a way there are zero tolerance in terms of grade difference. So as you walk in from the garage you roll into the house. From the front door to the sidewalk you roll in. There's no steps whatsoever unless you

go into the unit itself going down to the basement you'll have steps. Or if you decided to use the second floor as an option you'll have stairs to take you up there.

But all of them have the master bedroom on the first floor. They're very open concept. There are really a lot of windows. Different materials we tried to integrate into it to feel like its part of the subdivision, an extension of Village Green as well. So at this point I'll leave it here. If you have any questions I'll be more than happy to answer them.

Tom Terwall:

Doug, rather than as questions at this point because this is a public hearing I'm going to open it up to the public, and then we'll come back with questions from the Commissioners and staff.

Doug Stanich:

That's fine, very good.

Tom Terwall:

This is a matter for public hearing. Is there anybody wishing to speak? Yes, sir? Give us your name and address, sir.

Rick Beasley:

Rick Beasley, address is 9817 48th Avenue or Lot 205 on there. My question would be to these guys with pertaining to sidewalks. It looks like you're planning on cutting down either, A, the road at the upper left of the picture there which would be cutting into my lot. And, two, would also be the setback from the house behind me because you'd only be ten feet off my property line. I'm curious about that.

[Inaudible]

Rick Beasley:

Upper left, Lot 205. Yes, ma'am. It looks like there's sidewalks that go straight directly next to my house.

[Inaudible]

Rick Beasley:

Yeah, there is no sidewalk there.

[Inaudible]

Rick Beasley:

Correct, and this is where the road is.

[Inaudible]

Rick Beasley:

Okay, so they're going to shorten it down then as far as the --

[Inaudible]

Rick Beasley:

Is there any way to push that back?

[Inaudible]

Rick Beasley:

Because I see everybody else below has 25 feet.

[Inaudible]

Rick Beasley:

I guess all I would ask for is a reconsideration to make it 25 feet go all the way [inaudible].

[Inaudible]

Rick Beasley:

Thank you, appreciate it.

Tom Terwall:

Anybody else?

Ashley Latz:

Good evening. My name is Ashley Latz, and I live at 9956 48th Avenue, Pleasant Prairie. This is also regarding the development that's coming into my neighborhood. My husband and I recently built a home in Village Green Heights. And what attracted us to the neighborhood was that it had a very strong association, and the fact that all the homes around us were very different, and they were all kept distinctly different. Also, a quiet, family friendly neighborhood.

Recently we received notice that a new phase called the Cottages at Village Green was going to be proposed for our neighborhood. While I understand the development of our community is important, I'm hoping you will consider some of our concerns regarding this proposed plan. First, Village Green already has multi-dwelling units. In looking through the sales of those, I'm not reassured that this type of community within Village Green would be successful. In 2006 the

Sagewood Condominiums at Village Green Heights were built. Of the 16 proposed buildings only two have been built. Why is that? If multi-dwelling units of this type were in such high demand why has this project not been completed? When driving through our neighborhood you'll notice those remaining lots remain vacant, and often you will find debris and other building supplies sitting on those vacant lots.

In 2009 a two bedroom condo was listed for \$319,000. In 2015 the same condo was sold for \$173,000. That's a decrease of \$146,000. Can we expect the same type of decrease in the proposed Cottages of Village Green? I also have additional concerns about the possible negative impact on property values of Village Green homes that will back up to those proposed cottages. As one of my neighbors was speaking here, if you look out of his home I can't imagine that anyone in this room would appreciate having someone ten feet from their property line. When your home has beautiful windows in the back and you're looking basically right into your neighbor's home I can't imagine that anyone in this room would appreciate that.

How can you ensure that the homes on the west side of this development won't be negatively impacted by this lower cost housing? Our home values on 48th Avenue and 101st Street are in the half million dollar and above range. Second, one of our biggest questions is who will govern this space? Will it be under the direction of our current association or its own association? Our association has bylaws that ensures every home is built and reviewed and approved. This development has homes of similar design, and this development will include both side-by-side units and single family homes. With the growth of our neighborhood why not just continue the single family homes as you spoke about how well they were selling in our community that you had previously built?

Instead, the plan for these small side-by-side units to be directly behind a row of stately homes. When looking over the proposed site plan the design of it seems a little disconnected. Single family homes are wedged between side-by-side units. For instance, you have two side-by-side units, a single family home, four side-by-side units, a single family home, two side-by-side units, three single family homes, etc. In my opinion it just doesn't seem like a well thought out design.

Third, adding an additional 72 units will increase the traffic flow, while I do appreciate that you did come down from the original 100. With so many young children in our neighborhood safety is a concern. Another safety concern is knowing that smaller, low cost units have a greater chance of becoming rental units. Could this type of development turn into a number of rental properties? If so, we know that that will surely bring down our property values. There are still many unanswered questions regarding this proposed development. I can only hope that you will take our concerns into consideration and work with our community in good faith as the review process for this proposed plan moves forward. Thank you so much for your time.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. Is there anybody else? Yes, sir?

Mike Hughes:

Mike Hughes, 9957 48th Avenue, Pleasant Prairie. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I do have a handout if I could possibly share it with the Plan Commission.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you.

Mike Hughes:

I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight, and I will be brief. As a 30 year veteran of municipal [inaudible] I know how long these things can drag on, so I'll try to go through it quickly. But I am available for questions or a phone call if you ever have any. As my neighbor just alluded to I think my first concern is really viability. I read through some of the documentation, and under the developer's conceptual plan application there's a section called why now. And I'm guessing its why is this development needed now and is viable I guess. And the response was, and I'm quoting, as one agent said to me if you had 40 units I could sell them right now. Where the owner of a recent private sale commented that if he had a dozen units they all would have sold. Somewhat anecdotal from my perspective.

Also under the why now section the developer states low interest rates coupled with growing baby boomers' desire to scale down. I don't know what that was based on. But of the single family home lots on the west side of the property there, there are six of them, four of them sold and three of them are baby boomers including me. So we are three empty nesters out of the four there. So I actually did buy there to downsize. And I'm the third lot up from the bottom there.

So my biggest concern as my neighbor just alluded to is the Sagewood Condominium situation. I know that was built in 2007, bumped into 2008, and that was rough times. But those have not been picked up and run with in the last ten years. And they're really nice looking building, they are some nice residents, but for some reason I don't think the market is there for them. I have driven the Prairie Village West. It really is a nice development. It's very neatly done, it's well designed, and I think it's pretty well done. But my biggest concern is there's not a market for it. It can be nice, but if no one wants to buy it. And I'm not a real estate expert by any means, but I do have access to the MLS and I did a little research. And definitely I could be wrong on this, but in my research in the last 24 months there's been 14, quote, attached single units sold. And of those 13 have been what I would call traditional condos, multi-units. And one was what I would call traditional duplex.

I know this whole thing is a condominium with two family buildings and one family building. So I guess my vernacular is duplex and single family. So of those 14 that I could find 13 were what I would call single family and one was -- or 13 were normal condominium units and one was a duplex. I could totally be wrong, I'm not an expert on this. But I would just someone has done a market analysis because none of us wants to end up with a Sagewood again. It's sort of a blight on the community. It would be a loser for the neighbors, it would be a loser for the Village, and it would be a loser for the developer. Maybe it's been done and I just haven't seen it. But I would strongly encourage some market analysis prior to moving forward.

And then I'll be brief on these other sections. My next concern, again, is the adjacencies of duplexes and single family homes. On the second page you can see as actually alluded to there's a mixture of single family and duplexes in my vernacular within that pod which seems a little unusual to me. Normally you're stepping zoning from a less dense to a more dense and it's

incremental. Here the northeast part is all single, west is single family, south is actually single family, and there's sort of a hodgepodge in the middle. My recommendation would be take the multi family, the duplexes and maybe move them more towards the east and north away from the single family.

With 38 single family homes and 17 duplexes it seems to me it could be reconfigured. And I did see in the staff report there was already some suggestions to possibly realign some of the duplexes, shift them around within the subdivision to get more single family [inaudible]. So I appreciate staff catching that and making that recommendation.

My third area of concern is sort of quality of the project. Again, I did like the Prairie Village West, but I saw a few things in this that sort of concern me. One is the gabion wall entryway off of Main Street there. Being in construction my whole life, prior city engineer, director of public works, gabion baskets to me they're more of a utilitarian industrial use for retaining walls on highways, railroads. I know they can be sort of done architecturally, but the gabion baskets shown in the picture to me look like regular gabion baskets, and they're not the most attractive thing. I think a bolder wall would make a more grand entrance into the subdivision.

And then just sort of a lack of planting. Now, maybe there's a more detailed planting plan that I haven't seen, a landscaping plan. But I note along the west and south property line there's about 1,000 feet there, and I only see about five trees and several areas of bushes and plantings. I think that could be increased.

And then my fourth area of concern which is sort of a generalization, but I am concerned about the state of the erosion control out there. I did walk around this weekend, and that wetland retention area has currently got silt in it. So I think there could be some measures to step up some of the erosion control to keep the whole area neater. But, again, I have these concerns, but my basic concern is viability, because if it's not a viable project then none of these things will come to fruition. And none of us wants to see this be unsuccessful. I'd rather have it go in and be successful than get started and fail. so that's what I have to say. Appreciate the time.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you. Anybody else? Anybody else? Hearing none I'm going to open it to comments and questions from Commissioners. Yes?

Jim Bandura:

A question to Doug. You're going to market these for baby boomers, am I correct, like a 55 plus community?

Doug Stanich:

Not necessarily totally 55, but typically that's who ends up moving into this. These are people that are downsizing, people that are empty nesters now, and maybe not use the word baby boomers but empty nesters. And then there are couples that just don't have children that would like something like this.

Jim Bandura:

I for one am thinking of trying to not cut any more grass or shovel any more snow. Now, Jean mentioned that this is going to be owner occupied?

Doug Stanich:

Yes.

Jim Bandura:

In the declarations it mentions tenants of owners and leases. So I guess I'm a little leery of that. I'd like to see owner occupied.

Doug Stanich:

Yeah, I can assure you that these are not rental units. You're not going to spend \$270,000 to rent these out.

Jim Bandura:

Right.

Doug Stanich:

The reason that that language is in there is, first of all, there are instances where somebody may have to leave the county or a job may take them away for a year or something like that. And we want to make a provision inside of this that allows them to rent that up. Obviously anybody that's rented up this has to all be screened if it is somebody. And it would be approved. That tenant would have to be approved by the association. And I would just say this. You're going to rent these units, and these units would rent up because I just rented for a friend of mine that has single family homes, I just rented three of them for \$1,800 apiece. I would say that these units would rent somewhere in the vicinity of the low twos. You're going to bring in quality tenants if, indeed, there ever comes a need to do something like that. But we need to leave that provision in there because there are incidents where somebody may need to have somebody in there for a couple of months or a year.

Jim Bandura:

Would it be advisable to write that provision in with some kind of --

Doug Stanich:

Yeah, the actual final draft of this will have that in.

Jim Bandura:

Okay, okay. One other issue I had. I know that the neighborhood would like to see it less dense up against their properties. I know that you have single units. Maybe if you did get the single units up against their property.

Doug Stanich:

You know, we have moved things around so many times on this site to try to accommodate and try to keep at least the density that we do have that really it would be difficult to move them around. We moved them all over the place and finally came to this reiteration of it. And this gives us the ability -- literally when Fouad Saab mentioned something about there's inches involved in this, placing things in there because of the curved roads and everything really involves having to be able to place those so precisely in there.

Jim Bandura:

I can understand the curved roads, yeah.

Fouad Saab:

What I alluded originally is that these roads are already set in place. So the utilities were already in there. We did look at single family in that area, actually tried to get more single family in the whole subdivision. But we couldn't because of the setbacks that were infringed on us based on the 25 foot setback and all that kind of stuff. So these units, actually, the two units are the shortest units that we could get in, like depth front to back, the two units. The single are a little bigger because they have a little bit more room in them.

When we originally had a 15 foot setback in the back we could fit a single back there. But then when it was increased to 25 feet we had to take them out and put what can fit there as a two units because of the shallow depth. And the roads are dictating. I can't move the road. The road that's kind of working against us in terms of moving things around.

Jim Bandura:

So what you're saying is you've got them numbered, unit 55 type D, the type D is less deep?

Fouad Saab:

Yeah, the D is the shortest unit that we could get to fit in there, they smallest. They're 1,500 square feet per unit.

Jim Bandura:

Okay, I can understand the ten foot easement.

Fouad Saab:

In all honesty the Village has the back of them a really low roof line, single [inaudible].

Jim Bandura:

I can see where the design of your housing, your single and your duplex units are coming from. And, again, as a baby boomer I really think this is good for the Village. I had the opportunity to go out to Phoenix, and all of a sudden this came up in front of us, and I was looking at the floor plans submitted to us, and it requires a lot of similarities. And to have that grade right to it I believe that's a good idea.

Fouad Saab:

Believe me we tried everything. We put ourselves in the shoes of the single family residences as well. That's why we have 38 singles. We were shooting for more. But because of the density of trying to make this economically to just balance itself. We're putting so much in terms of landscaping that's not shown. Maybe you see a few [inaudible], but each unit has an individual landscape plan very lush on the front. In the back we have to create some swales and whatever. This is a very challenging plan for us in terms of slope. So we tried to minimize building plans, the approach to it as minimal as possible to make sure [inaudible].

Jim Bandura:

A question to Doug. There was mention of doing a survey or marketing survey or seeing if this was viable.

Doug Stanich:

You know, that's a very interesting question. I will say this, I've been in the real estate business for 42 years now. And I've been developing for approximately 30 years. And alluding to Sagewood I can tell you that what happened starting in '05, I'll give you the month, October of '05 is when the market started to contract. And it just nosedived. And by '08 those of us that were in the development industry were sucking some serious wind. It got horrible. And what happens is that typically markets -- about every seven years a market will get a little dip. It will stay down for about ten months, and then it will start to take off again. And I can go historically and I can show you that.

But this was very unusual. This was not a slowdown. This was an outright depression in the market. And it hurt a lot of us including myself. And I had several different developments. In fact, we had a development that was shovel ready and we scrapped several of them at the last minute because of what was happening at that time. We're in a different time frame right now. In the United States on average on any given day the number of new households that are formed are somewhere in the vicinity of around 2,700 to 2,800 new households formed every day. If you equate that out and run it, and that's 365 days out of the year, that would be a requirement of bringing in about over a million new housing units over a year period in the marketplace.

What happened for almost a ten year period of time here the market sucked and it went way down. And the inventory that had been over built in the '05, '06 range obviously was consumed. And that's part of the problem that happened. And I blame a lot of the reason that some of this stuff sold as low as it did on banks that bought this stuff up or took it back, and then they decided -- the feds came in and said you have to get rid of it, you have to write these things down and dump them. And dumping started to happen and that hurt the market. The market has changed, and it's come back substantially.

I think it was Mike that alluded to -- I had an agent, several agents in real estate, I used to own the Remax office in this area, and our office did more business than number two, number three, and number four combined. So I had a good handle on what was happening in the market. And I was a statistical sort of a person. I loved to take a look at numbers and see what was happening and try to analyze what's happening in the business.

I had an agent call me up about a year and half ago and he said are you going to do anything new, or do you know of anybody that's going to sell out there because I'm telling you right now I've got four clients that would love to move into Prairie Village but we can't get anything, there's nothing for sale out there. A couple of the units that recently sold, we had one sell, a neighbor of mine -- by the way I lived in Prairie Village, and I lived there for 15 years, and I plan on living in this. I plan on being your neighbors. And I can guarantee you one thing, I like things nice. And what we're going to do here is going to be nice. This is not low cost housing. These are smaller units that cost more because we're going to put more into them. The style, the construction, the materials that we use. And the finishings on the inside are all going to be more upscale.

This is for people that -- sure, we want -- I just moved out of a 4,200 square foot condo. And I lived in a 5,500 square foot home. I've built some very, very beautiful homes in this area and mainly in Pleasant Prairie. So I understand the concerns that people would have. I would not even consider doing something that would affect the value of anything else in this market. This type of a product it's a different product. And it's going to sell for more money than it typically would, and it will have value. It will enhance the area because it will have its own value for what it is. It's not going to distract and pull down the value of other homes in the neighborhood. I just don't see it.

And my experience, and I've been involved in the sale of I think somewhere in the vicinity of 30,000 homes in the Kenosha County area, so I have some handle on what's going on. And another thing I'd like to point out is there's a liability on my part, too. I'm not going to start a project again, and I've waited, you can check with Mr. Hanley, I talked to him for how many years, eons, and we talked about this project probably three, maybe four years ago. And it was nice because I'd call him up and we'd have lunch, and I'd have him buy, of course, and we'd get together and talk about this.

But it had to be the right time. And the market right now is ripe for this type of a product. There's a lot happening in this area. I just talked to an agent yesterday, he was selling single family homes. And I said what are you seeing in the subdivision that you're working in? And I said what percentage of your buyers are probably from Illinois? She said, man, over 50 percent of them that are coming and buying in this area are Illinois. Now, I would say this, I would say that probably 40 to 50 percent of these units will probably come from people that want to cross the line and get out of the quagmire that they're dealing with south of the border. And they're

going to look at this as a real value even though a lot of Kenosha County residents may get a little bit of sticker shock as we move into this, but that is reality today and that's what the cost is going to be.

But my concern is to do something that I can be proud of. Something that when I walk down the street like I do where I live I'm not ashamed of anything that I did there. Was it perfect? Absolutely not. Are there things that we did there that I would never do again? Absolutely. And we've made those corrections in this. We're going to do something that not only are the people around it going to say, you know what, that's nice, but you as a Village are going to say that's nice also. We're going to do something that will be very nice. Any other questions?

Jim Bandura:

I can see baby boomers that live in Kenosha County or in general that have family living in and around this area, I could see them possibly moving into this.

Doug Stanich:

Oh, yeah, definitely so. My neighbor three doors down, I think I may have started to say this but didn't finish what I wanted to share with you, sold as a unit on his own. Just advertised it, I forget where, Craig's List or somewhere in Illinois, he had 12 calls. And he told me, he says, Doug, if I had 12 of these units I'm telling you I could have sold all of them. That sort of spurred me along. And that was a little over a year and a half ago. And I realize that we're coming to the point now where we're at a critical point in our community. We have no housing to start to move into. We need to start developing things, and this is a product that's needed for the area. So with that I can say that it will be something that will be nice. I can tell you that I'm into vegetation. I like a lot of it. And we're going to be doing a lot of screening and peek-a-boo type stuff in this area. And it will be something that will enhance the area, not distract.

Jim Bandura:

Since this is a somewhat new product, have you seen this in any other areas around like Racine County, Walworth County, any of that in real estate?

Doug Stanich:

Not exactly like this. When we started this I wanted to create something different. I wanted to have something that was a little bit unique. And I don't want to just say a step up from what we did at Prairie Village. But I believe that this answers some of the questions and situations that I wanted to have a little bit different. So these units are going to bring some freshness and a different look.

Tom Terwall:

Doug, when I moved into Prairie Village 15 years ago it was legal to rent, you can rent your unit out subject to the approval of the Board. For the last nine years I've been on the Board of Directors, and the association that you're being asked to the owners made us change it so you can't rent anymore. It's owner occupied, period. And I would encourage you to do that here.

Doug Stanich:

Yeah, there's been some discussion on that, even discussion in our meeting with staff about that. And there were some concerns about locking it out totally. But I will tell you, Tom, there are some instances where you want to leave a little bit of space in there for somebody that has a situation. And God forbid that we ever go into a market like we started in '05, '06, '07 going up to '13 and even '14, again. Because I don't care what you own, that value will slide like it did here and everywhere. So I understand what you're saying, Tom. And I know that was rewritten in there. But that's something that we'll definitely take a closer look at as we share this.

Bill Stoebig:

Because this is a condo style development, any idea what HOA fees will be at some stage of the game?

Doug Stanich:

I'm sorry?

Bill Stoebig:

Because this is a condo development, any estimate on HOA fees?

Doug Stanich:

Yeah, okay, that's a good question, that's a very good question. Currently I would say this would be very, very similar to Prairie Village. And Prairie Village current monthly fee is \$235. What I'm seeing and the figures that I'm running right now put us right very close to that.

Deb Skarda:

Thank you for your passion.

Doug Stanich:

You're welcome.

Deb Skarda:

It seems like you're very excited about it. So tell me a little about -- so one of the comments we heard from some of the current homeowners is the association and the two associations working together. So tell me a little bit about your thoughts on that. So Village Green association, either a partnership so that there's some good alignment.

Doug Stanich:

As an association, the association would be willing to work I'm sure with anybody. Obviously the most important thing is for the entire neighborhood to have continuity and to keep it as nice as you possibly can. Our association is a little bit different than their association. Their association it doesn't cut the grass, it doesn't pay their building insurance, it doesn't set money aside for future roof replacement. We do all of that. That's all going to be had in there. There are some little nuances that we might be able to share with them. But even around our pond we're going to be doing a lot of vegetation and making that look very, very nice. We'll put a fountain in there. Across and around the association we'll put as much vegetation as we can to give it a sort of closed village feel to it, but do it with vegetation rather than with fences.

Deb Skarda:

And then the other question I had was tell me a little bit about the speed for which where you're going to start building and how fast do you think this will all build up from a sequencing perspective.

Doug Stanich:

I'm sorry.

Deb Skarda:

So sequencing perspective, where do you think that you'll start building and how will it build out?

Doug Stanich:

Phase 1 will be the loop drive. We'll have 32 units in Phase 1.

Deb Skarda:

And you're just going to do Phase 1 and not start until you fill out Phase 1?

Doug Stanich:

Yeah. We'll do Phase 1. And I suspect -- I probably have 12 or better names right now of people that said I'm very interested in this project. So once we get a little bit further down the road and we get our hard numbers we'll start taking reservations on it. I can tell you the last phase that we did where you live Tom we built 55 units. I had 25 of them sold before we put a shovel in the ground. I'm not saying that we'll have that here, but I'm looking for probably 10 to 12, maybe more. And if the pace is above what I anticipate, one and a half to two a month, it could get up to three, if it gets up to that phase we'll be working and may combine the last two phases together just as a second phase. Phase 2 goes up 47th, and it goes up into the cul-de-sac. And then Phase 3 would be 98th Avenue connecting from 47th going north or west, yeah, going west.

Michael Serpe:

Lately if you've been paying attention to what's going on with Pleasant Prairie and Kenosha County we have Uline that is expanding tremendously in this area with high paying jobs. Now we have Haribo coming in with high paying jobs and 400 employees. Uline has I don't know how many employees, many of them living out of hotels temporarily. The need for housing in this area is tremendous. And I understand when there's change in a beautiful area that people are concerned, and you have every right to be concerned. I know developers that have come to our staff with proposals that never came to the Plan Commission because they knew we wouldn't accept it. Those never made it here. The last thing I would want this Plan Commission to do or the Board to do would be approving something that wasn't good for the Village. And I don't think we've done that yet. If we have somebody has to point it out to me where we went wrong.

We're quite proud of what we have, and we want to continue that. I personally think this project is going to be a plus for the Village, it's going to be a plus for your area. I know Doug personally, and what he said tonight is nothing but the truth. He does fine work, beautiful work. My wife's in part-time real estate, and there's no inventory. There's nothing out there right now. The *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel* had an article on the front page of the paper Sunday, prices of houses are skyrocketing because there's none available. So there is a need here. And I think it's going to work out well for the Village. And I think it's going to work out well for your neighborhood as well.

Jeremy Baumann:

My name is Jeremy Baumann, 9943 53rd Court, Pleasant Prairie. I would just have a comment about the owner occupancy and the recommendation potentially. Coming from living in condominiums for a number of years, ten plus years, we had the same concerns about leasing versus owner occupant. One of the things we put in the bylaws that it was a percentage of home within that condominium association that could actually lease. So it may alleviate some of the concerns that you have but still provide some alleviation whether the market goes or you have people coming in and out, the max 10 percent, 20 percent, something so that we as residents of Village Green Heights aren't concerned about completely turning into rental.

Tom Terwall:

Good point. Thank you.

Jim Bandura:

And pushing to Jean in some of our developments we had done that, am I correct?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mm-hmm, yes we have. And those developments have about a 20 percent leasable provision. And there are extended provisions that talk about blood relatives or married relatives and so on and so forth. And then there's also provisions that talk about hardship situations as well. But in any event in order to lease or rent you do need to go through the condominium board for approval.

Jim Bandura:

Good, good.

Wayne Koessler:

Mr. Chairman, I've gone through this about three times in detail. And it all comes down to me one thing. This is a conceptual plan. It's going to be back before this Commission a few more times before it's finally approved. And the staff has laid out about 31 conditions that the developer has to go through and come back to them with answers and make sure they're set. So I'm going to be in favor of this at this time.

Tom Terwall:

Is that in the form of a motion?

Wayne Koessler:

I'll make that motion. And that's subject to the above comments made by staff in the following 31 conditions.

Jim Bandura:

And I will second your motion.

Tom Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY WAYNE KOESSL AND SECONDED BY JIM BANDURA TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN.

Jim Bandura:

Do we have questions from Jean?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

I just wanted to add a couple of other things. Back in the early 2000s we did a very detailed, lengthy transportation impact analysis with the developer that needed to be approved by the Village as well as the DOT, Department of Transportation. And at that time that detailed transportation analysis made an assumption of full build out development and what improvements would be needed and what costs would need to be borne by the developer and what interconnections needed to be made. One of those interconnections that has now been made, it was made last year, was that interconnection of Cooper Road to the north/northeast towards Devonshire. So the intention is that we are continuing to work on our transportation system. And when this was initially proposed as part of that TIA it was envisioned that there be 100 units here as opposed to 72 units.

So with respect to the transportation analysis that was done and vetted out. And there is memorandums of agreement with the Village and the DOT and with the DOT and the previous developer which are still in place. So for that reason additional transportation fees have to be provided by the developer at the time of closing of the plat as well as with each unit that is built. And certain improvements need to continue to be made. And as it hits certain trigger marks with the DOT and the Village other improvements are made along 165. And we've been making those over the last several years, whether they be roundabouts or other improvements. So that has been completely vetted out throughout our process over the last 15, 20 years.

One other thing is we can't really mix the declarations between single family and condominium. There's a separate statute for condominium declarations. But we can incorporate some of the elements, and the declarations that they have submitted are in draft form. And I have been working through our attorney, and we do need to introduce and make sure that everything that's on the plat is in those declarations and the bylaws so that the new tenants that are residents that move in there understand what those regulations are. One of the biggest thing obviously is taking care of those common areas, whether it's stormwater management or the sidewalks or landscaping or the grass or trees, any of those things, those all do need to be addressed, and those will all have to be all vetted out and detailed so that every owner that moves in there knows what their responsibility is.

In addition, with respect to the fees that someone had a question about, that's a hefty fee. Every month someone's going to have to pay that \$235 or more in order to guarantee and make sure that all of these common area are properly taken care of and maintained by the developer.

And I think there was one or two other things that I wanted to just touch base on. For a single family home the setbacks are 10 feet for a side setback, 25 foot rear setback. So whether it's looking at some of these single family homes or single family condos that's what the setbacks are. I did mention in the staff comments that I do want to visit with them about possibly making some adjustments here or there with respect to some of the units. But this is kind of an interesting concept, and it has worked in other area, Milwaukee, Mequon, Brookfield where there is a mixture of these ones and twos. Because everybody is owner occupied. And whether or not your unit's a little bit bigger or a little bit smaller it has worked to put these side-by-side.

And so when they introduced this concept to us we felt that this is a concept that could work, and it could work here in Pleasant Prairie. It doesn't have to be just single family, single family, single family and then two family. It's okay to intersperse them if everyone is maintaining and meeting the same regulations, same requirements, and same fees. That's ownership. People want to protect their investment whether it's a side-by-side or it's a single unit. And, yes, the Village staff has been supportive of this concept. And, again, when we first started laying out the Village Green Center and the developments adjacent to it along with the neighborhood planning, we felt for a very, very long time that eventually this would transition nicely into that area.

With respect to Sagewood that has recently changed hands. There's a developer or owner that owns it. I have met with probably ten different people that tried to purchase it, and the Village was not satisfied with what they wanted to do with it. So that's why it hasn't developed. That's why it hasn't changed because we didn't want to lower the standard. We didn't want to change the rules midstream. And we didn't want it to look less quality than what is next door. So

eventually that will develop and someone will do something there. But the economy was very tough on condominiums and different types of development along with single family for years. And that's why that inventory of 600, 700 vacant available plants that the Village had in 2006 to 2007 that's depleted. I mean we're between 60 and 80 I think lots that are currently available, and that's throughout the entire Village.

So there is a need, and with job growth and creation we do need to have opportunities for people to actually live in the community that they work in. And so we are looking for different opportunities, but it needs to be quality, and it needs to be a nice opportunity for anybody who wants to relocate or to move within the Village. We don't want to force out our older population, and I'm saying anyone probably 45 to 70 to 80, we don't want to force them out of our community. We want to create opportunities for them to stay in the community should they choose to do that, and this kind of gives that opportunity, or the young, upcoming individuals that maybe have no children. I think the demographic here is a little bit different than a typical single family home. And I think he's got a target market that is just going to -- I think they will fill it rather quickly based on all the conversations that we have had and my staff has had with people coming to the Village.

Tom Terwall:

Thank you, Jean. I'll repeat then we have a motion and a second to send a favorable recommendation to the Village board to approve the Conceptual Plan subject to the terms and conditions outlined in the staff memorandum. All in favor signify by saying aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

B. Consider approval of Final Site and Operational Plans for the request of Jason Lueders, of Zilber Properties Group for the construction of a 72,324 square foot speculative industrial building and associated site improvements on the vacant property generally located at the northwest corner of 102nd Street and 78th Avenue to be known as Zilber Industrial 1.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Plan Commission, this item is Consider approval of Final Site and Operational Plans for the request of Jason Lueders, of Zilber Properties Group for the construction of a 72,324 square foot speculative industrial building and associated site improvements on the vacant property generally located at the northwest corner of 102nd Street and 78th Avenue to be known as Zilber Industrial 1.

The petitioner is requesting approval of Final Site and Operational Plans for the construction of a 72,324 square foot speculative industrial building and associated site improvements on the vacant

property generally located at the northwest corner of 102nd Street and 78th Avenue to be known as Zilber Industrial 1.

On November 28, 2016, the Plan Commission conditionally approved Preliminary Site and Operational Plans for this development. The Preliminary Site and Operational Plans approval allowed the petitioner to make applications to begin mass grading, footing and foundations and for the underground utilities to be installed. Based on their economics they chose not to begin this project last fall but to wait until Final Site and Operational Plans have been approved by the Plan Commission.

No occupants have been identified for this building, however the building is designed for a warehouse, distribution and/or manufacturing tenant. The building is proposed to have six dock locations expandable to 13 on the north side of the building with two drive-in doors and a total of 71 parking spaces including four handicapped accessible parking spaces on the south side of the building. Note if a single tenant occupies more than 50 percent of this building, they will need to come back to the Plan Commission for Site and Operational Plan approval.

Building Setbacks: The property is in the M-2, General Manufacturing District. This requires the building to meet the following minimum setback requirements:

- Street setback: minimum of 40 feet from the public streets which is 78th Avenue and 102nd Street.
- Side and rear setback: 45 feet minimum.

Setback for parking areas which includes parking spaces, maneuvering lanes and fire lanes it's measured from the back of curb, that will be a minimum of 20 feet required from all property lines. In addition, parking areas shall not be located within any easements unless express written approval is allowed by the easement holder.

The existing driveway access on 102nd Street shared with the property owner to the west is allowed which they will have cross-access between the two. A 20 foot setback then would not be required at that location. This southern entrance will be for employees and visitors. Truck access, again, to this site will be from a separate access on the north side of the building off of 78th Avenue which we discussed last fall.

The Village staff has evaluated the separate spacing of the truck entrance off 78th Avenue and have determined that this location is acceptable due to the limited traffic on 78th Avenue. Open space, the M-2 District requires that at a minimum 25 percent of the site must be open space. The site does provide 31 percent open space. They are projecting to begin this project sometime in late April, early May. The preconstruction meeting is scheduled for the second week of April. And at this time they are proposing work diligently and have the project completed by late fall of 2017. The staff recommends approval of the Site and Operational Plan subject to the comments and conditions as outlined in the staff memorandum. There's representation here in case you have any additional questions.

Tom Terwall:

Comments or questions from the Commission?

Jim Bandura:

Move approval.

Michael Serpe:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY JIM BANDURA AND SECONDED BY MICHAEL SERPE TO APPROVE THE FINAL SITE AND OPERATIONAL PLAN SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

C. Consider the request Zilber Properties Group for approval of a Lot Line Adjustment of approximately 1,916 square foot triangular area between the properties located at 9800 72nd Avenue owned by Exeter and the vacant property to the east owned by Centerpoint Wispark Land Co. LLC to allow for the access to the vacant property without the need for an easement from the adjacent owner.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission, this is to consider the request Zilber Properties Group for approval of a Lot Line Adjustment of approximately 1,916 square foot triangular area between the properties located at 9800 72nd Avenue owned by Exeter and the vacant property to the east owned by Centerpoint Wispark Land Company LLC. And this is to allow for the access to the vacant property without the need for an easement from the adjacent owner.

When the staff looked at this property initially we had some concerns because we were looking at how the property would be accessed from the adjacent street. And as a result, I don't know if you can see this, where that red star is located is kind of comes on an angle. And depending on where the two driveway placements may be located, without that acquisition of that triangle piece of property it made for a very awkward entrance and very difficult for trucks that would be headed south into the property.

So they requested that there be some type of consideration. We asked them to contact the adjacent landowner to see if they'd be willing to convey that little triangle to them so that the

alignment would be a straight line basically for trucks heading south that would like to go into the site.

So the owners of the properties located at 9800 78th Avenue, Tax Parcel Number 92-4-122-211-0420 and the vacant property to the east identified by Tax Parcel Number 92-4-122-223-0120, again, owned by Centerpoint Wispark Land Company, they're proposing to adjust their lot lines to detach that 1,916 square foot triangular area from the Exeter property to the vacant Centerpoint Wispark property, again, to have that access that they need.

Both properties are zoned M-2, General Manufacturing District. The Lot Line Adjustment will comply with the requirements set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and Land Division and Development Control Ordinance. And, again, this is being set up so that this property could be laid out for future development. Staff recommends approval as presented subject to the comments as outlined in the staff memorandum.

Tom Terwall:

What's your pleasure?

Michael Serpe:

So moved.

Jim Bandura:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY MICHAEL SERPE AND SECONDED BY JIM BANDURA TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE LOT LINE ADJUSTMENT SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

Michael Serpe:

I have a question. Any other Commission members have an objection with this thumbnail, the page thumbnails? Do you like that or not?

Tom Terwall:

I don't.

Deb Skarda:

I don't like it.

Michael Serpe:

Thank you.

--:

I like it.

7. ADJOURN

Michael Serpe:

I move to adjourn.

Tom Terwall:

Is there a second to the motion?

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

Moved and second to adjourn. All in favor signify by saying aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? We stand adjourned.

Meeting Adjourned: 7:15 p.m.