VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY Village Hall Auditorium 9915 39th Avenue Pleasant Prairie, WI January 16, 2008 4:30 p.m.

A meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Community Development Authority was held on Wednesday, January 16, 2008. Meeting called to order at 4:30 p.m. Present were John P. Steinbrink, Gary Hutchins, Phil Godin, Mike Serpe, Tom Reiherzer and Larry Nelson. Kate Jerome was excused. Also present were Mike Pollocoff, Executive Director, Jane Romanowski, Secretary and Jean Werbie, Community Development Director.

1. CALL TO ORDER

- 2. ROLL CALL
- 3. MINUTES OF MEETINGS DECEMBER 19, 2007

REIHERZER MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 19, 2007 MEETING OF THE CDA AS PRESENTED IN THEIR WRITTEN FORM; SECONDED BY GODIN; MOTION CARRIED 6-0.

- 4. CITIZEN COMMENTS
- 5. COMMISSION COMMENTS
- 6. NEW BUSINESS

A. Consider approval of additional relocation expenses to C & S Management.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. Chairman, we received correspondence from Kevin Long concerning the request by C & S Management for \$20,500 in relocation expenses. We haven't paid C & S any relocation expenses. We did pay some relocation expenses for the owner of the building. Remember, C & S was the lease holder. In Kevin's review of the documents he's indicated that they are entitled to a minimum of \$20,000. He felt there might be some basis to dispute that, but the burden of proof would be on the Authority to make that determination in that the legal expenses would outweigh the \$20,000. So in as much as \$20,000 is the maximum he's recommending that we offer them \$20,000 and not the \$500 and receive a waiver with payment. My request is that the Authority authorizes counsel for the Authority to meet with their attorney and make that settlement.

Phil Godin:

Move to approve.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second for approval. Further discussion on this item?

Larry Nelson:

This is the last thing then, right? This ends it. It's done. They go away, is that right?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah. And all the other properties have gone past their two year limit. That's the recommendation of our counsel.

Phil Godin:

And it's more than arguable. I mean not only do we have the burden but it is likely they would prevail. Mike and I looked at it.

GODIN MOVED TO AUTHORIZE COUNSEL TO NEGOTIATE A PAYMENT OF \$20,000 TO C & S MANAGEMENT, INC. FOR RELOCATION EXPENSES AS DISCUSSED; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 6-0.

B. Receive and consider site plan for redevelopment of southwest quadrant of IH 94 and CTH Q.

Jean Werbie:

I would ask that Item B which is to consider the conceptual site plan and Item C, which is actually to consider the planned development standards for the development of lands, if both of those items could be taken up at the same time as I'll be making one presentation. You could have separate action on those items.

John Steinbrink:

Do we have a motion to bring both of those items up at the same time?

GODIN MOVED TO CONSIDER ITEMS B AND C AT THE SAME TIME BUT WITH SEPARATE ACTION; SECONDED BY REIHERZER; MOTION CARRIED 6-0.

C. Receive and consider report on architectural standards for the development of lands owned by the Community Development Authority and consider Planned Development Ordinance by the Authority to be presented to the Village Board.

Jean Werbie:

At the request of the Community Development Authority and the Village Administrator, the Village staff has been working on a conceptual site plan for the lands owned by the Community Development Authority at the southwest corner of County Trunk Highway Q and I-94. The development of lands you have in your packet and the conceptual site plan as well as the acreage calculations are the two documents that you have before you. What I'd like to do is I'd like to also go through the planned development zoning ordinance District #2 that the staff is recommending be created for the development of these lands.

We looked very long and hard about trying to adapt this area to the current zoning of the Village but we found that it just wasn't going to work. It didn't fit nicely into any one of the business categories. And so as a result we decided to create a planned development district somewhat similar in the thought process that we did create for Abbott and their properties north of County Trunk Highway Q.

So then the purpose of this PDD-2 and this ordinance is to regulate and control the development and use of approximately 30 acres of real property located within the Village generally located west of I-94 between Highway Q on the north and on either side of the West Frontage Road. And what you have before you is a regulating plan. We also refer to it as a conceptual site plan or a site plan. But what it will do is set forth a general layout of the dimensional requirements and land use locations for the development.

The design guidelines, which is actually referenced in the agenda, architectural design guidelines, will come with the next step of our process. If the CDA feels that we are going in the right direction with respect to the layout, the concept, the design and the planned development ordinance, then the next step will be the architectural design guidelines. In addition there will be some other steps that we'll need to take in order to set up the appropriate measures for a property owners association and bylaws and things like that. It really will just depend on whether or not this property is under multiple ownerships or a single ownership and how we set that up or how it's purchased and set up. We can go through those details a little bit later.

One of the things I'd like to do is just briefly go through this regulating plan and we're going to go through the other zoning regulations in more detail in a minute. There are six different areas that we have identified within our A area. What I mean by that is we've created three sub areas. The area that is kind of to the north and to the east of the Frontage Road, which is almost all of the area that you see right there, that is the A sub area. And within the A sub area we've identified up to six different retail, office or service related uses that could be located based on the amount of acreage.

The first use within the A area would be an A-1 use or a hotel. One of the things we've talked about is a hotel and conference center at the very corner that could service this entire development, the Uline property – Abbott - its traveling public. It could be a great use that could help service this part of the Village. The second use would be an A-2 use. It's a use that we've identified as a potential site for a corporate office directly south of where the hotel site would be.

A third use is A-3, retail mixed use, and that would be at the very corner of Highway Q and the Frontage road.

The fourth is an A-4 use, and this is a gas station/convenience store use. I know that we've talked about this off and on, but it really does make some sense to have more than one gas station at this interchange. And it does make some sense to put one here. As we go through the guidelines that we've put together in the zoning ordinance, you'll see that we are not proposing that it have a car wash. We're not proposing that it be a truck stop. We're not proposing that it have diesel fuel, so we are regulating it at a certain extent that it's intended to be for car traffic for service.

The fifth building area or use which we've identified as A-5 is a restaurant use and that's just off of the Frontage Road because we feel that there should be an opportunity for some type of restaurant. I'm not leaning towards a fast food restaurant but more of a casual dining sit down type of restaurant, not something with a drive through.

And then the sixth or A-6 use or building site would be a small retail or restaurant use directly opposite from the hotel site. So those are all the uses that we envision to be within the A sub area. With respect to the hotel just to give you some perspective, the hotel we're looking at for a size of about 200 rooms. The corporate office we're looking for a minimum of three stories. The retail mixed use about 21,000 square feet, gas station not to exceed 6,000 square feet, restaurant 6,300 square feet and a retail or restaurant not to exceed 5,000 square feet.

The other two areas or sub areas that we've identified as part of this regulating plan are the B sub areas which on this map is vacant land that we'll be discussing a little bit later this evening. But at this point we've just identified it as vacant with the possibility of a public or private roadway connection from the Frontage Road west to the Uline property as a possible third exit or entrance to the Uline property.

And, finally, the third sub area is an area we've identified for storm water management retention, detention or storm water management facilities and that is to service all of this commercial area.

So what I'd like to do then is I'd like to go through more of the PDD-2 site and then now everything should fall into place for you as having some perspective. Again, the PDD-2, subdistrict A, restaurant, hotel, corporate business office, retail service. There are many other commercial related uses in the zoning district, but we feel that those uses are not appropriate and should not be located out here at this particular location. So what we'll do is we'll continue to go through the various aspects of the district.

The permitted uses within the sub-district B area, at this point we're recommending that it be retention or detention basin, but there might be a possibility, depending on who owns it and what the desire would be, that a corporate office could be there or a hotel could be there. Probably not a large hotel but a smaller type of extended stay hotel. Again, we'll have to have some further discussion on the particular use of that property.

The permitted uses in sub-district C, again, would be related to storm water management to service this particular quadrant. Again, we don't want to use our highest and best and most

valuable land for storm water management, so we felt that if we created a separate sub-district down here that's basically what we could place in that particular area.

Throughout the Village we have something referred to as auxiliary permitted uses, and we wanted both the sub-districts A and B to be allowed to have these districts as well. These auxiliary uses are auxiliary only to the permitted office uses. They'd be located in a principal office building. They are uses that are designed to serve the needs of the occupants of this campus or this area. They have no dedicated outside entrance. They have no visible signage, and they're restricted to ten percent of a particular building.

What I'm getting at here is, for example, if we have a corporate office building or a hotel we're allowing them to have ten percent of retail service uses within that building that may serve that particular building. So, for example, an office building might have a cafeteria, it might have a little convenience store; it might have a coffee shop. It might have any one of those types of retail services, but they would be integral to that office building. Same thing with the hotel. You could have those auxiliary uses within those particular facilities. But what I don't want is to see just like what we did with some of the other uses along the Interstate, we don't want to see 20 different advertising signs to get a cup of coffee or to pick up a card or something on the outside of their corporate office building.

So auxiliary permitted uses we break that down into retail and service. And as you can see by the list that's provided, books, candy, cards, newspapers, magazines, office supplies, it's very generic type of retail uses. Service auxiliary, barber shop, coffee house, might be a daycare office facility in the corporate office building. It might be a restaurant in that facility, travel agency, shoe shine, different things that would actually service the population out there. Again, the general public could use them but they have to come into the building through the front door basically to be able to get to those services.

The other provision that we have added throughout the ordinance is that the Zoning Administrator shall have the authority to evaluate these auxiliary and permitted uses on a case-by-case basis to find out if there's something substantially similar that we felt would be appropriate those could be included as well, but if they're not included and they're not permitted at the Zoning Administrator's discretion then they would be permitted uses.

Unspecified permitted uses in the district, sub-districts B and C their permitted uses are the ones that are listed in the ordinance. We're not allowing anything new or different or above unless specifically, again, they request. The district A is the one that we'd like to incorporate more flexibility so that depending on what use comes in that we would be able to address an ever changing market condition for them.

The following uses shall not be construed to be permitted uses within sub-district A. Now, this is very important because we want to make sure that no matter what we're not going to have any adult-oriented related uses at this location. We're not going to have uses that are serving alcohol unless expressly permitted through licensing. We are not going to have any cash convenient businesses, funeral homes, firearms, tattoo or body piercing studios, flea markets, pawn shops. As you can see the list there it seems to make some sense that these are not the type of uses.

These are more community commercial uses that are not appropriate for freeway-oriented uses in the Village.

Conditional uses in sub-district A, we have identified a gasoline station, a liquor store, cabaret, dinner theater and some commercial communication antennas, again, only integral to a principal building. No stand alone towers or anything that would be obtrusive out in that district. But we came up with a couple of them. Again, conditional uses are not permitted by matter of right in this Village. They do have to be approved by the Plan Commission and they are subject to certain conditions. Again, that gas station does not have a car wash or diesel for truck fueling.

Conditional uses in the sub-district B, the only thing we could really come up with is if there's some type of smaller, stand alone, ground mounted, something that involves some type of communication antenna. Again, if a hotel or corporate office building does happen to locate on B then it could be attached or fixed to that building. But, again, we're not encouraging any stand alone large towers or obstructions.

Under special licensed uses, uses that require cabaret licenses or liquor licenses in the Village are special use licenses that must be granted by the Village Board. So even if we set forth some type of provisions that it's a restaurant that can serve alcohol, that doesn't mean that the CDA or the Plan Commission are granting authority for a liquor license. That rests solely with the Village Board.

Combination of uses, it's specifically set forth in the ordinance that there can be a combination of certain principal uses within a particular building, again, with the noted exceptions of the prohibited uses.

Accessory uses within the PDD-2 district A and B, accessory uses to principal permitted uses are allowed, and accessory uses to principal conditional uses are allowed as well. But, again, we want them to be integral or a part of or attached to that principal building. We don't want to have a bunch of free standing, stand alone accessory uses out there.

With respect to dimensional standards, the ordinance does go into some very specifics with respect to lot size, lot frontage on a public street, lot frontage on a private street and open space. Some of those have some blanks left with them and I think we need to discuss this just a little bit further. It is the intent or recommendation by the staff that the frontage road remain as a public road, but that internal looped road that cuts through sub-district A that it be a private road but constructed to Village standards or specifications. But even though it's constructed to Village standards we are recommending that some of the setbacks be reduced significantly so we can bring some of those buildings in closer to the roadway.

With respect to open space considerations, what we'd like to do is because we're considering this as a planned development, the open space that is shown on sub-district B and sub-district C that could be used as part of the calculation and determination of open space for A. Again, I'm not trying to encourage a situation where we have great setbacks, 30, 65 foot setbacks for our buildings. We're not going to get nearly what we would like to get into this particular area if we create these great setbacks. We're trying to do this in a more compact or urban form.

What I'd like to do is quickly go through some of the design or dimensional standards that we have already put into the PDD. For example, the first use, the principal office building, we've got some design standards where we're recommending that it be a minimum of three floors, that it be a minimum of 36,000 square feet, each floor having 12,000 square feet. The area occupied by any research and development is not to exceed 25 percent of the building; minimum height of 36 feet, maximum height 90 feet.

The next use that we looked at is the principal hotel building; minimum of four floors, minimum of 15,000 square feet per floor, minimum of 100 guest rooms, maximum height of 100 feet. Just to put things in perspective for you, the Radisson across the street is just over 90 feet in height, and I believe they have about 120 rooms, so it's similar initially our thought process. But the one that's shown here is actually about 200 rooms.

The next use is principal gasoline station building; minimum building size of 4,000, maximum 6,000 square feet. Gas pumps and canopy shall be located on the east side so it's kind of shielded from the Frontage Road so that it appears that you've got just another retail building facing the Frontage Road. Maximum height of 35 feet so it can be designed so it looks like a two story but basically the second story would be a fake or a faux two story. And it shall be protected by automatic fire sprinkler system.

As you may or may not know the current fire protection ordinance of the Village requires that fire sprinklers be installed in all commercial buildings greater than 5,000 square feet. And we don't want a situation where we've got a bunch of smaller retail buildings out here that are at 4,999 in order to just undercut that sprinkler ordinance requirement. We want these areas to be protected. So regardless of its size, if it's 3,000, 4,000, 5,000, 6,000 we're recommending in the ordinance that it must have the fire protection system of the automatic sprinklers.

The next two areas or two uses that we looked at are retail buildings. There are two, the A-3 area which is up at the corner and an A-6 area which is directly across from the hotel. The A-3 area we're stating should have a minimum of 15,000 square feet, maximum of 25,000 square feet. Again, we're not looking for big box retail out here. Building A-6, minimum of 4,000 square feet, maximum of 6,000 square feet. Some of these square footages will depend on how much parking they need, setbacks, and so on and so forth, that's why we give ranges or maximums or minimums; maximum height of 35 feet. And, again, these two buildings as well should be protected by an automatic fire sprinkler system regardless of their square footage.

The next uses and, again, this one building could be retail or restaurant, so buildings A-5 or A-6, minimum of 3,000 square feet, maximum of 7,000 square feet; maximum height of 35 feet. Again, shall be protected by automatic fire protection system, fire sprinkler system.

The next things we looked at are setbacks. I was mentioning earlier that we were trying to get more of an urban feel to this particular area because it's going to be quite a built up area when all the improvements are completed and the roadways have been completed. But we are recommending that the setbacks be reduced, for example, along Highway Q, 165, and I-94 reducing the setbacks from 65 feet to 50 feet. On 120th Avenue the ordinance would typically

require 45 feet and we're recommending 30 feet to the right of way. 35 feet from the back of curb on the private loop road, and then we do need to address some considerations to the side or rear setbacks and whether or not we actually identify setback lines or, again, if there's single or multiple parcels.

With respect to parking, fire lanes and aisle setbacks, we're recommending that those be substantially less at about five feet for Q, 165 and I-94; 30 feet from 120^{th} Avenue; and 35 feet from the back of curb on the private loop road.

With respect to sub-district B we looked at those setbacks as well, and we're looking at more of a 30 foot setback to the right of way and the side and rear property lines, 25 feet from wetlands, and 30 feet, again, from fire lanes and aisle and parking.

And, finally, one of the things because the proposed storm water basin is going to be on the curve of 120th Avenue, we are recommending, and we don't even currently have this in our ordinance, that there be some setback from the high water level of the basin to the right of way. I'm not sure what that is. I think that's something that we need to get a recommendation from our Village engineers on, but we do feel that there needs to be some protection from separation spacing that's a little bit greater as well as plantings or berming or something to that effect just so that if you're traveling into the curve you're not going to shoot into the retention basin.

With respect to some design standards, we wanted to make sure that we had some maximums of the total number of buildings in this area. Sub-district A six maximum, sub-district B 1 maximum, sub-district C none because we are envisioning that to be the storm water area. We are indicating that we are recommending to detached accessory structures. All trash enclosures shall be attached to a principal building. All accessory uses shall be on the same lot as the principal. And all loading facilities shall be internal to the principal building. We just finished a project on Highway 50, Prairie Ridge Commons, and in that particular building if you look to the south side of that building all the loading and all the trash enclosures and everything is internal to the building so there aren't any exterior accessory structures at all, and it looks rather nice to have that.

Finally, we looked at some operational standards, again, worth discussing. In our zoning ordinance, the Community Business District, as well as the B-1, Neighborhood Business District, and the B-3 District, for retail our hours of operation in the Village are from 5 a.m. to 12 o'clock midnight. We don't have 24 hour businesses in this Village. We have a few that were grandfathered in before the ordinance went into effect but primarily we have none. And so we are not recommending any out here as well and that's worth discussing.

The exceptions are hotels because they are a 24 hour operation and any uses that we've granted a liquor license to or special license to out in this area they can stay open as late as their license allows. So for places that have a liquor license bar time is two o'clock so you'd be able to have that establishment open until two o'clock. But if there would be a convenience store out here or if there would be a restaurant out here, a gas station, they would not be able to be open past midnight.

All business activities shall be conducted within a building. No outside storage or display of merchandise. No onsite residential uses. Everything should be aesthetically pleasing on the side. Buildings and sites shall be in compliance with current approved plans that we put forth, regulating plans, site and operational plans, any plans that are adopted by the Village. All uses shall be connected to municipal sewer, water and storm sewer service.

And then one other provision that we've added in here is that collectively this would be a planned development and collectively the total square footage would exceed the minimum required for the security ordinance of the Village to kick in. So there would need to be security ordinance regulations that would be effective for this particular development which involves security cameras and a whole bunch of other things with respect to onsite security. So even though there's an individual use that's only 5,000 square feet we're looking at this from a big picture perspective.

So with that those are the operational and dimensional and all the other requirements that we have set forth in the planned development district that we're looking to create for this District #2. Again, you've seen the regulating plan. What I'd like to do is talk about both of those. Once we get some positive direction from the CDA then we will take it to the next step with respect to design guidelines and setting forth some of the other details that do need to be in place.

Mike Serpe:

This is probably something relatively minor to us, but each one of these businesses is going to need some signage of some sort on the Interstate. Who makes that application for that?

Jean Werbie:

They do. Those are the tourist information signs, and if they are gas, food or lodging or a cultural place or destination then they are allowed to have and apply for one of these signs on the Interstate. The Village will not make the application for them. They have to go through the permitting process of the State. I'm not sure if they have to pay an annual fee, and I think it can be multiple signs going north and southbound. But just general retail uses they're not allowed to be advertising on the Interstate.

Larry Nelson:

And then further to that question we'll have our own sign ordinance along with these?

Jean Werbie:

That's something worth discussing. Right now we have a pretty extensive sign ordinance at this time in the Village zoning ordinance, and we left that area blank because that's something that I find that until we get a little bit further down the road with knowing what the uses are going to be I can't even make a guess at what type of signage that they're going to be looking for or needing. Some of the things we can be flexible about I know. For example, the Radisson has a Chancery sign, a restaurant sign on that building, and it's up over 60 feet in height. It's not a separate pole

sign but it's on that same principal building that the restaurant is in. So that was one of the agreements that we had with them in their planned unit development and this will be a planned development. So that's something we could incorporate right into. But I don't envision any tower signs or any type of excessive signage out here other than what is truly needed for these uses. The biggest uses, I would say the hotel and restaurant, those would be the biggest uses and they will have signs on the Interstate as well.

Tom Reiherzer:

Jean, what did you allow at Uline? Let me get my directions straight. Uline is to the north of this and on the same side, west side of the road, correct?

Jean Werbie:

They are directly west of this, directly west of this.

Tom Reiherzer:

So this is on the east side of the I?

Jean Werbie:

No, they are directly west of the West Frontage Road. They will border this whole western boundary.

Tom Reiherzer:

One of their big things was the signage so that they could see the corporation from the freeway. You're going to have a corporation in this subdivision also. Now, what did we allow for Uline to have out there?

Jean Werbie:

We haven't yet. We have just started seeing their concept plans and their drawings, and we have not even talked about signage yet at all. Again, it's still a corporation. They're not advertising a retail business or a warehouse. They need to have prominent, and we talked about it generally with them today, monument signage, secondary monument signage at the entrance. They will likely have like they do in the corporate park now signage on their building. They might have something on their corporate office building. And, again, their corporate office building can go up to four, five, six stories. So if they decide to put something up that high on their building as a wall mounted sign that will be high enough for you to see from the Interstate.

Larry Nelson:

Are the uses that you have in mind here those are recommendations, but yet you still want a little flexibility in case something occurs that would be maybe better than the use?

Jean Werbie:

I think so. What we're trying to do really is put together not only a regulation plan and an ordinance, but we are trying to then put together design guidelines to help you market this CDA property. And so I envision that there would be amendments or modifications once a user comes in, whether it's a user that wants to purchase all of the land or a portion of the land. We'll need to look at possibly refining or amending the documents as we go further through the process.

Larry Nelson:

Would that decision come back to the CDA?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Phil Godin:

A couple things. Is it realistic for us to draw it with a hotel in there? How much room did we give Abbott in their development for a hotel?

Jean Werbie:

About 20 acres for just the hotel and convention center.

Phil Godin:

We feel theirs is going to be captive?

Jean Werbie:

Do I feel there's going to be a need?

Phil Godin:

No, that theirs is going to be captive. . . . think we're going to have three hotels basically on three corners.

Mike Pollocoff:

The hotel that KABA is looking to do is ten or twelve years out. So after Abbott has really established more of a presence and they're able to command a certain number of rooms then that hotel–because here we have hotel and conference probably similar to what we have at Radisson. But I think we'd be looking more to Marriott. That one there we're looking at 400 rooms for that hotel.

Phil Godin:

Then, second, as long as we're at this stage where we can decide what the uses are, why don't we not allow a physical fitness facility - seriously? We don't know what could come down the road to us if somebody puts in a 20,000 square foot facility there . . . that we all have an interest in maintaining?

Jean Werbie:

Would you be opposed to it as an auxiliary use in a hotel? Sometimes they use one or two rooms' worth of weight equipment or something to that effect?

Phil Godin:

No, I just don't want to see Anytime Fitness or something like that really takes off I don't want it out there. I may be alone on that but I want to protect what we have invested a lot in.

-:

And, Phil, that would be for hotel use only let's say?

Phil Godin:

I could go along with that, but these Anytime Fitness their plans are phenomenal apparently across the country and they're starting to succeed.

Jean Werbie:

So we would only allow an auxiliary use in an existing building.

Mike Serpe:

Looking at the layout with the amount of parking and if this were to build out just the way we have it planned here, traffic could become a problem with controlled intersections, controlled access points to some of these. I just consider Highway 50 west of the I right at the Brat Stop the majority of the time up until about nine o'clock at night it's almost a nightmare for anybody going east or westbound on Highway 50 that they don't hit somebody coming out of the Brat Stop or the gas station across the street. I see this as probably more congested in its total build out than I do on 50 and west of the I.

Jean Werbie:

And that's a good point. We last week requested KLOA, it's a traffic study and design firm, to give us a proposal to do a traffic study and analysis on this project. They are also updating the one for Abbott and they're also doing the one for Uline. So they're looking at all three projects at the same time. They are looking at the widening of Q, the signalized intersection at the Frontage

Road and Q, as well as the next signalized intersection. They're looking at number of lanes, traffic times, they're looking at the Frontage Road to make sure that we are designing that appropriately for the turn lanes. They're looking at the two driveway spacings for separation spacing to the intersection. We are a little concerned. It's about 450 feet from the intersection of the Frontage Road and the north driveway or the private road to Highway Q. It's a little closer than I like.

The State requires 460 feet. If you look at any of our parallel Frontage Roads like where St. Catherine's is and the distance to the intersections at Highway 50 they're 460 feet. They're controlled intersections though. And I'm sure that they're going to come back and say the same thing that these need to be controlled with dual lefts or dual rights, but we need to know all those things. And if it cuts into some of this property we're going to have to shrink it back and that's why we need to know all that. My understanding is depending on their schedule I think this spring is when they're trying to put together all those traffic studies for us.

Mike Pollocoff:

One of the things the Village wants to do is we want to reconstruct the Frontage Road this year along with Q so we can have that done and out of the way before Uline starts. Plus we want to be able to get this land set up. So what these Frontage Road widths look like could change. But the access points are pretty tough to change because of the curve of the road. If anything, more than likely what's going to happen is you're not going to be able to take a right in on that northernmost entrance. This loop road might end up being a one way road where you circulate from the south and go out to the west. Because otherwise you'll be jamming up traffic making left turns coming off of Q. So the traffic study is going to bear out which way we have to go.

We took a look at Uline's numbers today and they're significant for the number of employees for their ultimate phases. It's way more than they've disclosed to anybody at this point. And we need to build this for their ultimate use as well as ours. Once we start and we have commercial uses in here or once they've started it's too hard to go back in even if it's ten years from now and retrofit this.

The Village wants to get underway with this as soon as we get that engineering information as to what this is going to look like. And it's going to be a unique grading site. It will probably be terraced with this land along Q and the Interstate being a little bit higher and then the interior being terraced with retaining walls. So there's some architectural opportunities to make it look nice to get that lower because the pitch from Q down to the Frontage Road is significant.

Mike Serpe:

One other thing while we're talking about this. Is there any plans in the future that Kenosha County or Pleasant Prairie for that matter is going to have a park and ride somewhere in this area?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, not here. I think at some point I would think that there would be one with Abbott. That's the biggest player is where we'd be looking for a drop off there. Maybe on their commercial site on their side. Right now there really just isn't the land available over here. But I really think on the Abbott side is where there is room for that.

Jean Werbie:

The State did talk to us extensively about five years ago to have a park and ride at Highway 50 just to the west of where the new Walgreens is. I don't think that's possible anymore due to the amount of wetlands at that location. But they are looking for a site somewhere between E and the State Line for a park and ride lot. They were not recommending that it's here.

Mike Serpe:

I wouldn't say that it has to be here but I think somewhere along the line we have to address that need. Racine has one at 11 and 20 and they're well used.

Mike Pollocoff:

One of the park and rides that we may be looking at is right at the Village Green. You have a commercial center and then the ride takes you to Uline or takes you to Abbott and then brings you back to the Village Green where you may live close to that or at least it brings you into that demographic part of the Village. But if the State decides they want to acquire land for a north/ south park and ride we could sell them some land further south.

(Inaudible)

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. That land is too expensive for a park and ride.

Mike Serpe:

The weigh station - there's not enough room in that area to put a park and ride.

John Steinbrink:

You don't want to mix the cars and the trucks.

Mike Serpe:

Not at the same time.

Gary Hutchins:

And who controls the Frontage Roads?

Mike Pollocoff:

They're under Pleasant Prairie control. The State feels confident that the Village's design we're going to base it on sound engineering and traffic studies. So they're going to let the Village realign these frontage roads to work with the land uses we have and design them accordingly. We're going to get that done this year both north and south. And then next year we're going to be negotiating with the State to sell those back to the State. They're not going to pay 100 percent but that's what we're going to negotiate is what they will pay to acquire these back. At least in Wisconsin the State wants all the frontage roads back. But we'd much rather design them and get these access points worked out to our standards rather than have the State impose a Statewide standard on the frontage road because that's really difficult to work around. So they will be going back to the State in 2009.

Jean Werbie:

And the State has already told us to make sure that we're aware of the fact that they are probably going to need an additional 50 feet of right of way on the main north/south frontage road areas which is kind of just south of where this starts to bend so we've taken that into account. But all the way north and south for the main line expansion to the eight lanes of the Interstate.

Mike Serpe:

I don't know what affect my statement is going to have on this project or any other project, but the economic indicators right now for this country are rather bleak. And if the country is, and I think it is somewhat into a recession at this point, if it gets worse what's that going to do? I mean how much can we pare back, and it's based on how many people want to come in and develop obviously, but we're looking at spending money into a TIF District. What happens if something really bottoms out here?

Mike Pollocoff:

I guess there are a couple things that should be guiding us. One is that we really haven't spent a lot of TIF money until we've known that there's been tax base within the district to support that. And we've been holding back out here premised on our discussions with Abbott and now Uline. They're ready to go and they're making some investments, and those investments will only provide within the TIF District what's going to cover it.

Our ability to move this land is not solely covered by the return on the land. I mean that is going to be good for the Village, but these improvements in our original project plan are going to be financed by the TIF District as a whole as that increment goes. The TIF District has been doing fairly well. In fact, right now we're pretty well swamped with proposals of that kind of development. The residential has clearly gone off.

I think the second thing is that within reason and within a certain amount of caution I guess I think that's really what the charge of the Village has been is to create an environment where economic development can happen and take advantage of the economic pressures that come from I-94 and the opportunities that are there and this is where we are. If we have slow down in some respects that's a good time to get our plans in place for those areas within the TIF District that aren't developing. If Abbott doesn't start very soon we won't be out any money with them because we still won't be making any improvements for them. But we do know we have somebody in hand that at a minimum will be \$100 million in tax base that's itching and ready to go and that will facilitate this. And it will drive some of the commercial development here.

We've had a lot of people approach us about this area to develop it, and before it was kind of waiting on Abbott. Now that Uline is out there that interest has picked up because they're seeing somebody else is building in the area. I would be probably really hesitant if we didn't have Uline in here. I think probably my recommendation would be to wait on it and not go at all. But I think in some respects we have to build not this entire site. What I'm taking about creating is the road, get the road relocated for them, put in the loop road so we can get the sewer and water and grade it and then that's it. Then it's going to be up to a buyer to do the final grading and finish it off.

Larry Nelson:

The loop road would be part of the developer's responsibility or ours?

Mike Pollocoff:

That would be ours.

Jean Werbie:

It will be theirs to maintain.

Larry Nelson:

That's right, okay, thank you. And then we would then parcel it off and sell them as separate parcels ourselves or somebody can come in and buy the whole thing. Either way that would work for the Village?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. What's important is the Authority is going to have the architectural standards and we'll set up covenants that say what it's going to look like so we know what it will look like. And I think the other thing that we've indicated that when someone buys this land they need to develop it. We're not going to sell it for speculation.

Larry Nelson:

So should we if we parcel it off put prices on each parcel?

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd say we wouldn't parcel it off. We'd only parcel it off if somebody came-say the hotel came in and it was Jack's Hotel, somebody, and they were met our requirements for architectural standards - room count, the height - then we would carve that off and sell that site off. So at some point the first buyer is going to really kind of dictate which road we go down on and that will be our decision when we accept the offer if it's worthwhile to say, okay, the money price works, it's going to pay for us to do this in small pieces. In visiting with Rocco and the appraiser we might do better if it is parceled off on a square foot basis.

Larry Nelson:

That's the point I was trying to get at is we're acting somewhat as our own developer and I think there's a possibility you could make more money with this if you did it that way. Of course, there's more responsibility, too, along with that.

Phil Godin:

Mike, what do you think the cost will be to build the Frontage Road and the loop road?

Mike Pollocoff:

We're looking at this development here and the Frontage Road the number I got from the engineer takes us from Q all the way down to almost 116th Street so that's a long haul. But it gets us past our other site that we have, the 30 acres on the south. Everything is \$3.4 million, sewer, water and a really oversized road because, again, we don't know what that road width is going to look like. So the numbers are pretty conservative.

Phil Godin:

And you're planning to start maybe in March?

Mike Pollocoff:

Yes, as soon as we can get started. Uline is looking to start in August which means we need to be out of the way. We have to have the roads done and get the utilities to their site so that they can start. This is tracking a little bit faster than we thought, but I guess the good news is they're intent on really getting in and getting the structure up.

Phil Godin:

Realistically almost their revenues alone, their tax revenues in the following year would pay for this or close, a little less.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. And, again, in our TIF pro forma we don't even have them loaded into the formula and we're coming in at a tight point here where our fund reserves are small but we've got somebody big coming in. And we also at least the active development proposals in the existing Corporate Park are up over what they've been. The tough thing is making that carry for 2009 for it to show up on the road completely.

Phil Godin:

And we have a little pressure to do the Frontage Road anyway because of the State's issues.

Mike Pollocoff:

We want to get these things the way we want them for ourselves before we turn them over to the State.

Phil Godin:

We're boxing in at 2008 either way, that way regardless of whatever the economic conditions might be.

Larry Nelson:

I've got one more question. The pond that's our responsibility I take it. Then the maintenance of the pond is?

Mike Pollocoff:

We create an owners association of this development. So at such point as if we say when it's 90 percent filled or 75, whatever we said, that association is going to take over not to pay into it but the Village or the CDA will be the main controller of the association until everything is sold off. But they'll always have to maintain that pond, the green space around there. We're also going to require the associations over there to do some irrigation and plantings around the interchange so it dresses that up and maintains a nice value in that area.

John Steinbrink:

Other comments or questions?

Mike Serpe:

What kind of motion are we looking for? To accept your proposals and send out to the Plan Commission?

Mike Pollocoff:

To approve the site plan as we've submitted it and then to authorize staff to continue working on the ordinance and the development standards. And we'll bring those back next month from the architects.

Mike Serpe:

So moved.

Phil Godin:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

That's a motion and a second on Item B, is that correct?

Mike Serpe:

Item B.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second on Item B. Further discussion?

SERPE MOVED TO APROVE THE SITE PLAN AS SUBMITTED AND AUTHORIZE STAFF TO CONTINUE WORKING ON THE ORDINANCE AND THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AS DISCUSSED; SECONDED BY GODIN; MOTION CARRIED 6-0.

John Steinbrink:

Then we have Item C to receive and consider the report on architectural standards.

Tom Reiherzer:

I make that motion.

Gary Hutchins:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Further discussion on this item?

HUTCHINS MOVED TO RECEIVE THE REPORT ON ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF LANDS OWNED BY THE CDA AND THE DRAFT PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE; SECONDED BY HUTCHINS; MOTION CARRIED 6-0.

7. CONSIDER ENTERING INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION:

A. Pursuant to Section 19.85(1)(e) Wis. Stats. to deliberate or negotiate the purchase of public property, investing of public funds, or conduct other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session with Centerpoint Properties for land owned by the Community Development Authority generally located South of CTH Q and west of the 120th Avenue right-of-way.

John Steinbrink:

The purpose of which will be discussion to formulate strategy pertaining to the properties we've mostly discussed here and negotiations with CenterPoint Development.

Tom Reiherzer:

I make a motion to go into closed session.

Larry Nelson:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion by Tom, second by Larry. We need a roll call vote. .

Mike Serpe:

I will have to be excused. I have another meeting I have to go to.

REIHERZER MOVED TO ENTER INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION PURSUANT TO SECTION 19.85(1)(E) WIS. STATS. TO DELIBERATE OR NEGOTIATE THE PURCHASE OF PUBLIC PROPERTY, INVESTING OF PUBLIC FUNDS, OR CONDUCT OTHER SPECIFIED PUBLIC BUSINESS, WHENEVER COMPETITIVE OR BARGAINING REASONS REQUIRE A CLOSED SESSION WITH CENTERPOINT PROPERTIES FOR LAND OWNED BY THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF CTH Q

AND WEST OF THE 120TH AVENUE RIGHT-OF-WAY; SECONDED BY NELSON; ROLL CALL VOTE – STEINBRINK – YES; HUTCHINS – YES; GODIN – YES; SERPE – EXCUSED FROM MEETING; REIHERZER – YES; NELSON – YES; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

John Steinbrink:

Motion carries. The Commission will return to open session for the purpose of adjournment only. No other business will be conducted.

8. **RETURN TO OPEN SESSION.**

After discussion, **REIHERZER MOVED TO RETURN TO OPEN SESSION; SECONDED BY GODIN; ROLL CALL VOTE – STEINBRINK – YES; HUTCHINS – YES; GODIN – YES; REIHERZER – YES; NELSON – YES; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.**

9. ADJOURNMENT

REIHERZER MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY GODIN; MOTION CARRIED 5-0 AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:50 P.M.