

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD
PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY
PLEASANT PRAIRIE SEWER UTILITY**

Village Hall Auditorium

9915 - 39th Avenue

Pleasant Prairie, WI

February 18, 2019

6:00 p.m.

A regular meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on February 18, 2019. Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Kris Keckler, Mike Pollocoff, Dave Klimisch and Mike Serpe. Also present were Nathan Thiel, Village Administrator; Jean Werbie-Harris, Community Development Director; Kathy Goessl, Finance Director; Dave Smetana, Police Chief; Craig Roepke, Chief of Fire & Rescue; Rocco Vita, Village Assessor; Matt Fineour, Village Engineer; John Steinbrink Jr., Public Works Director; Carol Willke, Human Resources Director; Dan Honore', IT Director; Sandro Perez, Inspection Superintendent; Craig Anderson, Recreation Director and Jane C. Snell, Village Clerk. 14 citizens attended the meeting.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

4. RECOGNITION

A. Present Pleasant Prairie Police Department Recognition to Detective Andrea Brey to commemorate her period of service to the Pleasant Prairie Honor Guard.

Chief Smetana:

Good evening, Mr. President and members of the Board. The item before you tonight is submitted as recognition for Detective Andrea Brey. Detective Brey has served for eight years on the Pleasant Prairie Police Department's Honor Guard Team. And to go into greater detail on that honor and her service I'm going to invite the team leader, Lieutenant Paul Marik to the podium.

Paul Marik:

Good evening, everyone. I understand your time is valuable and I promise I'll be brief, and I thank you for spending some of it with us. To the Village Board, Village department heads and members of the audience I come before you this evening to hereby announce the retirement of Detective Andrea Brey, Unit 171, from the Pleasant Prairie Police Department Ceremonial Honor Guard where she has served with distinction and merit for eight years. The job of the Honor Guard is not an easy one. We're more than pretty uniforms. Every movement is choreographed, every step, every turn, every count must be flawless. Try standing in one spot for more than four hours in order to look like a marble statue and tell me that that's not difficult. And for those of you that would say no I have a chiropractor that would tell you otherwise.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

It's not by happenstance that when Milwaukee loses one of their own the Pleasant Prairie Police Department Honor Guard is one of the Honor Guards in Wisconsin that's called up to assist. And that's because of these men and women you see in front of you. We're the living embodiment of what it means to carry the shield, and we have a duty and privilege to represent our police department in moments of great joy, and of course, in great sorrow. The emotional toll it takes on our members is also worth mentioning. After every law enforcement funeral for a fallen officer I can guarantee you that these men and women sleep as though they just ran a marathon, and emotionally they have.

When a member of this team retires their white gloves the team is absent a critical member, and thus the retiree receives their boat paddle. This is a tradition that was started in the military, and the philosophy is still embraced by the Navy Seals and Recon Marines and Pleasant Prairie Police Department. It's a metaphor for teamwork. The rowing team has to be in sync in with one another to make the boat as fast and effective as possible. If just one person is not rowing in time with others it throws the entire compass heading off. If a person is missing it throw off the entire balance of the boat. In that boat every person is an equal, every person is important, every person has a direct influence on the mission, and every missing oarsman is felt.

Andrea, members of the Honor Guard, can I have you come up please? You can see how pretty they look, and my uniform is older. They got the new ones. Mine's still on the way. Andrea we thank you for all you've done for us and with us on our journey together. Your paddle has been crafted by the officers of this department and members of the community. The handle is wrapped in Village colors representing the call you received for your community. The path has been seared into the paddle to represent the authority by which you serve. Your badge number is engraved at the top to represent how you alone had a direct effect on our mission. The challenge coins at the bottom represent a job well done and a reminder to continue to answer the call. On behalf of the Pleasant Prairie Police Ceremonial Honor Guard it's with deep reverence that I would like to now present Detective Andrea Brey with her paddle. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you. Chief, I want to thank all of your folks for the honor, pride and distinction you serve our community with. I've been to many events where you've been there and presented yourselves there, and I've also been honored to be from Pleasant Prairie and see what you folks do. It's not an easy location most of the places you're at. And you guys do a great job. Thank you.

B. Present Resolution #19-03 of Appreciation and Recognition to Walter Graeber for His Years of Service to the Village of Pleasant Prairie.

Nathan Thiel:

Village President and Village Board, we have the fortune of having Walter and his wife Roxanne here this evening. And I'll invite them to come up to the stand here in the next little bit. But for

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

the benefit of the crowd we wanted to read this resolution. So Resolution #19-03, Resolution of Appreciation and Recognition to Walter F. Graeber for his years of service to the Village of Pleasant Prairie.

Whereas, Walter retire on February 27, 2019, after twenty-three years of outstanding service and commitment to the Village of Pleasant Prairie; and whereas, Walter began his career with the Village of Pleasant Prairie on December 4, 1995 in the Office of Assessment Administration; and whereas, throughout his 23 years of service, Walter has served the Village with the highest degree of integrity in his role as Senior Appraiser within the Office of Assessment Administration; and whereas, Walter has demonstrated great devotion to his work by mastering the methods of property appraisal and resolving complex valuation issues for all property types; and whereas, Walter has applied his knowledge and expertise of real estate analysis and valuation to the benefit of all property owners.

And whereas, Walter worked tirelessly for the Village and all residents of our Assessment Consortium, providing the highest level of professional service; and whereas, Walter has honorably served all communities of our Assessment Consortium as an objective, unbiased, and credible resource of real estate information for residents and local officials of each of the municipalities within his sphere of responsibility; and whereas, Walter's unfailing integrity and credibility earned him tremendous respect with residents and municipal officials of our Assessment Consortium and officials of the Wisconsin Department of Revenue; and whereas, the Village would like to acknowledge and sincerely thank Walter for his tireless dedication and commend him for the tremendous amount of knowledge and expertise he bestowed upon the community.

Now, therefore be it resolved that the Village of Pleasant Prairie hereby extends to Walter F. Graeber our sincere respect and appreciation for his service to the Village, our congratulations to his well-earned retirement, and best wishes to his for continued success, happiness, and good health in the years to come. Considered and adopted this 18th day of February, 2019. Now I'm going to invite Walt to come up if he wants to say anything and Roxanne. I will tell you that this was the clean version of the resolution. We were trying to get the assessment staff to come up with any dirty stories they could, but they were pretty fair to Walt.

But I want to say that I have been so impressed with the staff, and Walt is the epitome of the professionalism that is within our personnel. And I just have been grateful for the opportunity to work with Walt. And he has always been friendly, he has always been respectful, he has always been just positive and came with an attitude of appreciation for the opportunity to serve the public. And so I want to thank him on behalf of the Village.

Walter Graeber:

Thank you for the 23 years. It's been a pleasure, and I'm blessed to have worked with everybody here. Twenty three years goes by quickly for those of you who are a little ways from retiring yet. But I've been with Rocco since the county in 1984, and we've been together for almost 35 years now. And Rocco has -- as far as our office goes I think we are the best in the state thanks to you. You've created quite an entity here. And to reflect what is in the resolution and the recognition I

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

just reflect what this entire Village has done over the last 23 years that I've been here with Mike Pollocoff, Mr. Steinbrink, all of the department heads, everyone, all the staff we show respect to the people of the Village that we serve, and we're accountable to them as well. And those are just two of the main themes that run through this entire Village. So thank you very much.

Nathan Thiel:

Rocco, why don't you come up for a picture as well.

John Steinbrink:

Congratulations, Walt.

Walter Graeber:

Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Oftentimes people say that the assessors don't get the love they deserve. I'm amazed to see how many fellow citizens have turned out for your retirement here tonight.

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd just like to say when Kenosha County jettisoned property assessing away from the county and the municipalities had to pick it up, Pleasant Prairie had created a consortium of Pleasant Prairie and four other communities to be together. And we were fortunate enough between us and the city we selected the best staff available. And what Walt and Ed and Rocco and the people that have come and gone in the intervening period they've worked really hard to make sure that property tax assessments here were as fair as could be, as equitable as could be, and they worked diligently to do that with everybody and getting as much input as they could from property owners when they received their notices or whatever.

Walt was a standup guy. He spent a lot of time out west when they were doing revals there, and he was spending time here when we did it here. And we were lucky to have him just like we were lucky to have the other guys. So when I look back when Kenosha County left assessing and left it to the communities I think that was one of the best things to happen in Pleasant Prairie. We brought an important function back to the Village. But more importantly we brought really good people into that department when that Village assessing department was created. Walt, you were definitely a key part of it so thank you very much.

5. MINUTES OF MEETING - FEBRUARY 4, 2019

Dave Klimisch:

Move approval of the minutes.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Michael Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second. Any additions, corrections? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? So carries.

**KLIMISCH MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE VILLAGE BOARD
REGULAR MEETINGS OF FEBRUARY 4, 2019 AS PRESENTED IN ITS WRITTEN FORM;
SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

6. CITIZEN COMMENTS

John Steinbrink:

And please be advised per State Statute Section 19.84(2), information will be received from the public on items not on the agenda; however, no discussion is allowed and no action will be taken under citizens' comments. Jane, we had a signup sheet?

Jane Snell:

Mr. President, we have 14 signups this evening. And with that we'll keep them to a three minute time restriction. Our first one is Lucy Torres.

Lucy Torres:

Good evening. My name is Lucy Torres, and I live on 60th Avenue. And I'm here to ask the Board to reject the Conceptual Plan for apartments being built near me. My husband and I received a letter from the Village outlining that proposed single family homes were going up on our street, eventually on our road with the values being at \$400,000. \$400,000 doesn't go with the word Workforce Housing apartment. It just doesn't. I don't know anyone who will spend that kind of money with that many apartments near them.

My husband and I moved to Pleasant Prairie for a good, overall quality of life and to invest in property that would increase in value. And I do not believe that will happen with this project. If Mr. Mills is here today, I don't know if he is, I understand that he lives near many acres in a

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

development called The Reserve. I think that he should lead by example, and if what he is saying is true and that this project and these apartments will have no crime, no loss in property value, then he should lead by example in this community and put them in his backyard. If what he is saying is true, then he should have no issue putting them in his backyard. He has the means, he has the way, and he knows how to do it. He got us here today talking to you all about it. Show the community, Mr. Mills, that you back what you say and lead by example. Put this development in your backyard. Let's see what happens to your property value. So as to the Board I ask you respectfully that you not approve this Conceptual Plan or that you remove that many apartments off it. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you.

Howard Cooley:

I'm Howard Cooley from 8731 Lakeshore Drive. I'm in my 40th year as a homeowner in Pleasant Prairie. I've been here, been fortunate enough to witness the miracle that has taken place in Pleasant Prairie over the last 30 years. But I'm really here specifically tonight to say how much I appreciate the way the decision were made to develop the environmental park plan in Carol Beach. This is an example of how this highly professional government listens to both sides of every story. How they go outside to get third party consultants. It never satisfies everyone, I liked the first plan myself before the changes, but we're not all satisfied but we think the decision was made very well, very professionally. And I'd just like to say I thank you for continuing to provide a Village that's the best place this 84 year old has ever lived.

If I may I'd like to introduce Rosalie Villano who is the Chairman of the Carol Beach Homeowner's Association that had many, many discussions with people from the Village about how this plan was done and how it was going to be and the wonderful compromises that were made. Rosalie also is helping out with the Pleasant Prairie Police Appreciation Association. Rosalie?

Rosalie Villano:

Hello. To the Village President and the Village Board my name is Rosalie Villano. I live at 8630 Lakeshore Drive. And I am the President of the Carol Beach Homeowner's Association. I fell in love with Carol Beach a lot because of the beach which is a treasure worth preserving. Many other local communities have developed their beachfronts. But we have such a beautiful, lovely, skinny, long beach in its beautiful, natural form it makes it very special.

Since we moved to Carol Beach five years ago, the amount of erosion to the beach has been dramatic and significant. Back in the '80s I want to thank Mike Pollocoff, John, Sr., John, Jr. and others who helped to protect the beach along Lakeshore Drive with the building of sand catchment areas on the beach. Thank you for that. They've done their job. And where they are the beach is wide. And in the north area where I used to walk my dog I no longer can because there's very little beach left there. So what you put in place back in the '80s really worked.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

I'm asking today -- to assess the Carol Beach residents' attitudes towards the plan that was in the 2012 plan we did a survey. We presented these results to the 2018 Park Commission, 118 residents completed the survey, 88 percent did not support building structures on the beach; 92 percent wanted the Village to initiate and actively support ways to restore, protect and preserve the beach. And this is consistent with the survey that was done this last summer.

I want to particularly thank John Steinbrink, Jr. for hearing our voice and for modifying the 2012 plan. We encourage the Village to tackle the issues of preserving the beach by restoring the beach with sand dunes, hiring an expert to facilitate planning, planting and fencing off new planted areas with appropriate native species, and evaluating ways to prevent off roading vehicles on the beach whether by boulders or other kinds of structures along the road front. With that I want to just recognize that we have about a dozen residents here in the audience from Carol Beach who all came here to say thank you. And thank you very much for listening to us. Appreciate it. Looking forward to working with you again in the future.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you.

Karen Denhartog:

Good evening, Mr. President and members of the Board. There are three main points I'd like to make tonight. Karen Denhartog, 9203 62nd Court in Creekside Crossing. We oppose the current plan to use the main Creekside Crossing entrance to haul approximately 10,000 cubic feet of clay fill to the north side of the property. The proposal states that over the next several months large dump trucks will drive past the only children's park on our community both on the way to dump their load and again to leave the neighborhood to pick up more fill, up to 30 trips or 60 crossings in front of the park a day. We are very concerned about the potential dangerous traffic, damage to our roads, hours of operation day and night, and for the noise and dirt and debris that will no doubt be tracked throughout the neighborhood.

My second point is the current plan for Vistas at Creekside do not include any additional park space dedicated to the younger residents of our neighborhood. A dog park is not an acceptable use of public park space when you consider that we will potentially have more than double the number of families and children utilizing the one tiny tot lot space in the community. And considering that Ingram Dog Park is just a couple blocks to the east. I strongly encourage you to consider requiring an additional park green space for human use to the north or northwest section of the Creekside Crossing neighborhood. This was in the original plan for our community.

My last point our Creekside Crossing community was originally built with the promise that this would be an owner occupied piece of land subdivided between single family home sites, condominiums and some very nice duplex units. This plan was well thought out and allowed for a variety of income levels to become a permanent part of our community. Respectful of our neighbors, the land we purchased and in harmony with the lifestyle of our hard earned dollars afford us.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

For this opportunity we gladly paid our portion of Village taxes for the last 12 years, and we expect those tax dollars to be managed wisely and equitably and to be used to maintain the integrity of our investments which the people have faithfully entrusted to you. The introduction of apartment rental living whether it's referred to as Workforce Housing or low income is in direct opposition to what we were promised when we purchased our homes here. In fact, all of the homes in our community were already Workforce Housing. If you consider that we are a community of working families in the demographic the developer is saying is their target market.

Our neighborhood already includes police officers, firefighters and teachers. This is not a retirement Village nor are these luxury estates. We are hardworking, honest, respectful homeowners who pay our taxes in exchange for what we believe to be our dream neighborhood. We do not want rental living in our community or the potential for an increase in other socioeconomic issues that go along with the apartment lifestyle. We are not fear mongering as the developers have complained in the newspaper. Renters bear only short-term interest.

Jane Snell:

Your time is up.

Karen Denhartog:

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Curt Decker:

Good evening. I'm Curt Decker. I live at 6218 92nd Place. Karen covered most of anything that I would have spoke to. Mainly our biggest concerns are that we invested in our neighborhood like she said. We were given a plan that showed the single family homes, the mixed use of condos, duplexes, and that was at the point when we first bought the properties a lot of us and built our homes. The single family homes had a homeowners association that dictated the size of the homes, this amount of garages. We haven't seen any type of plan for the single family homes that even follows that format whatsoever. So I have some concerns about what the single family homes would be.

But the elephant in the room is the apartments, whether they're subsidized apartments, Workforce Housing, whatever it's called. We were sold a neighborhood plan with a quiet circle, two parks, different age groups, different income levels, but it was all home ownership, and that's what we were sold back in 2007, 2008, I think maybe back into 2006. So this clawing back into our neighborhood to drop apartment buildings, again whether subsidized or not, is not equitable to the homeowners in our neighborhood, in our community. So with that I really request it stop here tonight. I'd like to see no apartments be proposed, whether it's on a frontage road, whether it's right inside of our neighborhood. I think there's a lot of land that Bear owns in Pleasant Prairie. They own a huge tract from the Kenosha Drive-In Theater down to 165 and Sheridan Road, untapped lands, and they own it.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

As far as the Workforce Housing goes my daughter I helped her do her taxes recently. She was a full-time employee between her junior and senior year in college. She worked in an assistant managerial role at a restaurant. With the income that she earned for those three months' period if she had that job for the entire year she would not qualify for housing there. And with that I would know that the people who work for the public works department in the summertime cutting grass, doing landscaping and those seasonal jobs they, too, would earn too much money to live in this Workforce Housing with income restrictions.

So, I just ask do we have a working poor problem? Do we have a problem with that in Pleasant Prairie because this is supposed to be for Pleasant Prairie? The assertion is that it's for residents of Pleasant Prairie to maintain their jobs in Pleasant Prairie. And there's two very good examples of younger people that work in Pleasant Prairie that would be not eligible to live in these housing units. So are we providing housing for the young, the young professionals in Pleasant Prairie, or are we creating a magnet for other people to come into Pleasant Prairie and take advantage of this Workforce Housing?

Understandably Mills is not going to be getting a monthly check from the federal government to cover the rents. They're getting north of a million dollars up front, and I believe that this is a ten year program --

Jane Snell:

Sir, your time is up.

Curt Decker:

-- So it's \$100,000 a year for ten years.

Warren Denhartog:

Good evening, I'm Warren Denhartog, D-E-N-H-A-R-T-O-G. I live at 9203 62nd Court, Pleasant Prairie. I wish I could talk as good as my wife because she said everything that I wanted to say. But my thought tonight is two words, emotions and facts. Emotions according to the dictionary are natural, instinctive state of minds driven from circumstances that arise. Facts are things that are proven to be true. Emotions are why we're here tonight. All these people in Creekside Crossing Subdivision are here because we've got an invested interest in what's being said tonight. We live there. We help each other whether it's shoveling snow or borrowing a cup of whatever. That's why we're here for the emotional part of it. The safety of surroundings of what we built and what we don't want, what we don't want.

That doesn't mean that we're not able to be a little -- we're willing to bend a little bit I guess is what I'm saying. And if there's other options out there I think that we're willing to listen. As I said, fact is the truth, and what we've heard here so far is that everybody does not support what's being offered here tonight. I could go on and talk about crime prevention statistics. I could go on and talk about the fact that I was on the State Crime Prevention Board and know all that stuff, but that's not what we're here tonight for. We're here tonight to take a look at the facts and

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

emotions. We're emotional about it because it hits us home. And I don't know if Mr. Mills is here tonight but it doesn't hit him home. So we ask that you help us with what we're doing, and I believe that we can all come to a compromise. Thank you.

Lilian Staples:

Good evening. My name is Lilian Staples, and I live at 6203 92nd Place. And I've been a resident for 11 years in Creekside Crossing. When I see the projects that are being presented the way I analyze this is how would you accept or not the project. And the things that I look at is the density, how they're going to size off the lots, if the houses are similar what kind of characteristics they have. When you talk about density what traffic impact that is if you put more people in the same space. And I'm concerned that those projects are not considering all those points. And I would like to see that revised on something that would be acceptable to our community.

We have single homes, and the condos, they have specific characteristics, sizes, and I see that the project presented are putting completely different types of structures in the community that will look completely different beside all the different -- the value of all those types of different structures. We want something similar, we want the unity, and we don't want the bigger density in our community. So those are the points that I would like to raise. I apologize if that was already discussed. But I'm completely against the apartments. And if that is going to be built in that area it should be far away from all single family homes and the condos. They are completely different besides the traffic impact to our neighbors. Those are the things that [inaudible]. Thank you for the opportunity.

Jeff Sorensen:

Hi, Jeff Sorensen, 6299 92nd Place. I'm going to start with just a couple comments about my favorite place to read, the *Kenosha News*. Yesterday they had an article in there, and once again they're not very favorable to Pleasant Prairie. They seem to think that we should supply housing for Foxconn. We already got rid of Foxconn. We didn't want them here, and now look what's going to happen to Foxconn. So I don't think we should be responsible to provide apartments for Foxconn employees. I didn't like in the article that they want to know why we care about what happens in our backyards. Well, if we don't, no one will. We care, that's why everybody's here.

When Creekside Crossing started it was a requirement by the Village that this was owner occupied, condos and houses, owner occupied. No rentals allowed. As Mastercraft went out of business and Bear took over ownership they came back with another plan to develop the far north end with mostly single family and some duplex condos. I was at that meeting. Once again was told and promised owner occupied, no rentals. Now here we are with rentals.

I'm not going to talk about Workforce, but it says Workforce. That's going to be for firefighters, teachers and single professionals. None of those people are working at Foxconn. I would like to also point out we don't need sidewalks. We've gotten along just fine without sidewalks. The sidewalks will lead to nowhere. If you need sidewalks so bad sidewalks should be at the Meadowdale which will be adjacent to the new downtown and the development straight to the west of the new downtown to get them into downtown. Sidewalks mean nothing out by us.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

I was also interested the last time at the Plan Commission that a traffic study was done. Even if you were to move to option number three and place all those apartments adjacent to Old Green Bay Road on 91st Street, they've all got to get out somehow, and they're going to either go north or south. Friday when I was on my way to the RecPlex at 7:30 in the morning you have two options, turn left, go straight at the stoplight. There's a little right hand turn lane. I was third car in line. No one can get to the right hand turn lane with three cars.

I guess in looking at it I would say option three is the best of the worst. We don't want apartments, but if you think that that's --

Jane Snell:

Mr. Sorensen, your time's up.

Jeff Sorensen:

Thank you.

[Inaudible]

John Steinbrink:

All right, please --

Ken Harju:

I just want to say because a lot of people are --

John Steinbrink:

We're allowing citizens' comments here. This is not a demonstration. If you want to use your time wisely use it. Otherwise a petition has been accepted, and said petition is in lieu of --

Ken Harju:

I'm sorry, sir.

John Steinbrink:

And we're allowing you this time to do this.

Ken Harju:

I'm sorry.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

John Steinbrink:

We're allowing you to applaud. It takes extra time up. If you want to do it that's fine, but please don't show a demonstration like that.

Ken Harju:

I only did it just because a lot of people are terribly afraid to come to the microphone, sir. Its worse, most peoples' biggest fear is speaking in public. I'm sorry. My name is Ken Harju at 9249 64th Court, Pleasant Prairie. When I moved in three years ago I came to the professionals here. The assessor was very good to me, explain to me exactly how it was zoned back there. And this is how we were promised, R-8, R-10, R-9, R-4, two units, eight units, four units and single family homes, that's what it was.

History, Mr. Mills bought this property a total of 61.95 acres over the last ten years for \$550,000 or \$8,900 an acre. There's other units going up, two different projects in the area, Village Green condos, Green Bay Trail condos. Those people would come here and do back flips up a hill to be able to put condos into this area. Mr. Mills says he can't build condos here and make money. Ludicrous. Green Bay Trails actually dropped their density from 66 to 46 units. Incredible. So this is ridiculous. We now have 138 units in Creekside Crossing. He's coming with 185. That's more than what we have there now, and 140 of them are apartments. That's more units than exist there now.

Now, to talk about subsidized housing, this is a dense cluster of subsidized housing. This is what the solution was in the '60s, '70s and '80s. We're better than this now. The Village can do better than making a dense cluster of subsidized housing. What Mr. Mills got from the Wisconsin Housing Authority \$24.9 million to use on top of tax credits. And there's never been transparency of what this money is coming from. It's our money, it's a grant, and what's it being used for? Even at the Plan Commission no one asked what are these dollars. So I thank you for your time, and I just apologize. I didn't mean to cause a demonstration. These people are terrified of microphones so I just wanted to say, hey, these are the people you say you serve and are accountable to, here they are. Thank you very much.

Bill Demo:

Tough following all these eloquent speakers but I'll give it a shot. I'm Bill Demo, 9285 66th Avenue, Unit 21. I'm also President of the Creekside Crossing Condo Association. I'm here to register objection to the rental units that are planned by Bear to be put in the back of the property. [Inaudible] you mentioned a petition had been submitted, 110 signatories to that petition out of 140 possible. Out of that 110, 98 percent were against the apartments being built. We had one that was undecided and only one person that was in favor allowing those to go.

We're concerned about the adverse impact it's going to have on our property values. As you know, property values are making a comeback. Now I've been there 12 years, I'm finally seeing the housing values come back in to where I paid for them. We have paid a lot of effort in as a condo association to make sure that we maintain the street and curb appeal that we had when we

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

all bought in years ago. We keep the exterior of our buildings up. We have 19 acres of largely green space that we keep maintained, almost manicured, to make sure that we maintain ourself to be an attractive community.

One of the things that drew many of us here is the fact that we are open spaced buildings. We have 21 buildings in the southern part of the condominium association, it's on 19 acres. People like the fact that you are not next door to your neighbor. We've already had people talk about the density of the proposal for putting units back there that doesn't fit in with what we have back there. The entire rental apartment scheme does not fit in. They're trying to shoehorn something that doesn't exist anywhere else in the Village. They're trying to plan an apartment complex inside a neighborhood that doesn't have any ready access to a street that will get you to a main thoroughfare. You look around the Village everybody can get onto 22nd, 93rd. There's a road right there where they can get out, not in this plan for us.

Apartments by nature are transient people, all right? There's no sense of ownership. It's hard to develop a sense of community. I've been fighting for years, our association has been fighting for years to develop that sense of community, and I think we have. This is an adverse impact to the feel of our neighborhood. It's already been mentioned we don't need sidewalks. People walk their dogs, they walk their kids, they ride their bikes, and we have not had any problem with any of that. We have a beautiful neighborhood.

Sidewalks that were proposed I understand that they want to those in. I'm sure that's to invite approval. It's going to put really a substantial impact of the cost of maintaining those sidewalks. Right now our snow removal budget is something that we can't control with how the weather is. And it would double the cost of our snow removal which we'd have to pay aside to our homeowners. As you know Mastercraft went under. When they went under we took it over, there was no money in our reserve funds.

Jane Snell:

Sir, your time is up.

Bill Demo:

That's five?

Jane Snell:

Three.

John Steinbrink:

Sir, could I get your name again?

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Bill Demo:

Bill Demo, D-E-M-O.

John Steinbrink:

D-E-M-O?

Bill Demo:

Yeah.

John Steinbrink:

Okay, thank you.

Tish Tippet:

Hi, Tish Tippet, 8966 62nd Ave. I'm one of the homeowners that will have those 100 apartments right behind them in their backyard. And if you do something like that it's not only going to bring just 100 apartments, it's going to be hundreds of people on a small parcel of land that's going to create noise pollution, light pollution. I'm going to have car lights through my windows at all hours of the night.

At the last Board meeting here there was asked a question about the percentage of evictions that they have to deal with on their properties. He never answered the question. He kind of danced around it, never gave an actual answer to that question. Another question was asked if the rental rates would ever go lower. And he said they could go lower if the economy does go downward. So that could leave it open to even people with less income to come in and rent those houses or those apartments. And I believe there's a police officer who lives in our subdivision who spoke out and said we're likely to see crime and drugs start to occur in our neighborhood with those apartments coming into it.

We all know nothing like this would happen to the homeowners down the street in Meadowdale. They really should go out and find another piece of vacant property with nothing on it to build those apartments, and that way if they want to put homes on it after the fact the people buying into those homes know what they're getting because they're apartments low income. Thank you.

Eric Davidson:

My name is Eric Davidson. Address is 9115 Old Green Bay Road. When my wife and I bought the property that we live on Creekside wasn't even thought of. We were planning on just living a nice quiet existence on our property and watching the hawks soar around. It was pretty neat. Then Creekside came, and like everybody else said, it was all supposed to be single family and duplexes and the condos and stuff and no apartments and stuff.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Apartments are not what we signed up for. A lot of this stuff I'm not part of the Creekside but I live adjacent to it. The way it's laid out any of the plans I'm going to have either 40 units or 100 units or 120 units adjacent to my property surrounding me. It doesn't seem like the right thing to do. It's one of those things where you guys didn't approve apartments in the beginning and it fell through, and you didn't do it again. And now we're bringing that up. And I'm just a vote against the apartments all together. I'm done.

Greg Olzewsky:

My name is Greg Olzewsky. I live at 9003 62nd Avenue. I've lived previously on 1st Avenue in Pleasant Prairie back in the '90s. And I kind of change the level of what I say. Everybody that has spoke before me is absolutely right and have brought up things that are just -- I couldn't match. I just want to tell you why I moved back to Pleasant Prairie in the year 2000. I lived on 1st Avenue. I had a nice home on the lake, and I owned the property on the lake. But I had a problem with a neighbor. And rather than stay in that beautiful home I sold it, and I found a home in downtown Kenosha which was very nice on the lake. I like lakefront property. And I stayed there about ten years.

At that time my wife just developed cancer, her first round of it. We were in our 60s, and for the next ten years she fought cancer, seizures and finally dementia. And we had to move out of there, and I said we've got to get a ranch. So we came back to Pleasant Prairie, looked around, looked at the home at 9003 62nd. It was the first one we looked at when we started looking. And she liked it because she was in a wheelchair already and she could get around. It was built for us.

Now, my background is, I've got to give you that, I spent 20 years in the Army, I'm retired. I spent 15 years at Procter & Gamble as an industrial technician. I spent 30 years in the landlord business in Kenosha and Waukegan. And now I'm retired. And I want to stay here and be up on that fireplace with my wife when I pass. She passed three years ago. And one lady brought out a good fact. When I came up here to buy this home, the last one that Mastercraft built, the last single family, I did the research. I found out that everything that they've said, I'm not going to repeat it, and it's all true. And what's supposed to be built there? Guys, we can come with something closer than those 20 units. And I'm here because I want to die here. I don't have to die here, I got money, but I want to stay here. That's where she passed. Thank you.

Jane Snell:

The next person is Keith Humphries.

[Inaudible]

Jane Snell:

Oh, okay, thank you. No further signups.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Nathan Thiel:

Jane, there was one other, do we want to read the petition into the record. Okay. As was alluded to in the public comments there was a petition that was submitted. And they asked for us to submit this document in lieu of a verbal statement. It was presented by Kathleen Wallace. And so I figure just for transparency we include it into the record.

Please accept this document in lieu of the verbal statement at the February 18, 2019 Village Board meeting. I have circulated a petition among my neighbors in Creekside Crossing opposing the construction of the income restricted apartments in the proposed Vista at Creekside development and opposing the construction of sidewalks in the existing CC neighborhoods. The original copies of the petition are enclosed for your consideration. Ninety eight percent of the neighbors that I spoke to are opposed to the construction of these apartments in our backyard and also opposed to the addition of sidewalks. I have also enclosed an opposition letter from our absentee neighbors Mr. and Mrs. Ron Hale and an email from Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Rojas. Only one person remained undecided and one person said no to the signing of the petition.

But I'd also like to add a little background to the term Workforce Housing. It's a term used to describe housing that is affordable for households with an earned income that is insufficient to secure quality housing within a reasonable proximity to a workplace. I contend that the argument that Workforce Housing is needed in our neighborhood is a suspicious one. As the residents of CC are the workforce of Pleasant Prairie, Kenosha, Zion and surrounding communities. We are teachers, policemen, nurses, entrepreneurs, sales persons, tradesmen and so on. We are retirees, single women and men and young families. We purchased our homes here because it's a desirable neighborhood and one that was affordable to us without any assistance beyond perhaps a mortgage. Thank you for consideration. Sincerely, Kathleen Wallace.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak under citizens' comments. If you're shy come up and speak, it's not that bad. If Jeff Sorensen can do it anybody can do it. If not I'm going to close citizens' comments.

7. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Nathan Thiel:

Just two items to update the Village Board on. First off we've been having some good success with the community collaboration effort. A Thursday ago we had about 66 people show up to the meeting so that was very impressive. We've had about 100 individuals committing to serve on subcommittees so I just wanted to update the Board on that. Yes, for the Village Green Center. It's just been a really exciting project so I just wanted to update. Our next meeting will be this Thursday. And it's open for participation so we'd encourage anybody to participate.

And then the second thing just an update on the PPCVB or the Pleasant Prairie Convention and Visitors Bureau. They've had some good movement of late. They had a group called Simple

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

View come out to review the marketing strategy for Pleasant Prairie and tourism in the area. We're really excited for this marketing firm and what they will provide for the Village. And then also Michelle Williamson has been proactive in getting Travel Wisconsin to participate in a planning session within the community to identify the assets that our region has to provide. And so that also has been just kicked off this last week and moving forward.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you, Nathan.

8. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Receive Plan Commission recommendation and consider approval of Ordinance #19-05 for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Village of Pleasant Prairie's Park and Open Space Plan 2018- 2023.**

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President, I'm going to introduce John Steinbrink, Jr., he's our public works director and our parks director, and have him present a presentation of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment which is Ordinance 19-05. Again, this is to adopt the new Park and Open Space Plan for the years 2018 to 2023. It came with a positive recommendation from the Village Plan Commission. But I'd like John to go through the slides for the formal presentation for the Village Board.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this evening I bring before you consideration of the approval of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, as Jean said Ordinance #19-05, to adopt the Village of Pleasant Prairie Park and Open Space Plan for 2018 to 2023. This is a component of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan and also to amend Section 395-6B of the municipal code. This plan is a component of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

We entered into an agreement with Ayres and Associates, and Blake Theisen was the representative that worked with the Village. We started this about a year ago, so it's been a pretty long and comprehensive project. He's very familiar with doing plans, and he does these around the state, he's very successful with them. It did include an overview of the project in report format, a survey, some recommendations, some mapping and some concept plans.

For the overview of the project it's called the CORP, it's a Comprehensive of Outdoor and Recreation Plan. It's analysis of all the Village owned parklands and greenways, and it's a five year plan window. It is required by the DNR to get grant approval and stewardship grant money, and it does provide a forecast for capital improvements projects and future equipment processes and purchases.

Just a quick overview of the project. We entered into an agreement with Blake and Ayres and Associates in February. We scheduled a kickoff meeting for the public. It was very well

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

received in April. We did some field work in April. We did a public survey in April through June. The Carol Beach residents as Rosalie had mentioned did their own, and we took that into consideration. We got some preliminary recommendations back from Ayres in June. We got the first draft reports that the staff worked on in July. Put together these CIP budget for the park plan in July of '18. And just to note that that was late enough in the process where we were not able to include it in the 2019 budget. We were already too far along. So we'll start that process in 2020.

We got the second draft report in October of '18. We did a little bit of work on it, listened to some of the comments and made some changes. And we had a final report approved by the Plan Commission in February of 19. I'm just going to go through it very briefly. I won't go into detail. If you have any questions I can answer them at the end.

Chapter 1 is the introduction. Chapter 2 was the inventory and analysis. Chapter 2 was recommendation to the existing parks. With inventory and analysis they told us the good the bad and the ugly, really what had to be done. So they weren't shy to say if a piece of equipment needed to be replaced or some recommendations on some changes that had to be done with the existing plan. Chapter 4 was an implementation plan. It did include a mapping review. And so the National Rec and Park Association has six different classifications. And so we kind of identified each of those classifications and the reach as identified in some of these polygons as shown with different colors on here. The mini park is the smallest park, the neighborhood park, community park, regional park as RecPlex and Prairie Springs Park would be an example of that. Any sort of special use like Ingram Park and the dog park and the conservancy land that the Village owns and maintains.

This is just kind of one example of each of the inventory sheets that we have for each of the parks. I'm not going to go through each of them, but just to give you an idea of what it entails. They were based on the survey results, outcome from the public information meeting and the analysis that Ayres did and the field review. It talks about the name, the existing facilities, some of the issues that are observed, different tasks that are done at each of the park and some options that have to be done. It talks about the classification, it gives the location and then a site map. So it's very informative for each of the parks, and it was included in the plan in your packet and will be included online for all the residents to have in reference. The next one just shows a couple more of the pages, excerpts from the plan, the different trails, the playgrounds, the swings, the reference to the Kenosha County Bike Trail.

I am going to take just a little bit of time and highlight one of the parks that we really spent a lot of time evaluating. This is a five year plan, and every year we go through the same drill. We ask the residents for comments, we take them into consideration. We take a hard professional look at each of the parks and each of the sites that we have. We make the recommendations, make changes to the plan, and then we budget accordingly based on the recommendations of each of those plans.

Five years ago when we developed the 2013 to 2018 plan, the feel for the Lake Michigan Park, the name at the time was Lake Michigan Park and since it's changed to Prairie Shores Park, was they really wanted to gate the area, they wanted to have some lifeguards, they wanted to have these other amenities. Since that time we have heard from the residents down there that they

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

really want to focus on keeping it natural. So we did alter the plan. We have a cost estimate for it of restoring the dunes, of resolving some of the drainage issues, and installing some recycling receptacles in the area.

We are budgeted for 2019 for the Clean Water Utility to do an analysis of the five outfalls and all of the public owned lands on Lake Michigan just to evaluate really what has to be done out there, and then based on the results of those plans we can put together the engineering that has to be done to construct those recommendations. So that was the one really big change that we had in the plan was the Prairie Shores Park, taking it from some structures, some improvements, so really just kind of keeping it natural. Still keeping it open to the public but kind of instead of making fences and pavilions and restrooms and guard shacks, keeping it natural but protecting some of the shoreland in there. And with that being said I can answer any questions you may have on the plan.

John Steinbrink:

Questions?

Mike Pollocoff:

I have one. Just looking at Prairie Shores parcel if I'm reading this right, we're looking to look at restoring it to a natural area, actually a sand dune area. But do we have an estimate of what the shoreline work would cost us to not rebuild that but just enhance it to cover the new area? One of the things we've discovered over the years is the areas that were left natural with sand we had more erosion behind the wall than the areas where we had installed more of a clay-type material with landscaping on it. Then when we had the wash overs water wouldn't erode that area. It might wash through the wall, but I'm a little concerned that we're going to study this to death as the lake is starting to come back up again, and we'll be in a worse position if we don't get our hands around what we need to do to stabilize that shoreline protection especially in Prairie Shores.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

We do not have a cost estimate at this time. We're hoping that that project, that engineering design project that we'll be entering into a contract in 2019 will give us some sort of a feel for estimates with that. I have been working with the Village Administrator on different sorts of techniques that are available, and we will make those recommendations to the engineering firm that we do hire. We don't have a firm. It's something we should be doing within the next month or so. There's been options of do you spend the money right on the shoreline? Do you spend it out X amount of ways and kind of build the structure out in Lake Michigan to kind of stop it? Do you build jetties? So there's all sorts of different techniques, and that engineering contract we'll be entering into it will be evaluated by a PE that does this and give us the best recommendation for that. And then we'll probably come to the Board with something in the Clean Water Utility for the five year CIP based on the recommendations of that study.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Nathan Thiel:

Mike, if I can just add one other thing. The Department of Natural Resources along with the University of Wisconsin currently are actually doing some studies and making recommendations for a significant length of the shoreline. And so with that we'll be in touch with them as well to make sure that the practices that will be applied coincide with engineering studies that are already currently taking place. And then another item just to bring up that when John Steinbrink and I visited the Legislator's office we were discussing some potential grants and things of that nature that could potentially assist towards this effort as well.

Mike Pollocoff:

Are those the Coastal Grants?

Nathan Thiel:

Correct.

Michael Serpe:

John, I give you a lot of credit, the parks department, the Park Commission and also Ayres Associates. It's a big project, and it's a big undertaking. Before we incorporated the Park Commission had a budget of \$5,000. It cost us \$5,000 a year to cut the grass in the parks. And here we are evolving into something I think is going to be very nice for the Village for the future. And I'm glad we addressed the concerns with the Carol Beach Association. And I'd move approval of 19-05.

Mike Pollocoff:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second. Is there further discussion? Hearing none a roll call vote is requested.

Jane Snell:

Mike Serpe?

Michael Serpe:

Aye.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Dave Klimisch:

Aye.

Mike Pollocoff:

Aye.

Kris Keckler:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Aye. Motion carries. Thank you, John.

SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVED ORDINANCE #19-05 FOR A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE'S PARK AND OPEN SPACE PLAN 2018-2023; SECONDED BY POLLOCOFF; ROLL CALL VOTE – SERPE – YES; KLIMISCH – YES; POLLOCOFF – YES; KECKLER – YES; STEINBRINK – YES; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- B. Receive Plan Commission recommendation and consider approval of Ordinance #19 06 for a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to a portion of the Whittier Creek Neighborhood Plan located north of 93rd Street and east of Old Green Bay Road.**

John Steinbrink:

Do you want C with that, Jean?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yes.

- C. Receive Plan Commission recommendation and consider approval of a Conceptual Plan for the vacant properties north of Creekside Crossing and adjacent vacant properties to the west to be known as The Vista at Creekside.**

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the two requests you have before you this evening are Ordinances 19-06, and this is to update the Whittier Creek Neighborhood Plan. And the second request is a Conceptual Plan. And this is at the request of Dan Szczap from Bear Development, LLC. And this is on behalf of Creekside PP, LLC. They are requesting to develop the north side

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

of the Creekside Crossing development and the vacant lands to the west adjacent to Old Green Bay for a new project to be called The Vista at Creekside.

This initial presentation is a presentation of what was presented before the Plan Commission, and so that is the initial presentation we need to make this evening. The project consists of 62 acres. The developer is requesting to do 43 single family lots, one two-family lot and seven 20-unit apartment buildings. This would complete or finish off the original Creekside development that was started in the early 2000s by the Mastercraft development.

As some background information, the original Creekside development between 2005 and 2010 anticipated a total of 312 dwelling units to be developed in several phases, 24 single family lots, 34 2-unit condo buildings, 17 4-unit condo buildings and 19 8-unit condo buildings. The undeveloped land proposed to be developed now within the Creekside area included 158 additional condo units, 11 8-unit buildings, 6 4-unit buildings and 23 2-unit buildings. So the vacant land anticipated to have a total of 158 additional units.

A Conceptual Plan was initially presented in August of 2015 by the Bear Development team to the Village Board. And this was a Conceptual Plan that considered that the balance of Creekside Crossing would be developed as 64 single family lots and one two-family lot. Unfortunately after it had been approved by the Village the developers re-evaluated the situation, did not move forward with the project. They felt that the cost of a Creekside Circle which would be that east/west completion of the circle to connect to 91st Street and the bridge crossing the Jerome Creek waterway would be too costly. And so at that time they withdrew their project. Since that time since 2015 the conceptual plan expired as it was approved or value for approximately one year.

In 2019 Bear Development was working on a new proposed Conceptual Plan. Again, 62 acres, 58 acres remaining in the Creekside development plus four acres to the west with access to Old Green Bay Road and 91st Street. With the development they were proposing 43 single family lots, one two-family lot and seven 20-unit Workforce Housing apartments as well as the clubhouse. Open space would be approximately 31 acres or 50 percent of the property area. And, again, that's primarily in the north/northwestern side of the site. And this is due to a significant floodplain area as well as wetland area on the property.

So part of Bear Development's request is a Comprehensive Plan Amendment. And, again, this would be to amend a portion of the Whittier Creek neighborhood which is actually a southeast portion of this neighborhood. And keep in mind when I talk about a neighborhood I'm talking about a square mile or a square mile and a half of land area, not just one particular subdivision or one particular development. So it really encompasses a much larger area.

So on the east you can see what the existing Comprehensive Plan looks like, or on the west side or the right side what the west or the Creekside area was proposed to be envisioned to be developed as. Again, you can see that the balance of the area inside the Creekside Circle, and to the west of Creekside Circle was going to be single family lots. And what they were proposing were two multi-family 20-unit apartment buildings and a clubhouse to the west of Creekside

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Crossing just to the south side of 91st. And then to the north of Creekside Circle there would be five 20-unit apartment buildings.

With respect to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, again, this is looking at the entire neighborhood, what it exists today and at full build out of that total mile and a half square area. So 392 existing dwelling units which is comprised of single family lots and condominium units. And then proposed 396 total dwelling units, 254 single family lots, one new duplex, and then 140 multi-family rental units. The net density with this project would have been about 19,348 square feet per dwelling unit. Current population in the entire neighborhood 1,063. Project population 2,136 persons. We also have breakdowns for the number of school age children as would be proposed based on the information that we received from the census and from projections from KUSD based on the number of units. So the 2019 proposed Conceptual Plan, again, 62 acres, 58 acres remain in the Creekside development. Open space 31 acres, and 50 percent of the property area would remain open space. This is our first drawing of what the proposed units would look like for the 20-unit building.

So The Vista at Creekside would be comprised of single family and two family. Again, 43 single family lots as he proposed. The lot sizes would range from 12,721 square feet to 25,694 square feet. The average lot size would be just over a third of an acre or just over 16,000 square feet. There would be one two family lot that they are proposing right at that intersection of the two roads that would have an area of 17,539 square feet. Their plan would be that this would be a duplex, would be a two unit ranch-style side-by-side similar to the adjacent units, but it would likely be a rental project. It would not be a condo for one two unit, not as proposed.

The Vista at Creekside multi-family 7 20-unit buildings for a total of 140 units. Each apartment building includes 8 units on the first floor, 12 units on the second floor. Units range in size from 713 square feet to 1,325 square feet, 8 units having attached garages to the building. All units would be designed as a condominium-style in that they would have individual entries from an exterior doorway. They would not have common hallways or shared entrances between units. And, again, below is an artist's rendering of the colors and the look and the feel of what the 20 unit building what it would look like.

This is what the building elevations would look like. What's identified with all the little numbers are the different types of materials. It's hard to see, but this is the rendition of the colors and the materials that would be used for the building. Each building would provide a variety of options including 11 1-bedroom and 1 bathroom, 1 2-bedroom with 1 bathroom, 6 2-bedroom with 2 bathroom, and 2 3-bedroom with 2 bathroom units. And the elevations here are shown as the north elevation and the east elevation. And the second elevations are the south elevation as well as the west elevation.

The breakdown of the units and the units' sizes and the pricing for the multi-family development would include 77 1-bedroom units, again, an average size of 700 square feet with rents between \$700 and \$970 not including utilities. There would be 49 2-bedroom units, average size of 1,040 square feet with rents between \$840 and \$1,175 without utilities. And 14 3-bedroom units, average size of 1,300 square feet with rents between \$970 and \$1,425, again, without utilities.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

With respect to the parking 168 enclosed spaces would be provided or under cover spaces. Eight would be attached garages to the building, four detached garage buildings with 28 garages per building. There in addition would be 110 surface parking spaces. There would be 28 spaces at the clubhouse which is at the entrance of 91st Street and Old Green Bay Road, 8 spaces by the western units and 74 spaces by the eastern units. Again, population projections with this development 502 persons, and there could be up to 77 public school age children. And, again, we do this based on census information and information provided to us by KUSD.

With respect to floodplain boundary adjustment, as you know back on October 20, 2003 the Village Board adopted Resolution 03-42. And this was to approve the original floodplain boundary adjustment for the Creekside development. In January of 2005 the original developer obtained the required permits from FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency to begin the floodplain adjustment work. The floodplain boundary adjustment work began in the area that is already development, but it has not been completed for the entire project.

The FEMA approval is still valid and would need to be completed by the current petitioner as originally designed and approved by the Village, DNR and FEMA for it to be valid. Field delineated topographic verification would also have to be provided to all the agencies following the completion of the filling of the work of the floodplain. Since that time two small wetland areas totaling .214 acre have been proposed to be filled. And this is in anticipation of completing the Creekside Circle and 91st Street.

So this is the project as proposed as presented and discussed at the Plan Commission meeting and by the developer. The area that's identified in red is the area that was identified for proposed public sidewalks to be installed by the developer. Private sidewalks would be identified in blue which is just immediately adjacent to the five multi-family buildings on the north side. And then an asphalt path would need to be constructed adjacent to the five buildings up on the north end west of the detention basin to link the public sidewalk to the -- on Creekside Circle to the public sidewalk on the north end. In addition, a gravel path would also need to be extended over the sanitary sewer line that runs through the floodplain area that extends from Creekside Circle to the northwest corner of the property.

The proposed zoning of the property, single family lots would be R-4, Urban Single Family Residential District. The two family lot would be R-8, Two Family District. The apartment lots would be R-11, Multiple Family Residential District. The wetland areas would be C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District. The outlots excluding the wetlands areas would be PR-1, and this would be for the Neighborhood Park and Recreational District.

As shown on their original concept just to the northeast of the five apartment buildings is a small dog park. Again, it was primarily intending to be servicing the apartments in this development. But as was discussed several times with the developer there is a somewhat larger dog park open to the general public just to the east of this area by about 1,200 feet. But you have to access the dog park through 93rd Street to get through Ingram Park.

The 100-year floodplain would be designated as FPO, Floodplain Overlay District, and that would be upon the completion of the wetland floodplain boundary adjustment work. And the

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

entire development would need to be located in a PUD or a Planned Unit Development Overlay District to allow for multiple multi-family buildings for property. This currently in in the R-8, 10 and 11 districts those districts would allow only for one multi-family building per property. So a PUD overlay would be required in order to have multiple family buildings per parcel.

So after the Plan Commission meeting there was considerable discussion by the Village staff with respect to the development. And there was some considerable discussion as to what other alternatives based on the Plan Commission recommendation was that they recommended approval, but they wanted the staff to continue to work with the developer. So the Village Administrator, Village planning staff and others evaluated and asked them to show us three different possible alternatives. Again, the Village Board for consideration this evening is either to approve or to deny the original submittal that was presented by the Plan Commission. But because we knew this was of considerable interest to the residents as well as the staff and the Village, we wanted to take the time to present three options to the Village Board. And depending on the direction of the Village Board the Board would take action this evening or would need to make a recommendation back to the Village Plan Commission.

So option 1, and many of the residents have seen this option, this was an option that was presented directly to the residents at a meeting in November of last year. It was not presented in a public form or a public hearing before the Plan Commission or the Board up to this point, but this was just an option that was under consideration by the developer, again, presented to the residents. My understanding is that there was no support by the residents in the Creekside development for this.

But, again, what this development shows is that at the time there were four apartment buildings on the north side of Creekside Circle. And then there were three apartment buildings, all 20 units, on the east side inner loop of Creekside Circle. And at that time the west side of Creekside Circle as well as the land area south of 91st Street ascending to Old Green Bay those would be single family lots.

In this particular development the area that's identified in green was recommended to be public sidewalk. And the area in blue was a pedestrian walkway, more or less private walkway. And then the area that's blue with the cross-hatch as I indicated earlier would be a sewer overlay trail or pedestrian trail gravel over the sewer line that runs from Creekside Circle to the northwest corner of the site.

I had the opportunity to meet with Bill Demo with the Association President today after the Plan Commission met. And he outlined a number of concerns specifically for the staff. And in the second memo that you have before you I just want to highlight. I tried to summarize his concerns and comments. And these were the comments that he really had from himself and the residents from last November and after the Plan Commission meeting on the 18th of February. Again, my concern expressing the comments to him is that on that Monday night was really the first time the staff was hearing a lot of these concerns from the residents in more of a formal setting. And so we were trying to see what we could do to re-evaluate the plans. Again, this option one was the one in November, and then option two which you will see again, and that was the one that was presented to the Plan Commission.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

But Bill had mentioned that the comments and concerns as raised by himself and the residents included that the rental units are now proposed were owner occupied units were presented in the original Creekside development. That is true. The one comment I do want to make with respect to that is that the original plan did indeed present to us over several years that it was going to be an owner occupied development. That being said that development didn't go forward, and the land is zoned for multiple family. The current zoning ordinance does not distinguish between owner occupied and rental product. We can't do that in the zoning ordinance. So I just want you to be aware that the plans for years showed it from what was originally proposed by Mastercraft as owner occupied, but the current zoning does not distinguish between owner occupied or rental occupied.

Another comment, location of the apartments within the Creekside development were of a concern to both him and the neighbors. They were concerned about management and management practices related to the rental units including long-term maintenance of the apartments and the grounds and the rental rates over a period of time. They were concerned generally with increased crime, again, probably due to their concerns with respect to the more transient population as opposed to owner occupied population at that location.

There was concern with traffic congestion within and adjacent to the development when additional units are being constructed. They were also concerned with some speeding currently within the neighborhood. They were concerned with the perceived value of a drop in property values or actual drop in property values due to residential apartments nearby. They were concerned with respect to the public sidewalk locations, maintenance and cost. Again, they weren't concerned with the installation of the sidewalks because that would be done by Steve Mills or part of the Bear Development. But the ongoing maintenance of the sidewalk and snow removal would be obligations of the abutting landowners or the condominium development.

And then finally they were concerned about the loss of the proposed neighborhood park on the north side of the development. The one comment I can make with respect to that is when we updated the Comprehensive Plan really in 2009 by January 1, 2010, it was at that time, and there was some considerable discussion, that there would not be another mini park in Creekside with a community park being less than 1,200 feet to the east which encompassed a dog park and play park at that location. So, again, this is option one that was presented to the residents in November. Option two which you have in your packets as well and as shown on the screen is the option that was presented to the Plan Commission.

Option three, and again we did send these out to the residents even though there is no public hearing this evening, option three after some discussion tried to merge and move things around a little bit more, and it really brought back the concept from 2015 wherein all of the lots primarily internal to Creekside Circle and on the north side of Creekside Circle and on the north end of 62nd those would all be single family lots, not even one two family. They would all be owner occupied single family lots so at the end of the cul-de-sac and then all the way over to the gravel trail.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

And what it also did was it brought in one 20-unit building on the west side, at the northwest side of Creekside Circle just south of 91st Street just south of the retention basin. And then three more single family lots immediately north of the [inaudible] development at lots 36, 37 and 38. But what this did then was it moved six of the 20-unit apartment buildings to the west on either side of 91st Street adjacent to Old Green Bay Road. What it also requires the developer to do is to acquire the land north of 91st Street in order to move four of the apartment buildings to that location.

Again, one of the reasons why, as you can see the apartments are kind of shifted over to the west a little bit on the north side closer to Old Green Bay Road is because of the floodplain and wetland that has expanded from that wetland area on that northwest corner. It still leaves the clubhouse right at that main entrance, the parking adjacent to it. And then it still leaves two multi-family buildings south of 91st. By moving all of the apartments to this location it does increase the impervious surface. So the stormwater basin needed to enlarge significantly. It's actually identified as a 39 but it's not a separate lot, it would be an outlot. And then one of the buildings shifted south. And because of how it was placed the parking is behind of that particular unit.

So in the staff comments I have a memo that talks about different things with respect to the Comprehensive Plan. With respect to options one, two and three the Comprehensive Plan from a density perspective overall for the entire neighborhood is not exceeded. But it does need to take into account the entire neighborhood so that there's not an increase in density for this particular development.

The Village Park Plan as I mentioned was modified when Ingram Park was a 30 acre community park was added with the donation of the land from the Ingram family. And at that time there was a concept that a dog park and a community park and there would be other options there besides just a dog park of how that park could be expanded. So this option eliminates the northern park all together, the dog park all together, and assumes that land will be used in Ingram Park for park purposes. With respect to options for the apartments, again, one shows them to the north and southwest of his area. One shows them more to the north and to the west. And the third option just pushes all the density to the west.

With respect to rental versus owner occupied, as I mentioned the zoning ordinance cannot and does not regulate the type of ownership for residential dwellings. The ordinance regulates building size, setback, materials and general requirements for the development but cannot regulate ownership. In cases where a Planned Unit Development Overlay is considered, the Village in the past has strongly encouraged the developer to place percentages of the developer in renter or has requested owner restrictions on the units. And it's up to the developer as to whether or not they agree to that. And they agreed wholeheartedly that this was going to be an owner occupied development at the time, and that was to be developed by Mastercraft.

The requirement was then placed in the declarations for Creekside development by the original developer, and it was also placed in the Village PUD regulations as part of the Village ordinance as it relates to the owner occupied nature. Again, those provisions are on the existing Creekside but not in the future Creekside because that area was not yet developed.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

In recent years there have been changes in the State Legislature, and many of you know this, which limits the amount of regulation that a Village has over multi-family units. We can't regulate the size of the units. We can't regulate the number of bedrooms in a unit. We can't regulate whether they're owner or renter occupied. There are a lot of things that have been taken away from local communities when it comes to recent developer bills that have been approved over the years recently and some of the changes in the condominium statutes that we can no longer enforce or regulate. So our goal is to work with the developers as best we can to put forth the best developments we can in a particular area based on the desires of the developer in combination with discussing it with Village staff.

Again, not every development is approved the first time it's presented. Sometimes, and in this case we actually looked at about 12 different options for this development. You have three of them before you this evening, again, one that the residents have seen and now you have seen. One that everyone has seen and the Plan Commission recommended with staff making some recommendations or modifications to it. And then now a third option, but again this option has not received a public hearing, and the residents have not spoken with respect to this option yet because they have not had that opportunity.

So before you have this evening the recommendation of the Village Plan Commission to approve the original recommendation or to deny the original recommendation or to refer that recommendation and any others back to the Village Plan Commission. In anticipation of any recommendation that may go back to the Plan Commission we have tentatively set a public hearing date in March so that the residents would know in advance prior to leaving this meeting if you choose to refer it back to the Plan Commission so that they would have an opportunity to express their concerns and comments and any other opinions that they have prior to that date or at that meeting.

With that there are other things in my staff comments we can talk about if you'd like to get comments. We have all the department heads here to address everything from infrastructure. We can talk about sidewalks. We have the engineer here, we can talk about any concerns with respect to traffic or management of the apartments from the developer. Any of the issues that have come up this evening we'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have, and the developer is here I think as well, although I can't see him, but I'm sure he's back there to answer any questions that you may have of him.

John Steinbrink:

Jean, one more time can you clarify what our friends in Madison have done for us in the way of taking away the Village's responsibility or duty to regulate or have a say in what can be done in these situations. Our only hope is to work the best case scenario out with the developer to get a product that's kind of a win-win for both sides. It just irritates me when Madison steps in and takes away things from the Village, our powers because they think they know better. They're not here to answer the questions for the folks here tonight. So if you could just reiterate one more time.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Well, unfortunately there have been so many developer bills. There were few in the 2000s, but the majority of the developer bills came through in I want to say 2010, 2013, 2015, 2017, 2018, there have been a lot of recent developer bills affecting all different aspects of zoning to be perfectly honest, development construction, building construction, housing. There have been so many that most communities in Kenosha County were working together to try to play catch up and just getting a handle, and we're working with our state attorneys right now to get an understanding of all the changes that we need to implement from letters of credit all the way to multi-family housing. I mean there's so many things that we need to get caught up with so that we're in sync with the state regulations and changes to marry them up with all the rules that have changed.

Again, it's my belief that there might have been something going on someplace in the state, and they thought it would be good to add something related to that. And then it becomes statewide, and then something else in Madison or Waukesha. I mean it's throughout the whole state. But we all are obligated to comply with all of these different regulations. And so that's what we are trying to do. And we are making our best effort. And I work closely with all of our developers, not just Bear Development. It's my job to be able to work and navigate through the system with them and present projects to the Village and to try to make good projects come to the Village at all times.

But, again, there just have been a number of changes that have been made with like the renter and owner occupied. And another situation is with Airbnbs. No longer can we regulate an Airbnb anywhere in the Village. If people want to rent out their homes, if they want to rent out their units, if it's an Airbnb we can't regulate that through home occupation. I mean we can regulate it maybe through tourism or through the Clerk's office, but I can't specifically say, no, you can't rent your home for an Airbnb. I mean a lot of rules have changed. And, again, we're trying to get caught up with all of those rules to make sure that everyone understands what the new rules are.

And one other thing I just wanted to bring to your attention, and I had mentioned this, is that while we always believed that this was going to be an owner occupied condominium development, obviously a lot of things happened with the economy during the recession between 2008 and 2013/'14 which really became a downturn in our community and other communities for single family development as well as for condominium development. And as such there wasn't a lot of that type of activity, that new residential development going on. And so things have just started turning around. And as was mentioned we have two new projects that have -- just recently in the last year we have been working to develop in Pleasant Prairie The Cottages and Green Bay Trail Condominiums. So in both of those projects we worked with them, and we actually approved R-10, R-11 zoning and we intend to and they have PUDs overlay.

This just happens to be a map of what could develop on the property should there be some kind of change of heart from their development. They want to put rental product in here. This is what the current rental product would allow, R-8 on the north end, R-8 with that cul-de-sac and then R-10 in the center, and then R-9 towards the west end. Again, much larger single lots, but

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

individual buildings, six 8-unit buildings in the middle, three 4-unit buildings on the west, seven 2-unit buildings, and then fourteen 2-unit buildings on the north. But, again, I can't regulate as to whether they would be owner occupied or renter occupied. I don't have that authority. And we don't have any deed restrictions, PUDs, regulations, ordinances that would force that issue. So I wanted you to be able to see that.

Obviously option three was the last of the versions that we had worked on with Bear Development. But there were a number of comments presented here. There were many more comments presented at the Plan Commission meeting regarding concerns raised by the residents. And with that I think that ends my presentation. Again, the department heads are here to answer any questions that you might have regarding the development.

Michael Serpe:

John, just to answer your statement, there's 140 bills that were passed in Madison that took local control away from the municipalities.

John Steinbrink:

Correct. But I just want to thank Jean and her staff for working on this. It's an emotional issue for a lot of residents. It's a process. The process has just started. Jean is working towards an end that's going to hopefully probably not going to make everybody happy, but it's going to be the best solution we can come up with considering the hand we're dealt.

Nathan Thiel:

John, can I make just a couple of comments just to give some context to the purpose? One of the biggest concerns with this development with the way Creekside is laid out right now is accessibility. Technically speaking the whole development to the east didn't have a second access, and at this time just according to our ordinance would require some type of second access, some type of egress for public safety.

One of the things that I guess the staff that the reason we were entertaining this development in the first place was to try to attempt to address that concern. And that concern was addressed by the connection of 91st and also the completion of Creekside Circle. One of the concerns that we have with Creekside Circle in general is making sure that there's enough development to justify even the construction of that road. So it's one thing to put the road in now, but also we need some type of development on that road to justify the future maintenance and outlay cost of that infrastructure.

And so just some points to bring out regarding that. One of the concerns on the north is that it's very low. And the idea is that to require -- the reason why the development in 2015 didn't really go through was because we were going to require basements. And in order for basements to take place it just became cost -- it became ineffective. And so I guess the point that I want to bring up is that in all of our deliberations as staff we're really trying to find an appropriate balance.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

One of the main items that we've had and talked about is just the infrastructure of the road requirement that we currently have. We have a very high standard for our roads. The reason why some of the condos that are currently working is because those road requirements aren't there. Jean, you can correct me if I'm wrong, but the condo on 165 was is that the new standard or is that the old standard? Matt?

Matt Fineour:

That development had started so it's the old standard.

Nathan Thiel:

The old standard. And Creekside Circle the south loop was based on the old standard. And so one of the thought processes is that we could sacrifice the standard, but the implication there is that in doing so we jeopardize the cost for future maintenance. And so my point in just making this comment is trying to strike the proper balance. And that's really what the staff have been attempting to do.

With this third option that was suggested we tried to pull as much development along the Creekside north as possible in order to continue to justify building that road on the north side and, therefore, giving the second access. Because, again, technically that eastern portion of Creekside really shouldn't have been developed without having had a second access. It was granted a variance at the time with the hope and the thought process that development would come. That development hasn't come. Now it's somewhat here. We're trying to address it now as fairly and equitably as possible.

The only other point that I want to make is just regarding the parks. You actually saw it in the Park Plan today. When you looked at the parks and the bubbles that surrounded the parks, with Ingram Park the access to the residents exceeded that area of Creekside. And so the need for a northern park basically comes obsolete. Whereas other entities or other residents or locations in the Village technically were outside of those bubbles, and that's where parks -- we really should be focusing our attention on placement of parks.

And then the last comment that I just want to comment on is the sidewalks and just that we understand and give context. With the new road profile part of the thought process was including sidewalks in all new development. One thing that we're really trying to avoid as staff is creating dead ends and creating sidewalks that do go to nowhere. In the original concept the thought process was to connect the parks through a trail system. But that trail system was going to be on the back of lots. And so the thought process was to try to come up with a better solution and, hence, the reason for creating a sidewalk that went around the entire circle. One, to not create dead ends, two to access the park, make it ADA compliant and, three, to avoid trail systems on the back of lots.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, so Jean if I understand your comments on the current Comp Plan, what's permitted there, we could have basically the same development that Creekside has right now, but if Mr. Mills just doesn't proceed and he sells it or whatever, we can't stop it from being apartments. So we could end up having all apartments in what is the undeveloped part now that is the second phase of Creekside.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It could develop as a rental product as opposed to owner occupied product. Again, I don't know how practical it would be because we could require that there be one lot created for each individual building as opposed to clusters of buildings. But the current zoning allows for a rental or an owner occupied product.

Mike Pollocoff:

All right. And I agree with Trustee Serpe and the Village President that in village halls and city halls and town halls all over the state these communities are working as development occurs to have something that works for the entire community. And the way you find that out is you have what we're having tonight and what you had with the Plan Commission where you get input from the community and you're able to craft something that works for everybody. And right now the state has leveraged that all on the side of a developer. We can't change that. We can't change it tonight, and we can't change it until the next election. Even then I don't think it changes. But that doesn't mean that we don't still try to find some way to make this work.

I had a couple questions. In any of these alternatives when we open up 91st Street to Green Bay Road, Matt, I take 93rd every morning, too. I'm not as early as Sorensen, but the traffic does stack up, and if somebody's coming south on Green Bay Road that light, that traffic doesn't get counted it what I'm thinking. So if this thing proceeds we need to have traffic improvements and signal improvements so that signal counts the traffic coming from the north and the south equally along with the traffic coming from the east. Otherwise that traffic light will only signal for two roads waiting, and one road is the only one it's going to recognize.

Matt Fineour:

You're exactly right. That intersection because it's so close to Green Bay Road right now it has kind of a shared right turn and straight through lane and a left turn lane. As part of Main Street Market that intersection will be widened so that there's actually a designated right turn lane, a designated through lane and a designated left lane. But with that you're never going to be able to change the distance between Green Bay Road and that intersection -- I mean not Green Bay Road but Highway 31 and that intersection so you have to modify the signal there so that traffic can go through and no one is really backed up. So it's a combination of getting each lane done and working with the state as far as coordinating that light timing for all the traffic.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Mike Pollocoff:

Okay, but that would be true at 85th Street as well?

Matt Fineour:

At 85th Street north?

Mike Pollocoff:

North.

Matt Fineour:

Potentially. I mean we would have to see I guess traffic-wise the split of traffic going north and south, but you could look at both those intersections.

Mike Pollocoff:

Okay, so I think that's got to be -- I mean that has to get in the mix and something has to get it done without leaving it to the Village. And the other thing is have we anticipated what the impact fee collection for parks would be with any of these out? Have we estimated what the impact fee for parks would be with any of these options?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Have we calculated what that number would be?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

No, but I can.

Nathan Thiel:

And, Mike, one thing to point out that there were still -- in the plan in these options the developer was going to make improvements to that current mini park as well both from an ADA and also a few items of additional equipment. But clearly the impact fee as well.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Mike Pollocoff:

Because one of the other options I was going to think of and pose this to John, in the Master Park and Trail Plan did we identify a trail that would connect Ingram or even to 89th from this park, or was everything on 93rd?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yeah, we do have a connection from Ingram all the way through to 89th with the connection to Creekside. And the current plan still shows the north park and the south park with that trail alongside the creek. So depending on the outcome of this process whether it may be this evening or in a month or six months, I'll make sure that we get that updated to reflect the current change.

Mike Pollocoff:

Okay, so we could end up having as part of this a trail that goes from Creekside not on the road but from Creekside to Ingram?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Correct.

Mike Pollocoff:

So people could access that larger park. I guess that's going to be a policy discussion for the Park Commission and the Plan Commission to take a look at. I know it's like I don't want to be amending a plan that we just approved. But on the other hand if this gets amended from here tonight, I don't think this is contingent on it being amended, but I think we need to look at that as part of the amendment.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

You are correct. The Park Plan that we did approve this evening is a fluid plan, and I do plan on changing it as things change within the community. And so we're actually looking at taking that path and extending it along that sanitary sewer in Outlot 1 eventually all the way out to Old Green Bay Road. Old Green Bay Road will have an on street bike path on both sides eventually when it gets reconstructed.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right, okay, good. Nathan brought up a really good point. And I think for the people that came here tonight if you look at option three one of the rules that the state has put out is that we have a levy freeze, so how much we can levy on properties is frozen every year. We can't levy any more on a parcel. The only time the levy really goes up is when there's new construction. And that's a one-time hit. So as a community all of us as taxpayers if we're going to be extending a road in the circle which I think from a public safety standpoint makes sense. I mean the worse

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

thing to happen is a fire truck or an ambulance goes in and we don't get a clean address and they go in one side, and it turns out it's on the other side but we can't get to the other side unless we circle back and go all the way to 93rd Street. You want to make sure those movements work as easy as possible.

But one of the problems is that if you look at those lots, 41 through 53 and then the ones on the south we're not going to collect one more dollar in each successive year for we don't know how long than we do the first full year. So that makes us put a heavy requirement on the developer to build a real heavy concrete road with an asphalt top on it. Because us as taxpayers, and we're all taxpayers here, we don't want to be going back in and resurfacing roads or rebuilding roads any sooner than necessary. Under the old standard that your roads are built under you'll see those roads will have to have some kind of more expensive maintenance on it than the new standard required.

Which brings me to two points. I think we have to look at -- I'm not in favor of using the existing roads for haul roads because our existing roads are under the old standard. It's going to be a match as to where did the damage come from, was it frost, was it the trucks, was it age, the depreciated value? I don't really care to get into that, and I don't think that's in the Village's best interest. So I think 91st Street has got to be the one that gets any fill in or out that has to happen.

I guess my recommendation is that, and I'd make it a motion, is that we take the options -- we take them all back, but especially the options that haven't received a public hearing before the Plan Commission. Have the staff incorporate any other comments that they have, and I just gave you some of the ones that I have, any other comments by the Board and refer this back to Plan Commission for them to consider the additional options that have come up and some of the other requirements that we might need to take into consideration in approving that plan.

The goal I think for everybody is to get it to be as comfortable a development as possible that's going to bring as much value, maintain as much value as possible for you. It's got to maintain as much value for the developer. I don't think it serves anybody very well if we make this a situation where the developer walks, and then we're fighting the original zoning with multi-family apartments for the whole site. That's a lose-lose in my mind, or we lose and somebody else wins down the road. But I'd like it to go back to the Plan Commission and ferret out those additional points and have them take a look at that with another hearing so that people can comment on that. And then you say option three hasn't been mailed out or it has?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

It has been mailed out but no public hearing has been scheduled. They've not had an opportunity to speak at a public hearing with respect to it. That would be on March 11th.

Mike Pollocoff:

I guess my recommendation is -- or my motion is that's what we do is refer these plans back to Plan Commission, have them take another look at it, the option that's here to gather public input

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

and to pick up any more staff comments or any other comments that the Board might have that they want to send back to Plan Commission.

Michael Serpe:

I'll second that with a comment if I could.

John Steinbrink:

Are you rejecting 19-06?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, I'm not rejecting, I'm sending it back. Before we act on 19-06 gives Plan Commission a chance to amend it or modify it before they send it back here again.

Michael Serpe:

I'll second that. Mr. Denhartog brought up a couple words tonight that struck me, fact and emotion. And since I've been on this Board since we incorporated emotion has always been a part of a lot of what we approve or disapprove. But we try to reach compromise that should be included in that fact, emotion and compromise. This isn't the first time that this auditorium or the previous auditorium has been full of people complaining to the Board or the Plan Commission about a development. It's changed. They're concerned. We understand that, we appreciate it. And like Mike has just said we're going to try and work through this thing. You spoke at the Plan Commission, we listened, and that's why we're here tonight. And I wholeheartedly support that the staff and the Plan Commission take this up again with the options that you have presented this tonight.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

What we can do is we can do some more vetting out of these plans and going through some of the specific issues and concerns again and go through that. I'll talk to the Village Engineer again about the traffic. Again, I think we might have had some mixed signals as to whether a traffic study would be needed for this development. I know that the nearby development would certainly need a traffic study, but we'll certainly look at this area in more detail. Also the question you asked about park impact fees, it would be about \$80,000 in park impact fees from the option to the development.

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, I don't know if that's going to solve any park issue, but I think once the Park Commission and the Plan Commission get a look at some options that they come up with, again, those would be hearings for the public to be at to see what we come up with.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Dave Klimisch:

Jean, you mentioned that the current park might get some upgrades from the developer? Can you speak more about that?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yeah, the developer had indicated that he would be willing to donate funding to increase or to put in some additional playground equipment at the park. Those were the improvements. He would do monetary donations to purchase playground equipment.

Dave Klimisch:

And then this is kind of a detail, but on option three that Outlot 39 which is a retention basin on the west side --

Jean Werbie-Harris:

Yes.

Dave Klimisch:

I don't know the topography, would that be able -- what would it take to move that south one place and have the apartment building moved north?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

We tried to do that in three different versions of this. But because that is such a low area and everything is draining right there, and another area to the south is draining there, everything just focuses that that water needs to be right there, otherwise we'd be having to -- and there's residence and stuff adjacent to that that we'd be grading all of their properties because everything is draining right there.

Dave Klimisch:

And I concur with what Mike was saying, both Mikes I guess, Pollocoff especially about connecting the northern route to make a second exit especially for the residents that are on the east side if something were to happen and connecting the trail over to Ingram Park. It would be a nice accessibility touch, accessibility for what is being proposed especially with that connected trail. That would be a very good highlight. I'm on board with sending it to the Plan Commission and the staff and have everybody review the comments and tighten it up and we'll come back.

Jean Werbie-Harris:

And we can look at that. It cuts through four properties. It's about 1,000 feet or so, but it goes through four different properties to get to that location to Ingram Park. But there are two ways

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

based on our neighborhood plans that it could go more directly, it could go a little bit further to the north and coming back down if we wanted to stay adjacent to like a future road system pattern. But otherwise we'd have to re-lay out the neighborhood plan as to how it could work. But we've looked at that.

Dave Klimisch:

And to make option three viable that lot north of 91st Street would have to be purchased, is that something that's feasible?

Jean Werbie-Harris:

There would be two properties that would have to be purchased. And my understanding is that Mr. Mills has contacted the property owner to the north and has provided an offer of purchase to the first property to the north where the buildings are.

Kris Keckler:

I'd like to add if possible my concerns for the congestion from the traffic patterns that may arise due to the proposed congestion in some of the areas. And if possible, not being an expert in this field, but in some of the basic research I've done there seems to be a mixed bag of results as far as whether crime is impacted or disinvestment is impacted depending on the type of subsidized housing and whether it's managed accordingly or well. And if you could find any type of comparables that may lend itself to how other communities may have addressed this issue either on the number of units or the type of congestion and density. It's always nice to have some other examples to look at. But I think a lot of it is dependent on what the existing area is. And having an area right now that is family friendly and a low crime investment that both the taxpayers and the Village have invested in, certainly nobody is looking to devalue that in any capacity.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion?

Michael Serpe:

Just one comment, John. There was a question tonight from one of the speakers about the project devaluating the property. And I don't know if tonight is the night, but at some point if we can get a comment from the assessor about what this project would do to property values I think would be good to have.

Mike Pollocoff:

If that could go to the Plan Commission and be part of their discussion evaluation before it comes back so we can see how that vets out.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

John Steinbrink:

A roll call vote was requested on the motion and the second. That's no longer needed, correct? Any further discussion? We have a motion and a second. Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries. That takes care of B and C then.

POLLOCOFF MOVED TO REFER ORDINANCE #19-06 FOR A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT TO A PORTION OF THE WHITTIER CREEK NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN LOCATED NORTH OF 93RD STREET AND EAST OF OLD GREEN BAY ROAD BACK TO THE PLAN COMMISSION TO TAKE ANOTHER LOOK AT IT AND GATHER PUBLIC INPUT AND VILLAGE STAFF INPUT AT A PUBIC HEARING TO BE ON MARCH 11, 2019; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

POLLOCOFF MOVED TO REFER THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR THE VACANT PROPERTIES NORTH OF CREEKSIDE CROSSING AND ADJACENT VACANT PROPERTIES TO THE WEST TO BE KNOWN AS THE VISTA AT CREEKSIDE BACK TO THE PLAN COMMISSION TO TAKE ANOTHER LOOK AT IT AND GATHER PUBLIC INPUT AND VILLAGE STAFF INPUT AT A PUBIC HEARING TO BE ON MARCH 11, 2019; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

D. Consider the Agreement between the Village of Pleasant Prairie and Clark Dietz, Inc., for the 47th Avenue Sewer and Water Extension project.

Matt Fineour:

Mr. President and members of the Board, I'll just wait a second.

John Steinbrink:

We'll just pause for a couple minutes until things quiet down. Okay, Matt, if you just want to speak up and we'll keep on moving.

Matt Fineour:

Sure. Mr. President and members of the Board, this is a professional service contract with Clark Dietz in order to design a water and sewer extension along 47th Avenue. The sanitary sewer is planned to be extended approximately 400 feet from 113th Street north that is to serve 11127 47th Avenue who has a bad septic field area. So we'll be extending that to service that lot. And at the same time we'll be designing and constructing a water main to -- basically it's a system

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

improvement to complete a loop out there between 113th Street where it dead ends and just north of 11009 to complete the water main loop.

This project is planned to be an assessable project. The owner of 11127 47th Avenue has been notified of the approximate cost of the sanitary sewer extension and is willing to pay that assessment. And the rest of the water main assessment is planned to be deferred until such time the property owners' hook up, but it's being done at this time since we're going to be doing work out in that area and we need to complete the loop eventually anyway. So the service agreement is for \$26,100 for the design and permitting of that project. I recommend approval. And I'm here to answer any questions you may have.

Mike Pollocoff:

I move approval of the contract with Clark Dietz?

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

POLLOCOFF MOVED TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT WITH CLARK DIETZ FOR THE 47TH AVENUE SEWER AND WATER EXTENSION PROJECT; SECONDED BY KECKLER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

E. Consider an award of contract for the 2019 Annual Paving Program to Payne & Dolan, Inc.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Mr. President and members of the Board, this evening I bring before you the paving program recommendation. We did have two bids that came in, one from Payne & Dolan and one from Stark Asphalt, really the only two players within the asphalt industry nowadays. There were 16 sections as are identified in the map. I'm not going to go through each of them individually, but I can answer any questions that you may have on the specifics of them.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

The budget for this project was just over \$1.8 million, and the bid came in at \$2.2. I'd just like to note that there's actually three funds that are put together with this contract. The \$1.8 million from the general fund as identified for the paving program, \$170,000 for the sewer adjustments, and then the Clean Water Utility is \$120,000. So we are over budget a little bit within this project. So what I will recommend is approval of this contract, but we will make some change orders once we evaluate the road conditions after this harsh winter to identify which sections we have to keep and which sections we may have to defer until next year. The other option would be we could take some other capital funds from other tax levy projects and defer those. So I'll work with the Village Administrator to identify the best use of those funds. And with that I can answer any questions.

Mike Pollocoff:

Do you know off the top of your head, and this is an unfair question, but when is 85th Street between 39th and Cooper Road slated for repaving? That carries a lot of traffic, and I know we had that one --

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

From 39th to Cooper Road it probably wouldn't be a pulverize and relay, it would be a micro pave. So we would mill up the edges, the three quarters and do a thin overlay on this. We did get a new asset management software program just this past year, and we're in the process working with IT to download all of our PASER rating, that's the rating information that we are required to do with the state. So we will be spending this summer and hopefully having it done by budget time to put together a new paving program. The last one we did is probably 14, 15 years ago so we're probably due to redo it. And I can probably better answer that question at that time frame.

Mike Pollocoff:

Because 85th the sanitary manholes are sinking --

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Correct.

Mike Pollocoff:

The storm manholes are sinking.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I would guess that it will be within the next couple of years. Because with the paving program we work really hard to do preventative maintenance as the micropave on these roads before they get to a PASER rating of 4 or 5 where it has to go to a pulverizing relay.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Mike Pollocoff:

Okay. Like I say I didn't expect you to know tonight, but I get a lot of comments on that road, and I use it a lot, too. We did that I believe in '88 or '89, we did a seal coating on it that didn't turn out very well. I mean it's not your fault or anybody, it just didn't turn out well. I don't want to see it slip to a pulverize. That's a long, wide road.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Just by the condition of it as often as I drive it I would say it would be within the next couple years.

Kris Keckler:

Move approval of administration's recommendation including the notion of potential adjustment based on the recent winter.

Dave Klimisch:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

KECKLER MOVED TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT WITH PAYNE & DOLAN, INC., FOR THE 2019 ANNUAL PAVING PROGRAM SUBJECT TO POTENTIAL CHANGE ORDERS; SECONDED BY KLIMISCH; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

F. Consider the McGrath Consulting Group, Inc., for the Fire and Rescue Study.

Nathan Thiel:

Village President and Board, before you tonight as a proposal from McGrath Consulting Group, as you're aware during the 2019 budget process there was submitted a request for a \$30,000 one-time budget item for the purpose of a fire and rescue study. That purpose was to evaluate current service delivery and the Village's capacity to meet community needs both current and future in terms of staffing, equipment and facilities.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Staff requested a proposal. We received two proposals, one from McGrath Consulting Group, the other from the Center for Public Safety Management. Staff is recommending approval of proceeding forward with the McGrath Consulting Group. The study cost was outlined at \$28,900 not to exceed. There's no travel costs or travel costs are included in that base rate. And then the time delivery is about five months. They're headquartered in Chicago, so I think that that was part of the edge or the benefit that gave them a preferred pricing. With that any questions you might have we can entertain those.

Dave Klimisch:

Move approval of the contract with McGrath Consulting.

Michael Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Further discussion? Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? So carries.

KLIMISCH MOVED TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT WITH MCGRATH CONSULTING GROUP, INC. FOR THE FIRE AND RESCUE STUDY; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

9. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS

John Steinbrink:

Just one comment. Thank you, John, for the great job you guys did on the plowing and salting. It was one of those storms that just kept popping back up and required a lot of guys to go out there and work and they did a great job.

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Thank you very much. I'll make sure to pass it onto the field staff.

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

Michael Serpe:

And more coming Wednesday.

John Steinbrink:

Chief, you had an incident today? I want to just commend your people on the way you handled it.

Chief Smetana:

Yes, it was a false call put into the police department at 7:30 this morning at what sounded like an active shooter hostage type situation. If you listened to the call for service you'll understand the excitement in the dispatcher's voice as well. They handled themselves very well as did the officers. It was an organized check box, an organized investigation we carried out from beginning to the end locking down the area, making sure the area was safe, making sure critical businesses and our own public works and Prange Building was okay and then doing a house to house. So we made a lot of very positive contacts today in the Village and those among them. So job well done by the supervision and by the officers in the street. We were lucky we had ten officers including detectives and supervisors and third shift officers who stayed over and first shift officers. So there were ten of us out there to be able to handle it. The timing couldn't have been better.

John Steinbrink:

I just wanted to say thank you. And, once again, it shows your readiness and capability in the department. So thank all your guys for their work.

Chief Smetana:

It was a good practice, thank you.

Michael Serpe:

Very professional and good luck on an apprehension. That would be nice.

Chief Smetana:

It sure would. Thanks.

John Steinbrink:

Further Village Board comments?

Village Board Minutes
February 18, 2019

10. ADJOURNMENT

Michael Serpe:

How about if we adjourned.

Kris Keckler:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second for adjournment. Those in favor?

Voices:

Aye.

John Steinbrink:

Opposed? Motion carries.

**SERPE MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY KECKLER;
MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:20 P.M.**