

**PLEASANT PRAIRIE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
VILLAGE HALL AUDITORIUM
9915 39TH AVENUE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE, WISCONSIN
5:00 P.M.
March 13, 2006**

A regular meeting for the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission convened at 5:00 p.m. on March 13, 2006. Those in attendance were Michael Serpe; Donald Hackbarth; Wayne Koessl; Jim Bandura; John Braig; Larry Zarletti; and Judy Juliana. Thomas Terwall was excused and Eric Olson was absent. Also in attendance were Michael Pollocoff-Village Administrator; Jean Werbie-Community Development Director; Peggy Herrick-Asst. Planner/Zoning Administrator and Tom Shircel-Asst. Planner/Zoning Administrator.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER.**
- 2. ROLL CALL.**
- 3. CORRESPONDENCE.**
- 4. CONSIDER THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 13 AND FEBRUARY 27, 2006 PLAN COMMISSION MEETINGS.**

Jim Bandura:

Move for approval as presented.

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Mike Serpe:

MOTION MADE BY JIM BANDURA AND SECONDED BY JUDY JULIANA TO ACCEPT THE FEBRUARY 13TH AND FEBRUARY 27TH PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Mike Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it.

- 5. CITIZEN COMMENTS.**

Mike Serpe:

We have two items tonight that are a matter of public hearing, Item A and B. If you have comments on either one of those items you can hold it until we call those items forward, and if you have any other comments that you wish to make about anything else on the agenda or anything else you wish to bring to the Commissioners' attention now is your time to speak. Anybody wishing to speak on citizens' comments? Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak?

6. NEW BUSINESS:

A. Public Hearing and Consideration of Zoning Text Amendments to the Section 420-137 A and B, D, E and J of the Village Zoning Ordinance Related to Planned Unit Development Overlay.

Jean Werbie:

Trustee Serpe and members of the Plan Commission, on February 13, 2006, the Plan Commission adopted Plan Commission Resolution #06-03 to initiate a zoning text amendment and that's related to Planned Unit Development Overlay District.

Specifically, Section 420-137 of the Village Zoning Ordinance entitled PUD, Planned Unit Development Overlay District, is intended to permit developments that will, over a period of time, be enhanced by coordinated area site planning and diversified location of structures. The PUD Overlay District allows for flexibility of overall development design, with benefits from such design flexibility intended to be derived by both the developer and the community, while at the same time maintaining, insofar as possible, the land use density and other standards or use requirements set forth in the underlying basic use zoning district.

Currently, PUD Overlay Districts are not allowed in the following Zoning District A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4, R-1, R-2, R-6, R-12 and FPO. The amendment that's being proposed this evening proposes to allow PUD's in the A-2, A-3 and A-4 Districts, the R-1 and R-2 and the Floodplain Overlay District in order to provide for development opportunities to be designed to protect, enhance and benefit from unique environmental features on a site. The minimum land area for an agricultural PUD is proposed to be 15 acres. The current regulations allow for residential PUD's having a minimum of ten acres. So this would continue for the R-1 and R-2 Districts.

The amendment proposes that PUD's in the A-2, A-3 and A-4 that create four or fewer lots where water is not readily available be considered. In addition, the proposed ordinance sets forth the basis for application approval in agricultural districts so that it would include.

1. Such development shall create an attractive agricultural environment of sustained desirability and economic stability and coordinates with the overall Village plans.
2. That the proposed development shall be adequately provided with and does not impose any undue burden on public services and facilities, such as fire and police protection, street maintenance, and maintenance of public areas.
3. Provisions have been made for the installation of adequate public facilities and the continuing maintenance and operation of those facilities.

4. Provisions have been made for adequate fire and rescue and police protection.
5. Adequate guarantees shall be provided for any permanent preservation of open space areas as shown on the approved site plan either by private conservation easements for the preservation, protection and maintenance of the open space or by dedication of such open space areas to the public.
6. Other requirements as set forth by the Village.

Again, this ordinance amendment was prompted by some requests that the Village staff has had with respect to being able to do an agricultural PUD. In other words, be able to create up to four lots in agriculturally zoned districts for residential development but to create properties that would either be for equestrian estates or small farmettes or some type of residential purpose but allowing for farming operations to continue. So because of that in a lot of the areas where we still have some larger farm areas that could be divided up into four lots, a lot of them have significant environmental features associated with them such as wetlands or floodplain or those areas which would remain protected as part of a conservation area as part of this PUD provision as well.

This is a matter for public hearing. Again, it's for modifications or amendments to the PUD Overlay District.

Mike Serpe:

This is a matter for public hearing. Is there anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak on the zoning text amendment? Hearing none we'll close the public hearing and open it up to comments by the Commissioners.

John Braig:

The items that are listed here as being included in the consideration of a PUD are a little bit vague and they're going to be subject to judgment on the part of the Commission and the staff. But my experience with the PUD's that we've had so far have been nothing but good, and while I'd be concerned under some circumstances about the vagueness of these six items, I'd be comfortable in recommending approval. I so move.

Judy Juliana:

I second.

Mike Serpe:

MOTION BY JOHN BRAIG, SECOND BY JUDY JULIANA TO APPROVE THE ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Mike Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it.

B. Public Hearing and Consideration of Plan Commission Resolution #06-04 to Amend the Village Comprehensive Plan Related to Updates to the Park and Open Space and the Village Land Use Plan.

Jean Werbie:

Trustee Serpe and members of the Plan Commission and audience, this public hearing this evening is for the Village Plan Commission to consider Resolution #06-04, and this is to amend the Village's comprehensive plan as it relates to updates to the park and open space plan for the Village.

The Village of Pleasant Prairie, pursuant to the provisions of Section 62.23 of the Wisconsin Statutes, has created a Village Plan Commission; and it is the duty and the function of the Village Plan Commission to make and adopt a master plan or portions thereof, for the development of the Village of Pleasant Prairie.

The Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission or SEWRPC, with the assistance of a Technical Advisory Committee, completed the Comprehensive Plan for the Kenosha Urban Planning District in July of 1995. This Plan was prepared in cooperation with the City of Kenosha, Town of Somers, Kenosha Unified School District, Kenosha County and the Village of Pleasant Prairie. That plan in 1995 represented a second generation comprehensive plan prepared by SEWRPC for the entire area located east of I-94 for the communities. The planning effort, completed over a five year time period, involved extensive inventories and analyses of the factors and conditions affecting land use and development in the area. The plan also involved the preparation of forecasts for future population, household, and economic activity levels, the formulation of community development objectives and standards, and the design of a land use plan and supporting transportation, community facility and public utility plan. It also included a park and open space plan element, and the plan also identified land uses and reserve land uses in the community.

On June 5, 1996, the Village adopted Plan Commission Resolution #99-06, which approved the aforementioned Comprehensive Plan with minor modifications as specified in the resolution. Since the adoption of Plan Commission Resolution #96-06 the Village Plan Commission has made a number of corrections and amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

The request for the amendments this evening comes from the fact that the Village desires to maintain its eligibility for grant funding for the acquisition and development of park and recreational facilities through the State Stewardship and Federal LAWCON Programs and the fact that the Wisconsin Department of Administration requires that the Village update its Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, or community-wide Park and Open Space Plan, every five years to maintain such eligibility and to assure that park planning goals, objectives, and policies are current.

The Village Park Commission is proposing an amendment to the Park and Open Space plan elements of the Village's Comprehensive Plan. The Village has contracted with Vandewalle and Associates to prepare an update to the Village's Park and Open Space Plan. Specifically, the consultants have been working with the Village staff and the Village Park Commission to prepare

this plan. Again, it's 1 2006-2011 as the five year plan, however, there are many elements and really the plan looks forward into the next approximately 30 or 35 years to the year 2030. So this is really a design year plan for 2030.

On the February 7, 2006 the Village of Pleasant Prairie Park Commission approved of the recommended Park and Open Space Plan. As the staff or the Plan Commission goes through it with you this evening, at the end there are some recommendations or modifications that we have and primarily just corrections and some typos and such, but we will go and give you a copy of those additional comments that the staff has.

But I'd like to provide to you a document overview at this point. I'm not sure if you've all had an opportunity to read through the park plan, so I will just highlight on the major parts in the plan.

Chapter I of the Plan is an Introduction. Over the years, the Village has planned for and developed a park and recreation system that is designed to meet the needs of the community and has also maintained a regional perspective by taking measures to preserve critical ecosystems and watersheds and providing parks and recreational facilities that serve the surrounding communities. The primary purpose for this updated Park and Open Space Plan is to proactively plan for the Village's future park and recreational needs of the growing community. The Plan is intended to incorporate and refine the previous findings and recommendations presented in the Park and Open Space Plan for Kenosha County, written in 1987 and amended in 1999, and the 1995 Comprehensive Plan for the Kenosha Urban Planning District which is the Village's Comprehensive Plan that I just referred to. This update was prepared in accordance with the guidelines that will make it certifiable by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and qualify the Village for matching grand funds through the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund. I referred to that as the LAWCON funds, and the State of Wisconsin Stewardship Fund Program.

Chapter II of the plan related to Background Information provides information related to the Natural Resources including information on Climate, Soils, Water Bodies and Watersheds, Vegetation, Wildlife Habitat and the Chiwaukee Prairie-Carol Beach; a section related to the Village's Population, Demographics and Housing Characteristics; a section is included that provides a review of the Existing Park Plans or the parks in the Village.

Chapter III relates to Public Participation. Appendix B provides the results of the Visioning Workshop held on September 28, 2005. The results of that workshop contributed to the development of the goals, objectives and policies that are located in the plan. The other thing is that as a part of the public participation, this is a matter that was before the Village Park Commission and the public hearing is being held before the Plan Commission this evening.

Chapter IV provides information related to Existing Park and Recreational Facilities including: Prairie Springs Park, a regional park, Anderson Park, a community park which is located just into the City of Kenosha but on our border, and the following Neighborhood Parks in the Village: Carol Beach Park, Becker Park, Woodlawn Park, Pleasant Prairie Park, Rolling Meadows Park and Lake Michigan Parks. These are all shown on Map 1a which is in your packets as well. Map 1b shows other Open Space and Natural Resources areas including: Carol Beach Open Space Lands, Country Corner-Tobin Creek Open Space Lands, Des Plaines River Open Space Lands, Momper's Woods, Prairie Trails West Open Space Land, Golf Course/Driving Range, Chiwaukee Prairie State Natural Area. Map 1b also shows other publicly-owned open spaces, other privately-owned open space, 100-year floodplain, primary and secondary environmental corridors

and isolated natural areas, two recreational trails, including the Kenosha County Bike Trail and the Prairie Springs Park Trails.

Map 1a also shows, LakeView RecPlex and Pleasant Prairie IcePlex and the three school park facilities including Pleasant Prairie Elementary School/Park, Prairie Lane School/Park and Whittier School/Park land. Appendix A provides a summary of each of the parks and other open spaces related to the facilities and the conditions of the facilities.

Future park, open space and recreational opportunities with the Village are influenced by its position in the region and its unique physical environment and demographic characteristics as discussed in Chapter V of the Plan. The opportunities available in the neighboring communities affect what is possible and desirable in the Village. Map 2 shows major recreational resource available in southeastern Wisconsin and Northern Illinois. The recommendation is this Plan is intended to enhance and contribute to the regional recreational experiences by taking into consideration the following activities/resources:

- Utilize Lake Michigan frontage for passive and active recreational uses;
- Enhance the Des Plaines River Corridor;
- Build connecting trails;
- Build on the success of Prairie Springs Park/LakeView RecPlex/Pleasant Prairie IcePlex;
- Create more outdoor active recreational space as new development occurs;
- Increase variety of recreational experiences; and
- Use community growth to create great parks.

Chapter VI of the Plan provides information on the goals, objectives and policies. These goals, objectives and policies are based on the information that has been presented in the previous chapters of the Plan, including citizen input and discussions among Village Staff and the Park Commissioners. Again, the open house and the meeting that they had last fall really set the groundwork for preparing a lot of these goals, objectives and policies.

Goals, number one, to ensure the provision of a sufficient number of parks, recreational facilities and open space areas to enhance the health and welfare of the Village residents and visitors. Such facilities should accommodate special groups such as the elderly, the handicapped and young children. Two, preserve the Village's natural resources and amenities for the benefit of current and future residents.

Objectives, one, provide quality public outdoor recreation sites and adequate open space lands for each neighborhood in the Village. Two, ensure that at least one park or recreational open space is within a safe and comfortable walking distance for all Pleasant Prairie residents. Three, increase the diversity of recreational opportunities, active and passive, resource oriented and non-resource oriented, water based and land based. And ensure that these opportunities are well distributed throughout the Village. Four, provide good pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular access to all parks

and recreational facilities. Five, balance the need to acquire and develop new park and recreation facilities with the need to maintain and upgrade existing park sites and facilities.

Continued policies: All citizens should be provided with an opportunity for engaging in recreational experiences and recreational facilities should be equitably situated. Next, the Village should continue to maintain and upgrade existing parks and recreational facilities for the safety and convenience of the age groups that use them. Next, the neighborhood parks should be sited and designed to enhance neighborhood cohesion and provide a common neighborhood gathering place. All parks should have multiple access points from surrounding neighborhoods. All new residential development should be within one mile of a neighborhood or community park. Next, parks should be integrated into future neighborhood designs and linked by a network of sidewalks, bike routes and/or open space corridors.'

Next policy, the Village should explore opportunities to increase controlled public access to Lake Michigan, particularly beach and swimming areas. The Village should take all possible measures to protect and enhance the natural resource based elements and compatible recreational opportunities located in Chiwaukee Prairie/Carol Beach lands working in collaboration with State and nonprofit agencies. Efforts should be made to increase the cohesiveness of these open space lands. Next, the acquisition of park and open space lands should occur in advance or in coordination with development to provide for reasonable acquisition costs and to facilitate site planning. Parklands in undeveloped areas should be acquired through land developer dedications where feasible.

Number eight, the Village should continue to develop a diversity of park sizes and types based on the characteristics and needs of the individual neighborhoods and the surrounding land use and natural resource features. Number nine, park impact fees are mandated through Village ordinances. An alternative means of reserving lands required for open space should be explored to ensure that lands are obtained at the lowest cost to the public. For example, nonprofit organizations, conservation easements and purchase of development rights. Number ten, parks and recreational facilities should be combined with school facilities where appropriate and feasible with joint planning and maintenance agreements.

Number 11, the preservation of primary and secondary environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, steep slopes, woodlands and forests, lakes, ponds, streams, lake shores, floodplains, riparian habitats, wetlands and prairies should receive special attention to ensure their maintenance as vegetative, wildlife and fish habitats as natural drainage areas, as areas for passive and active outdoor recreation and as storm water management areas where appropriate. Number 12, all new residential development should meet the park and open space standards and recommendations as outlined in this plan and implemented by the Village of Pleasant Prairie Zoning Ordinance and Land Division and Development Control Ordinance.

Number 13, the Village should explore the need for special recreational facilities such as dog parks and skateboard parks, through more detailed park and recreational planning initiated following the adoption of this plan. Number 14, the provision of safe and convenient bike and pedestrian connections between the Kenosha County Bike Trail, Prairie Springs Park and other park and open space facilities should be emphasized in ongoing Village planning and acquisition efforts. Wherever possible, Pleasant prairie's trail network should also be interconnected with trails in the City of Kenosha and Lake County, Illinois.

Number 15, bike and trail connections should focus on linking industrial and commercial areas with residential areas and parks to facilitate multi-modal transportation opportunities. Number 16, the Village should encourage public awareness of the Village's parks and outdoor recreational facilities by promoting them through maps, signage, internet and other materials. In addition, Village parks should serve for locations for outdoor education centers and classrooms.

Number 17, the Village should take measures to ensure that existing park facilities are upgraded to comply with the ADA design guidelines. Future parks should be designed so that they are barrier free and accessible to persons with disabilities. Number 18, the Village should continue to plan for a park system that can accommodate Village residents, as well as a large number of people that commute into Pleasant Prairie for jobs on a daily basis, and the periodic influxes of athletes and spectators for triathlons and other large Village-sponsored events. Number 19, the Village should continue its Neighborhood Planning process to identify future land uses, road and lot layouts, and the locations of parks, open space corridors and trails.

Chapter VII of the Plan provides information on Park and Recreation Standards to guide the park and planning process. These standards enable a community to quantitatively measure how well its existing facilities are meeting the needs of the residents and to assist in planning for future facilities based on the Village's projected population growth. SEWRPC has developed more localized park and recreational facility standards that were used to make the recommendations in this Plan. This Chapter discusses each park or open space type and specifies a standard related to service area, size, basic facilities and activities. This chapter also discusses standards for outdoor recreational facilities based on the total number of residents.

Chapter VIII includes an analysis of existing park and recreational facilities and how well the Village's existing park and recreational facilities satisfies the current needs of the community. Based on the current population, it is estimated that there is a need for 42 acres of Community Park area in the Community. This is because the only community park in the area is located just north of the Village's boundaries. That's Anderson Park and it is generally open to the public. Figure 9 indicates that the Village is lacking in the number of tennis courts and swimming pools. Figure 10 indicates the acreage of parks needed by 2030 based on the proposed population projections and Figure 11 indicates the park facility needs for 2030. Figures 10 and 11 suggest that in the future the Village will have to plan for additional neighborhood parks, school parks, and community parks to meet the needs of the growing population, and provisions shall be made in the upcoming years to develop additional recreational facilities including additional basketball goals, ice skating rinks, play fields, playgrounds, softball diamonds, tennis courts, soccer fields and swimming pools. Again, I have to emphasize this is as the community grows in order to meet the standards as set forth by SEWRPC for recreational facilities we would need to continue to add to our various park related amenities in the Village.

Maps 3a and 3b depict the service areas of the Village Parks. These service areas are based on the SEWRPC standard identified in Chapter VII of the Plan. Map 3a, which is on the slide, suggests that the central and southwestern portions of the Village are not well serviced at this time in terms of neighborhood parks or community parks.

Chapter IX provides recommendations for park and open space improvements. These recommendations are based on projected growth rates and distributional deficiencies identified in the Plan. The plan recommends that a total of 16 new parks are needed and improvements should be made to 9 existing parks over the next 25 plus years. The timing of park land acquisitions and development should coincide with the actual demand for the need for recreational facilities in the

Village. Map 4 indicates areas of Planned Park and Recreational Facilities and Map 5 indicates the Future Park Service Areas.

The next three slides that are on the overhead in the Park Plan overview is Chapter IX Recommended Park and Open Space Improvement plan, park and recreational facility trails. As you can see the planning staff has some recommendations to the plan for some modifications, and they primarily have to do with making some changes to make some interconnections on off street trails in the Village. In the park plan it identifies various priorities of trails, whether it's an on street trail, an off street trail and what priority it might have, and this map just provides you of an overview of some additional third priority off street trails that we are recommending in order to interconnect various neighborhoods and subdivisions. A lot of this is based on some of the detailed neighborhood planning that we have done and are doing, so we wanted to make sure that these interconnections are shown. If there's any questions I can answer those, otherwise we can come back to this particular map.

The next is the recommendation park and open space improvement plan park and recreational facilities. This is more or less more of a clarification with respect to the neighborhood parks that are being proposed, the new ones in the Village. Wherever we have an elementary school that is proposed with Kenosha Unified School District, we are also recommending that neighborhood parks go with the neighborhood school. Actually, for example, Pleasant Prairie School they constructed a number of recreational amenities such as some soccer goals and playground equipment and ball fields and things like that that are open to the neighborhood. So we do consider those neighborhood parks that go with the neighborhood elementary schools. So there are some additions and clarifications for additional ends on this particular map.

Finally, with respect to north of Prairie Springs Park, that is a potential for a future high school site for the Kenosha Unified School District. Typically a community park is associated with a high school site because of all the additional recreational amenities that they have whether it's soccer fields or softball fields or baseball fields or a track or any other type of amenities. So we've added a C along with the S or school symbol in that particular location.

Then the final map wherein we have a few additional comments is the recommended park and open space improvement plan, park and recreational facilities service areas, again, because some of the neighborhood parks in the very northeast corner of the Village and the community park had not been shown. If those are correctly shown, then service areas would need to be provided that are attributed to those new park areas.

As part of the planning process, five park concept plans were prepared to further guide the development and enhancement of the Village's park and recreation system. The Village Park Commission, with some assistance of the planning department, had identified five different areas of the Village where either growth was anticipated or a recent land acquisition was made by the Village in the way of like Momper's Woods, or there was an opportunity to look for creating a park on the east end of the Village to address an area that was really absent of parks. So the Park Commission had come up with five different parks to do concept plans on. I want to talk about those with you now.

The first is the Village Green Park Concept Plan. It's identified as map 6. As a Plan Commission you've already seen this as part of the neighborhood plan for this Village Green Neighborhood. But the Park Commission went through in great detail to identify specifically what type of active and passive recreational amenities would be designed for this park. This is located north of

where Main Street would be located and west of where the Village Green Center would be. So it's approximately at Cooper Road and north of Main Street. It identifies a large wooded area to be preserved, some ball diamonds, some tennis courts and some other amenities including a nice trail system that they have designed through that.

In this particular Village Green Park we are working with the developers on all four quadrants who are willing to donate land for this particular park as well as a number of the amenities to construct the park. So it's my understanding that the Village will not be putting any funds into developing this park. This is primarily developer driven with respect to this park amenity.

The next park in Carol Beach-Unit W Park Concept. It's identified as Map 7. I know that this is one of those areas that it was more of an in fill to address a concern for the need for parkland in an area of the Village that has a lot of open space and conservation area but does not have any immediate neighborhood park in its vicinity. The closest one I think is Carol Beach Park which is significantly further south. This one also shows a number of outdoor active amenities such as soccer fields, softball fields, there's some tennis courts and there's some other open space amenities, a pavilion and such. It does have a great deal of open space also attributed to this particular area. This particular area is not under Village ownership and it's under private ownership at this time.

The next park is Creekside Park Concept. The Creekside development is currently under construction, and the developer of this particular project is dedicating the land for the park at the north and the south and is constructing all the amenities as well as the interconnecting trail that connects the north end to the south end. So this is a park that is going to be under construction this spring/summer as well.

The next is Pleasant Prairie Park Concept Plan. This is actually an existing neighborhood park that the Park Commission wanted to take a look at to find out if it was enhanced with additional ball fields, soccer fields, possibly even a dog park, because at the open house that they had there was a lot of concern from the residents that they would like to see some type of dog park someplace in the Village as well as some other amenities. It looks like there's a disk golf course and some other projects on this particular one. This is looking towards the future if and when the Village acquires the land, the different opportunities that would be available for the development of this park. This is very centrally located to a large population extending from Highway 50 all the way south. So a great number of residents would be readily available or close to this particular park.

The next concept plan that was prepared by the consultants for the Park Commission was the Momper's Woods Park Concept Plan. This is an area that came under the Village's ownership through donation three or four years ago. At that time the Village had acquired the property and we basically left it in its natural state. There was a home on this site that was razed but not too much other work has been done on this particular property. But this was one concept that it was discussed that a nature center, a nature preserve, some type of more of an educational type park as opposed to active park amenities would be of benefit for this particular park. As you can see there are a number of trail systems that have been identified. Some of them are existing trails. There's also I think a section of the Jambeau Trail that runs through the east side of this development and some of the other trails that have some historical significance. In addition to these specific Park Concept Plan Appendix D in your book provides cost estimates for the proposed improvements for each of these five parks.

Chapter X relates to Implementation of the Plan. The recommendations in the Plan are proposed to be phased-in over an extended period of time. Phasing will be dictated by several factors, including private landowner decisions to develop their property for residential use and by the funding available to the Village to make it necessary for acquisitions or improvements. Appendix C outlines other potential funding sources for Park and Open Space Facilities, and I mentioned those previously whether it's the DNR funds, Stewardship funds or LAWCON funds in order to help to develop these parks.

As a result of the recommendation of the Park and Open Space Plan, 2006-2011 a number of amendments to the Village's Land Use Plan Map, which is Map 91, in the Comprehensive Plan as shown on Exhibit 2 is proposed. Specifically the amendments are outlined in your staff comments. I don't know that I need to go through every single one of them for you, but primarily wherever there was any references, misreferences to the schools or to park lands or to vacant property or tax parcel numbers or special use sites, all of the corrections as it relates to the Park Plan and its impact on the Comprehensive Plan as shown on the slide would all need to be made so that the Comprehensive Plan reflects the updates of the Park Plan. I can go through those if you need for me to go through those in detail.

Separate to that there's a summary of some recommended changes to the Park Plan from the planning staff and that has to do with, again, the trail systems that I mentioned previously, some typos and some other corrections that we are recommending with respect to some symbology on the Plan that refers to community parks and neighborhood parks. So with that I'd like to continue the public hearing. Also with us is John Steinbrink, Jr. in the audience, and he was the staff person that was primarily responsible in working with the Park Commission in helping to draft and put together this plan. Our staff provided assistance, and Mike Pollocoff was also available throughout that park planning process.

Mike Serpe:

This is a matter for public hearing. Anybody wishing to speak? I ask you come forward with your name and address.

Rick Frederick:

My name is Rick Frederick. I live at 8808 3rd Avenue. I'm basically addressing Unit W which is the unit that used to be the old Town Club. Since there are nine new parks proposed, three of which will cost approximately \$4 million, and since the Village already owns the five acre parcel adjacent to that, if you look up there on 90th Street, I'm wondering why that isn't being developed first. That's question number one.

Question number two is how much additional money is being spent to acquire this land from the owner, Mr. Morrow. And, third, based on the Unit W parks concept plan, why would a softball diamond and a soccer field be placed next to existing homes when you have all this other land available. It would make sense, number four, for us it would make sense and I think for the people who are environmentally concerned to take this entire area and put it into an environmental friendly center adjacent to the Chiwaukee Prairie which is both north, west and east. I'll wait to hear my questions answered. Thank you.

Mike Serpe:

Thank you. Anybody else wishing to speak?

Jerry Thomey:

Jerry Thomey, 8784 3rd Avenue. I live right in back where the ball diamond is. I don't know. To me it would be so much cheaper if you moved the two, and then with all the money that we're spending on these parks, our roads are terrible down there. You take 5th Avenue and 3rd Avenue, can't we take some of this money instead of getting these parks and stuff going fix our roads. That makes more sense to me than anything. During the summer I go out to lake Andrea, I do some kayaking out there, and I'll tell you what, in the middle of the summer and it's 85 degrees that place is empty. There really is hardly anybody out there and that's the biggest park we've got and no one uses it. Even for swimming or the water or there's a couple people jogging around there and other than it's empty. I've gone out there for the last four or five years and it's the same thing. We want to spend all this money for new parks and that park ain't even being used and it's a beautiful park other than a couple ball diamonds. That's it. Thank you.

Mike Serpe:

Thank you. Anybody else wishing to speak?

Len Brandrup:

Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity. Len Brandrup, 8816 3rd Avenue in Carol Beach. I want to first just let you know that I would be more than happy as a neighbor to the Concept W park area to work with the Village as we look forward to the development of that park if it's the intent to move forward with that area as a park. Shame on me for being unaware of the . . . and for the visioning ceremonies that occurred in September. I've shared with your staff some of my own personal goals and ideas on buffering especially along the area to the east where you show your ball diamonds and your soccer fields. One of the concerns that we will have as neighbors, and I would suggest that rather than approving a concept at the present time for that park that if you make recommendations, and let me share with you as you went through your presentation I find the policies and the goals that you're establishing and the willingness of the Village to look at parks because that's part of what makes the Kenosha/Pleasant Prairie area really one of the gems between Milwaukee and Chicago.

Our advantage over our competitors and this is a competitive environment is the fact that we have great parks in the region. That gives us an advantage to our neighbors to the south in Lake County. It gives us an advantage to our neighbors between here and Milwaukee without pointing fingers at other communities. And it makes us a far more competitive community as we look forward. I would suggest that, in fact, the idea of establishing goals, establishing policies in these areas are laudable.

But having said that, as a neighbor to this particular concept, I'm disappointed that the neighborhood is only now, and I only yesterday became aware of the specifics of the concept plan that have been on discussion for some time, and I would only ask that you that you and your staff work with that neighborhood in terms of location of ball parks, in terms of soccer facilities, especially in consideration to the neighbors that live there in that I agree with my neighbors that have recommended that we look to the area to the south. I guess my first question is I had understood that plans were to move forward with that five acre site for development first, and I

now see that the acquisition of the Town Club is a priority of the Village. That's a bit of a surprise to the neighborhood. Having said that, there's certainly green space to the west that would provide for parks.

And just for the record there are six ball diamonds being constructed on the 39th Avenue area in the City of Kenosha this summer. The City of Kenosha is moving forward with the site between 45th and Washington Road in terms of development of that site. Soccer fields at Anderson Park also, not to negate the fact that we may need ball diamonds and soccer fields, are probably some of the finest in the State. In fact, I understand they're being considered for State tournament activities because of the quality of their soccer fields. They're adjacent to the Village and extremely accessible for us.

So I only offer these as comments. For goodness sakes tonight don't approve that concept as it's sitting there because that would be a disappointment to me and my neighbors. But as you move forward with your policies get the neighborhood involved prior to moving forward with the acquisition of the Town Club and that specific development. I would encourage your staff to work with us as neighbors. We want to work with the Village. We don't want an adversarial relationship. Thank you.

Mike Serpe:

Thank you. Anybody else wishing to speak?

Dennis C. Jansen:

Dennis C. Jansen, 820 97th Street, Pleasant Prairie. I guess I kind of bring a unique perspective to this proposed plan. I am actually the project manager for Cedar Construction on the Anderson Park Pavilion. One of my concerns is whether you've considered architects. The City of Kenosha grouped up with Castle Soccer, Kenosha Area Soccer League, and Kenosha Area Soccer League ponied up half of the money. However, they had a lot of donations that came in from the architects and designers. You get what you pay for. The design was poor. It wasn't planned. They missed very simple code issues. If you're going to get donations be very careful. Architectural fees run about six percent. The contract was \$400,000, the base contract. It would have cost probably about \$24,000 in architectural fees, but the cost of the construction is about \$460,000, \$60,000 in mistakes for the most part. Now, there were some valid changes, but there were many mistakes, simple mistakes, simple code mistakes, exit lights being missed, expansion joints, things that should have been caught. If you group up with an architect have a general contractor review the plans and make sure that they're correct.

Now, I know most of these gentlemen have got up and spoke and I personally think all these parks are kind of a waste of tax dollars. The politicians can sit up here and say, well, we're going to get grants and monies, money from different organizations. Maybe it's donated, maybe it's federal money in the form of grants. The bottom line is it is still my money. It may not be coming out of the property taxes but it's still coming out of federal funds. These are my funds. They're everybody's funds. And I think that the parks do have a benefit to society, however you have the Anderson Parks located there. The soccer fields I think they're proposing are a little bit ridiculous, but I just think the tax dollars could be used in a better way. Thank you.

Mike Serpe:

Thank you.

Gus Hauser:

Gus Hauser, 143 113th Street. I applaud this Commission and Pleasant Prairie and the staff and everybody who was involved in putting that proposal together. It's a very nice, thought out concept. I am glad to see it. And I sure hope you go through with it and that you will find the funds and the monies especially for the upkeep. One thing is it's easy to acquire it, but you have to think you have to maintain all of those infrastructures, everything that you put in at the same time, too.

And the other thing is what I would like to see that was not really addressed in that proposal at all that the Chiwaukee Prairie concept once comes to a closure. That concept gets struck out by now for over 20 years. The concept of willing buyer/willing seller was a tragedy to start out with to be honest. Changing the zoning from conservancy and scientific areas conservancy back into C-1 was a mistake. I think everybody knows it. That whole area got basically cut apart. Lands that were supposed to be set aside and was necessary for the continuation of properties now they are hacked apart. You have residential units right next to lands inside that is not very conducive for management purpose. You cannot burn in a lot of those areas anymore. Think of it and I hope you find a way to finally come to a closure with the Chiwaukee Prairie. Thank you.

Mike Serpe:

Thank you. Anybody else wishing to speak? Anybody else wishing to speak?

Jean Werbie:

I need to read some letters into the record for the people that weren't here. Our park superintendent received a number of e-mails that they wanted read into the record and made part of the record as part of the public hearing.

The first one is from Joe Lakin: Hello, I am a resident of River Oaks and I am very happy to hear about the master park plan. This is a very good step for Pleasant Prairie's future. I am also very interested in the plan for Pleasant Prairie Park since I live near there and have children who use the park now. I have received the on-line Master Park and Open Space Plan that is on-line, but the maps don't show up. Maybe that was intentional but it could not affect a resident's properties but maybe it just didn't show up. Could you please let me know if you are able to review the Map 9, Pleasant Prairie Park Concept Plan on page 56 of the report and if so fix the on-line versions so that the maps can appear.

The next is from Tony and Deanna Hendley: Is there every going to be a park in the circle of 9th Court off of 115th Street in Carol Beach? It would be really nice to open that area up. Maybe with that being opened it would take away from some of the older kids of the neighborhood going in there doing drugs and other things. We have heard and seen on the map the plan to put a park there. Realistically is this every going to happen while my children are young enough to enjoy it? Thank you.

The next one was received from James Kennedy: I am opposed to spending any tax dollars on the parks described in the *Kenosha News* of Sunday. We have a beautiful park on Lake Andrea that still has much potential for additional use. Having that many parks will mean several more

Village employees which will cause our budget to rise rapidly and mean more supervision problems. Consolidating the parks into only a few of them will mean less personnel costs and waste. Kenosha County and the City of Kenosha have many existing parks that our residents may use very easily. We pay for the County parks so should use them rather than spending all of our own money for additional parks. We still have much open space in our Village so do not need parks for that. Thank you.

The next is from Tom and Stephanie Froen: We are very much in favor of Pleasant Prairie Park being updated. It is the only park within walking distance of the Chateau Eau Plaines, River Oaks, Prairie Ridge and other subdivisions and it's underutilized. We would be most interested in a dog park in that area or at Lake Andrea. A bike path along 104th or a sidewalk would be great, too. Also, many of the properties in that area are becoming an eyesore. Giving the owners a fair price to move somewhere else would be beneficial to all of us, especially their neighbors who have to look at those properties on a daily basis. Allowing some small scale businesses such as outdoor cafes or ice cream parlors along the perimeter of the park would also be great. They would close early enough as to not bother the neighbors at night like a pub or bar would. We are excited about the planned growth in Pleasant Prairie. Keep up the good work. Sincerely, Tom and Stephanie.

The next one is from Pat Baird: First of all I think that it is great that my Village is able to post these items even in draft form on the web. I work too late to attend Village meetings so the web is a good alternative. As I was reviewing the Master Park Plan posted on the web, I noticed that none of the maps were included as PDF files. The photos appear and the tables appear but map 1a, page 18 is blank. Obviously the usefulness of this draft is limited by the absence of those maps. Other than that, I am very impressed with the quality, depth and breadth of the report.

The next is from Rick Frederick: Phone call from a resident opposed to park in Carol Beach Unit 2. Was there an impact assessment done?

Mike Serpe:

That's all we have?

Jean Werbie:

For public hearing comments.

Mike Serpe:

We'll close the public hearing and open it up to comments and questions from Commissioners.

Wayne Koessl:

Mr. Chairman, I had a letter dropped off at my office today and I'd like to read it into the minutes. It was not signed and I don't know who it came from. Here's what it said: My concern is the outhouse that was based on the beach at the end of 110th Street last year. At this time we have an unmonitored beach that is supposed to serve our local Pleasant Prairie residents. Many local Pleasant Prairie residents walk their pets and ride their bikes with small children along the lakeshore to get to the beach. We do not have a designated sidewalk but do have a narrow paved shoulder on one side of the road. There has been an increase in this walking traffic due to the

increase in homes in this area. Unfortunately, residents of Illinois have discovered our free, clean beach. Each summer weekend the parking lot is full of cars with Illinois license plates. When the parking lot fills the cars park along the paved shoulder where the no parking signs are posted. These non residents drive fast along the lakeshore, bring their watercrafts and grills and stay for extended periods of time. When they leave, trash and hot coals are dumped into the sand which is a danger for our walking residents and pets. I realize the outhouse was added as a way to appease these out of towners who do not wish to drive all the way home to relieve themselves. However, you have created a dangerous situation for local residents who live along this parkway and use the lakefront. We do not want the influx of speeding vehicles and trash. The outhouse only encourages these non residents to come for the day at our free park. If you want the service of these non paying users of our recreational area, I suggest you need to fence the park like Lake Geneva does. Charge a fee to all vehicles with an out of state license and provide supervision. This is the only way to protect our walking, bike riding, swimming local citizens.

And also, Mr. Chairman, I have a few comments on the park plan. One, it looks like it's about a \$5.3 million endeavor and that's without taking the land that is not owned for the parks yet, either through donations or purchase. I don't know if there's an operating cost put in there, I did not see it, to operate these parks and maintain them which goes on every year. I think that the pedestrian overpass is a kind of pie in the sky. I would think we should start with a priority of doing one park at a time and then going on. I would like to see this plan, if it is passed, to come back every two years for review by the Parks and Plan Commission and Village Board to see if it actually is doing what it's intended to do. Also, I would like a list of the land that has been donated so far and by who. Thank you.

Don Hackbarth:

I have a couple comments. This is a pretty comprehensive plan and a lot of work went into this. I take it Attorney Baxter looked over this stuff? No? Is this something that would be his purview to look over?

Mike Pollocoff:

The Village's Land Development Control Ordinance, which Attorney Baxter drafted, really is the underpinnings for how we acquire parkland and do things like that so I think that's already in place. But what the Village didn't have up to this point was an up to date park and recreation plan. It was pretty old. So this is just one component of the pie identifying what the park and recreational elements are and what's needed for the future. How that's secured financially or by park dedications already exists in our ordinance. There's going to have to be some modifications as far as payment in lieu of dedication and other contributions.

What this does is layout a framework for up to 2030 if we grow at a certain rate and the Plan Commission and the Board approves a certain number of lots, are you going to be able to approve those lots without having any parks. Or, if you are going to have parks what should they look like and how are they going to get paid for and who is going to do them. And there's existing parks that we have where previous Plan Commissions and Boards, even as a Town, got a

donation of land but there was not the resources in place that required a developer to improve that park. So now we have to go back and get those parks up to speed.

Don Hackbarth:

I've got a couple comments yet. The Momper's Wood site, is that using the existing entrance going in?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Don Hackbarth:

So it's going to be a limited amount of clearing. I know I've walked that and there's a lot of rubble and junk in between those beautiful trees. Okay, that's the one question. I believe the comments made on down in Carol Beach where the ball diamond and the tennis courts are up against residences I wouldn't be crazy about that either. In approving this plan or approving the concept I think that one would be the exception and I'd say that one should be reworked.

Mike Pollocoff:

Just to comment on that, because it kind of ties into some of the questions that were raised over the Unit W park I agree with you. I wouldn't want anybody swinging away at my backyard either. The plan doesn't anticipate this being a field where we would have games on it. It would be more like Becker Park where there's just a backstop there and the kids get out and play. And it could be--certainly the staff has no issues if we don't have a ball field there or a soccer field or what have you. It can be just open space.

One of the things that we were trying to accomplish in identifying the land further north rather than further south is that the Village has been on an ongoing basis probably for the last ten years dealing with numerous and unacceptable proposals for the development of the Morrow property. I've yet to hear any that I think the staff supported, and I don't think what the residents have gotten wind of that have gone very far they supported it either.

So what the Village has is even if we create that park where we have that five acres that's south of there, we still leave an isolated piece of land that is zoned residential that at some point someone is going to push us to the limit to be able to develop that. When the Park Commission looked at that, one of the concepts was to be able to take and do a couple things. One was to be able to secure some LAWCON funds for land acquisition; be able to do a swap where the Village would dedicate the five acre site to The Conservancy, do some prairie restoration on that site because that's a fill site and come up with a site that would be a little more tucked away and not right out on 90th for use.

As the people in Carol Beach can tell you, the cycle of traffic that goes down 90th to 1st Avenue to 116th Street or even up to 86th or 87th it's non stop. As we set a park right on that corner of 5th and 90th, and everybody's park in Pleasant Prairie is everybody's park, but what we don't want to do is set up a park that's going to be loaded for people to stop at. We have that right now in the Lake Michigan parks along 1st Avenue. That's what we thought about being able to use the lands

we have to barter and get some more money and snuggle that park back away from 90th and get it off of the street and it would be more of a neighborhood access.

We had a lot of notices on this development of this plan and there's nothing that is from a timing standpoint that says we can't spend another year or two laying that out with the neighborhood. That's not a problem at all. I'm completely open to that. That was our intent in moving it farther north was to get it away from the road but still it would be accessed by the neighborhood and getting rid of that ugly fill site which is the park now. If you want to grass that over that's fine, but what do we have, a ball field there. It really was just a pickup field for the kids to play ball in. We wouldn't be running a rec program out of that and same with the soccer. But if after we go through the planning process with the neighbors and they decide they don't want that, certainly they're going to be the ones using it. We won't see the rest of the Village coming to that site.

And how much? I don't know. All these things here you've got to realize that the consultant that helped us lay out these parks this is a plan that we're going to use to secure money in the future. They took all these plans basically and they loaded them up for as full a development as we wanted. That doesn't mean we can't peel back and say we don't want that much or we want less. We've already done a lot of that. None of this if you adopt the plan tonight is going to put any of this in stone because the next step is for the Village Board to look at it, and one of the recommendations they're going to have is they have the Park Department true up the cost and help put up a capital improvement program that Wayne was talking about that from a time line puts these things out in space and see what we can afford and when. We can do it for as little as we want to do it and it really depends on what everybody wants.

The parks that exist now with no improvements, Carol Beach and Pleasant Prairie Ball Park and Momper's Woods it's going to be hard to say to a developer you've got to help us pick up and fund this or pay for it because there isn't a lot of developable lots around there. There's some but not a lot. These are lots that the Village is going to need to prioritize along with the neighbors around those parks what it is they want and then what can we afford after we've gotten donations, after we've applied for grants, after we've done whatever we can do with our existing workforce to building something what is left and that's what we'd have to put on a levy. Under levy limits that means that goes to referendum. Then ultimately the people are going to decide whether or not they want to flip for that or not.

The other parks, as the report indicates, we're going to require the developer to put us in a position where we're not going back like we are with Carol Beach Unit W or Pleasant Prairie Ball Park or the other ones and start from scratch. We're going to want a park that's going to service a new neighborhood to be done. We are looking at the maintenance costs on these. As we looked at these it's one of the things that's driving us. It's tough for us right now to afford the parks we have and we've got to make sure we can afford new ones. So I hope that answers Mr. Frederick's questions and Mr. Brandrup's questions on Unit W.

With respect to Mr. Toomey's comment that parks are too expensive I agree, but the way you take care of that is you either don't do them or you scale them back. Those are choices that the Village as a whole is going to make. But do we want to make a park inexpensive for a developer? That's one issue. Do we want to make a park inexpensive for the existing taxpayers? That's the other one. I think that's the push/pull that goes on as you guys make your deliberations as developments are submitted.

I think Dennis on 7th Avenue, architects we've had some experience with architects. I've had some good ones and some bad ones. I agree with him you get what you pay for. If you're going to tell a guy that he's going to get a free design but then you're going to pay him for the fee on the back end they're going to get their money one place or another. I think the best thing that could happen with any architectural work that takes place is that it really gets a good review and that the community that's going to use it, the neighborhood, is cognizant of it and the same with the user. That's how we did RecPlex and the facilities out there. We got as many people involved in what those facilities are going to look like so we got the most from our architectural dollar.

I think that one of the key things in the plan that Jean identified, and I think it really helps on that underlying cost, and I think we'll be successful with Kenosha Unified because we've done this before is to split and share open space and recreation facilities. To the extent that we just have ours and they have theirs we're going to be doubling up on things. But in the plan as this thing comes about and we plan together, and Jean and her staff and the planners from Unified have done that pretty well at High Pointe as the most significant one, we're going to get something for a lot less money for everybody that's going to benefit more people than if we just said here we're going to do it on our own and Unified you go do what you need on your own. It's going to be a positive thing. That really benefits the Pleasant Prairie taxpayers and all the taxpayers of Kenosha County.

Jean Werbie:

I wanted to add that the area that's identified in this greenish yellow area on the Carol Beach Unit W plan is wetland and pretty much Conservancy area now. We would not be able to put ball diamonds or soccer fields in that area. So another option to this plan would be to make it more of a passive, open space park with trail systems. I'm sure that was one of the options that was discussed by the Park Commission. Again, this is a plan for guidance and direction of the future park system in the Village. It's not intended to be developed overnight. It's a 2030 plan, and it's no different than our Comprehensive Plan or any of the other plans we work on is that if we have newer or better ideas or we can accommodate or please more of the people that are going to be using these resources, then we modify those plans to the best of our ability, so that's the whole purpose of this public hearing is to hear what people want for a particular area.

Mike Pollocoff:

I might add on Unit W if the neighbors want to go back to the south park land on 90th, that was something that was worked through the Rec Commission and Park Commission together. If that's what the community really wants then it ends up being less expensive and we just deal with the development issue of the Morrow property whenever that comes up. That stays in private ownership and we deal with it then.

Don Hackbarth:

I believe that when we develop these parks like this, I think the residents have a big stake in this, and I think when these things are developed there should be open meetings with the residents to say what do you want. To tell you the truth, and I take your word for it, if that is undevelopable or if you can't put ball diamonds to the west, I would really think that if it's never going to be used for league play or league soccer tournaments and stuff like that, a real extensive use of that piece of property, there are other areas that can be used for that. We have other ball diamonds. I

don't think that a ball diamond and a soccer field there is a good use of that. I really don't. To me a ball diamond is something that's begging to be used, and if it's a neighborhood thing where kids are just going to come and fool around, I don't think that's a good use. The other thing, too, is ball diamonds if you have just grass are more hard to maintain. You have to level them and scrap them and all that kind of junk, and I don't think we want to do that for a neighborhood park.

The last comment I've got, Mr. Jansen I'm not sure what direction you're coming from, but it sounds to me like you're saying no parks at all and that's just not realistic. The reason I say that is I was born and raised in Milwaukee and we had a park fairly close. But if we don't have parks for kids they're going to play in the road. They're going to play in areas that they shouldn't be at. Designated areas are more conducive to having your kids going to a park and play rather than in the street. I go through some of our subdivisions now and in summertime these kids are in the street and that's not good. In some of the subdivisions we talk about the safety of our children and the traffic, I don't think it's a good idea to have these kids playing soccer ball or kick ball or whatever in the street. I am a firm believer in parks where kids can go to to be safe and do whatever they want and have fun in a park that we provide for them.

Jim Bandura:

I totally agree with Commissioner Hackbarth. I attended this meeting back in September, and I'd really hate to tell the kids that ganged up on me that we don't want to foot the bill for a skate park because of the taxpayers or whatever. They were pretty adamant about getting this park developed out by me and I really wouldn't want to tell them that. They do need a place for activities.

John Braig:

Two points. One, I was a little disappointed with the Carol Beach Park. There's a tremendous amount of Conservancy lands in that area and there's not much public access to it. The roads go by it, but I think we should have a trail somewhere through there going way north all the way up to the sewage treatment plant at 80th Street and well south. Somehow there is a trail loop that's indicated on the Carol Beach Park but the loop is quite small. I think people would enjoy an opportunity to walk several miles through a wildlife area.

The other point, and I guess this is pretty much in summation, is I see this as a good plan. I recognize it projects well into the future and a lot of us are going to be gone before this plan leads to fruition. I see in more in the vein of a neighborhood sketch plan. In other words, this is what we would like to do as things develop. I don't see it in any way as a commitment that we're going to do this. The commitment is going to be made by the current Village Board and future Village Boards who are going to look very carefully at capital improvement budgets and more significantly operating budgets.

Granted, I do see a nice feature in these parks in that it is a way to hire college kids in the summer and give them something to do. But there's some other hidden costs. Fire and rescue are going to be involved. Definitely if all these parks are developed it's going to add to the cost of police protection. But there might be a population here 20 and 30 years from now that will want this and will be able to pay for it. But the decision to go ahead with each of these items is going to be up to the Village Board and they're going to look at both capital and operating and maintenance costs. And if the money is not there it's not going to get done. But I think it's our responsibility to set the framework or the guidelines as to what we want to do. In that vein I move approval.

Wayne Koessl:

I have a couple more comments.

Mike Serpe:

Let's second John's motion then we can continue the discussion. You want to second that?

Wayne Koessl:

I'll second his motion on the one condition, that we do a two year review of the plan, that it comes back to us.

John Braig:

I can accept that if it doesn't put too much of a burden on staff. Staff, any comment? Thank you.

Wayne Koessl:

I have a question for the gentlemen from Cedar Construction. You mentioned an architect that did a kind of bad job because he donated his time. I think if you're a professional person your ethics should rule doing a good job on anything you take under your endeavor, and I would think he should be ashamed of himself if he did not do what was the best that he could do for the people he worked for donated or not. If I donated labor for someone I'd make sure I did it above and beyond anything else. That's my only comment.

The other one is our roads are starting to deteriorate in the Village. I have to agree with some of the people that mentioned that. That's all I have.

Mike Serpe:

Mike, considering today's climate with levy limits and available money, and most of the interest tonight is in the Carol Beach area, when could we really start seeing something actually take place, some moving of dirt, some creation of trails, whatever?

Mike Pollocoff:

In Carol Beach?

Mike Serpe:

We can start with Carol Beach.

Mike Pollocoff:

The parks where the Village would have to come up with the money we'd have to go through the planning process to focus in on what it is we want to do and what the neighborhoods want. And then basically it would be whenever the Village is ready to adopt through a referendum the money to do it. Right now we're under a freeze, so unless we cut some other level of government

in order to do that we need to go back and ask. It's like a sunset resolution. Say it's \$100,000, do we authorize raising the mill rate to cover \$100,000 of expenditures or not? Or, do we wait it out and see what happens?

Right now this last year we had \$60,000 worth of room that we could have spent but we kept our levy frozen so it was the same as last year. Every year we do that, the amount of room we can legally go up is not a lot. So it's either find other cuts or go out to referendum. So 2007 would be the soonest and there's nothing in the 2006 budget to do it.

Mike Serpe:

And impact fees will play a part in this, is that correct?

Mike Pollocoff:

Some parks more than others. The parks where there's a lot of development around them they're going to have less opportunities for impact fees to help than those parks where there's going to be a lot of development. You take the Village Green Park that will be virtually 100 percent impact fee funded. The other ones are less.

Judy Juliana:

I just have one comment. Looking at all the current parks and the current parks, my one comment is we have to be very careful about encroaching on the environment. When you talk about Unit W Carol Beach, it's where I live, and north of the proposed park there are a lot of wild animals that call that home. We have to really be aware what we're doing to the environment and the animals that are there. I know there are two coyote that live back there and I've seen them out on the road and the deer. So when we're talking about parks and concepts we really need to take that into consideration.

Larry Zarletti:

Just real quickly I wanted to make sure that the gentlemen in the audience that had the questions feel that your questions were answered? Is everyone good with that? Okay. I wanted to be sure of that. I actually applaud them for coming. I know the size of this Village and to only have this many people come out and speak on it at least you know that what you said was heard. Furthermore, the Plan Commission I think sometimes people think that what we do is a vote in favor or against a certain plan. I think the Village did an outstanding job in preparing this, and my vote tonight will be to move it to the Board where they can make the decisions as to what we do with it. So all we do here is make sure they've met the criteria to move it forward for discussion.

Wayne Koessl:

Through the Chair to Mr. Pollocoff, Mike, I know you're going to apply for some grants for this. They take a while to get them approved. So my motion was to review it every two years just to see how things are going and what the costs are being like operational costs and everything else. I know grants are applied for by everyone so they're hard to get.

Mike Pollocoff:

We think the Carol Beach one, if the neighborhood is open to swapping that land, is going to be-- you're really putting some land back into high quality wetland use, and you're removing some land from development. So it's almost a win/win and that's one of the reasons we were looking to do that. On the other hand, we don't want to set the whole neighborhood up on an apple cart either. If they don't want it there then we go back to plan A.

Jean Werbie:

I have a comment and a question. The first comment is the Plan Commission solely is responsible for amending the Comprehensive Plan of the Village of Pleasant Prairie. It is your responsibility and it's your decision so it would rest with you tonight if you choose to adopt this plan, amend it, pull out the Carol Beach Unit W, whatever you choose to do. It's a guide and framework for development within the community. The Village Board when we bring it on to them they certainly can endorse it, and they would be the ones that if anybody wants to develop the park plan would have to fund it through one means or another. But it's the Plan Commission who is charged with responsibility for adopting the master plan for the community. So it rests with you tonight as to what direction you would like to go.

I know there's a motion on the table to approve this plan as it is, but I heard a number of comments tonight regarding Carol Beach Unit W as to whether or not this may or may not be the best plan. So I'm questioning whether or not you don't want to either, a, table this; b, pull out this particular concept plan and then work with the neighborhood, come up with some other alternatives, and then amend this park and open space plan and bring it back it. That's certainly an option. So I guess I wanted to know what your direction is tonight because it will go onto the Village Board as an approved amendment to the master plan.

Don Hackbarth:

Since I made most of the comments about Unit W I'd say we pull that one. And I think we should consult with the neighborhood to find out what they want because it's going to be in their backyard.

John Braig:

I'll amend my motion accordingly.

Wayne Koessler:

And I'll second it.

Mike Serpe:

FURTHER COMMENTS? THEN THE MOTION MADE BY JOHN BRAIG AND SECONDED BY WAYNE KOESSL IS TO APPROVE THE PLAN MINUS THE UNIT W PARK.

Jean Werbie:

And subject to the other planning comments that we had?

Mike Serpe:

And subject to the planning comments, that's right.

Wayne Koessl:

And the two year review.

Mike Serpe:

And that can come any time really, but you want to guarantee it will come in two years.

Wayne Koessl:

I think we should review it every two years.

Mike Serpe:

EVERYONE UNDERSTAND THE MOTION? ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Mike Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it. Thank you people for coming. Thank you very much.

C. Consider the request of the Bentz Estates Homeowner Association for an amendment to the Restrictions and Covenants for the Bentz Estates Subdivision.

Jean Werbie:

Trustee Serpe and members of the Plan Commission, the Village received a request from Tim Baas, President of the Bentz Estates Neighborhood Association, Inc., to amend the Declaration of Restrictions, Covenants and Easements for the Bentz Estates Subdivision as it relates to detached garages and sheds.

The amendment will allow for detached garages and sheds to be allowed, insofar as the buildings have the same roof pitch as the home, use the same roofing and siding materials and colors as the existing home on the property and are required to be approved by the Bentz Estates Architectural Control Committee. Furthermore, all other regulations related to location, size and setback for detached accessory buildings shall comply with Village Ordinances.

The Association would be responsible for recording the amendment at the Kenosha County Register of Deeds Office.

This would be an amendment with the homeowners in the Bentz Estates Subdivision, and the staff recommends approval as presented.

Mike Serpe:

And this came from the homeowners' association asking for our stamp of approval?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

John Braig:

How many lots are in the Bentz Subdivision?

Jean Werbie:

Eleven.

John Braig:

And you dealt with all eleven owners?

Jean Werbie:

We had a neighborhood association meeting last September/October, and we went through a whole bunch of different issues, and this was one of the issues that we had talked about at that time. We had told them that they needed to continue to meet and discuss the matters with their neighbors. We had prepared an amendment for them, and if they wanted to amend it they needed to bring it forward and they are doing that at this time.

John Braig:

And they're aware that this is the subject of the meeting tonight?

Jean Werbie:

Yes, the President was sent notification.

Don Hackbarth:

You say there are how many homes, eleven homes in this subdivision?

Jean Werbie:

I believe there's still one vacant lot.

Don Hackbarth:

Are there any flat roofs or goofy pitch lines or a cathedral thing. You don't want your garage looking like that.

Jean Werbie:

No, this is a brand new subdivision. Actually I think there are ten lots built on out there. I think there might be one vacant still. But my understanding is there's one garage type shed structure that has already been built out there. They didn't realize they weren't supposed to be building it and so they went to the association and the whole association, the residents, agreed to make the modifications and they seemed reasonable.

Don Hackbarth:

Move approval.

Larry Zarletti:

Second.

Mike Serpe:

MOTION MADE BY DON HACKBARTH AND SECONDED BY LARRY ZARLETTI FOR APPROVAL OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE RESTRICTIONS AND COVENANTS FOR THE BENTZ ESTATES. ALL IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Mike Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it.

D. Consider Plan Commission Resolution #06-05 to initiate a zoning text amendment related to Child and Adult Care Home Occupations.

Jean Werbie:

Trustee Serpe and members of the Plan Commission, the Village Plan Commission may initiate a petition for an amendment of the zoning ordinance which may include rezoning of the property, change in zoning district boundaries or changes in the text of the ordinance. Article VII of the zoning ordinance regulates home occupations. Section 420-42 specifically identified permitted home occupations that are allowed. Section 420-42 (5) states that child or adult care with fewer than eight children or adults shall be corrected to reflect past practice for in-home day cares and the State standard to be eight or fewer children or adults. In other words, the State standards for in-home day cares allow you to have up to eight including eight. And the way the zoning

ordinance is written it says up to eight but not including eight. So as a result we have a little conflict between our zoning ordinance and the statutes as it pertains to regulated child or adult day care centers. This has come up before in the past and another individual had requested if we could take a look at our zoning ordinance so that it is consistent with the State statutes.

So the purpose of this resolution is to initiate a zoning text amendment to modify the text of the ordinance to reflect up to and including eight for a home occupation for a child or adult day care. This resolution is not making any determinations regarding approving or taking action on the proposed changes of the text this evening. We're just setting the public hearing in order to consider this matter at a future date. The staff recommends approval as presented.

Don Hackbarth:

Question, how is this policed? Because I have a sneaking suspicion that have more in-home day cares that have more than eight children.

Jean Werbie:

The State licensing board comes down and verifies that all child and adult day cares are in compliance with the State license requirements. The Village once we've made our initial inspections we typically only do spot inspections for home occupations. We do inspections as a result of complaints being filed. For example, there being too many children, typically there are other issues that come to light with respect to cars and parking and kids running around and things like that where we would be called in to do an inspection. But we typically do not routinely verify that there are, in fact, eight children and not nine in a particular home occupation for day care.

Don Hackbarth:

I also have a sneaking suspicion that there are a number of homes that are not licensed that are just running day cares. I don't know how you police that either.

Jean Werbie:

That could be possible in the Village. Typically we respond on a complaint basis.

John Braig:

Move approval.

Jim Bandura:

Second.

Mike Serpe:

MOTION MADE BY JOHN BRAIG AND SECONDED BY JIM BANDURA FOR APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 06-05. ALL IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Mike Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it.

7. OTHER SUCH MATTERS AS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.

Mike Serpe:

We've got a few. I just want to mention one thing. The last few days Kenosha County, especially the Village of Pleasant Prairie, lost a real good friend in Phil Sanders. What that man has brought to this area and to Kenosha County with The Conservancy, with history and his love for conservancy there's not enough words that can describe Phil. I got to know him personally. I have an autographed book by Phil, the couple that he wrote. He has attended our meetings in the past when there were matters concerning conservancy and the Chiwaukee Prairie. I think we even have a road in the Chiwaukee Prairie named after him. Quite a guy. He almost made it to his dream of living to be 100. He missed it by just a few months. He'll truly be missed but long remembered.

Don Hackbarth:

Interesting we talk about him. What I did is I passed around a bunch of stuff. It's out of Arbor Day. But what you'll notice there is Arbor Day's tree ordinance I wish it was a little bit longer than this, but it's a good real quickie guideline on tree ordinances and what they're looking for and what they feel is important.

The other thing is there's a document that I received the other day from Arbor Day in regard to Tree Cities, USA, and that is communities that adopt rigid standards on trees and have part of their structure as setting up the organization to protect trees, to watch over them, to make sure they're planted properly and whatever. Jean, you've got the original copy, I gave it to you. But I think it bears something that we should look at because we're in the midst of a tree ordinance, and I think this is pretty important information. We should at least peruse it. This is going to come up later with me when we talk about the tree ordinance because I want to see this.

The last thing on trees is there's a fellow in our congregation who was, he's dead, but he was even more avid in trees than I am. He said the sequoia tree out in California is the largest tree in the world, and he said some of them are so big that it takes many, many people to go hand in hand around a sequoia tree. But he said to me the interesting part about a sequoia is that it's root system is very shallow and a sequoia would never survive in any kind of wind storm. A 20 mile an hour wind would blow those large trees over. And he said the only thing that causes them to still stand for so many years is because they group. They grow in bunches. They grow in a forest and that's what protects them. I guess what I'm saying is my philosophy is I think we've got to protect our trees.

John Braig:

Two items. There was a hearing at City Hall regarding the Wal-Mart store. And one comment I heard there, and I forget the number but I believe it was something like the police made 486 visits in one year to the north side Wal-Mart store, which made me think do our impact fees, and I know we have them for subdivision development, but do we have additional impact fees for commercial and so on? Okay.

The other thought I was thinking of was they were talking about a lot of traffic, and I see a high possibility of 85th Street being one of the routes for semi trucks. Right now there's a load restriction. In fact, it's something we should investigate. There's two signs on the east end where you turn onto 85th Street from 39th. One says trucks a limit of 7,000 pounds, and within 100 feet or so of that sign load limit five tons. A lawyer would have fun with that. My question is, in the event Wal-Mart would be located as the current discussion is, would our load restrictions remain on 85th or would there be some required modification?

Mike Pollocoff:

They'd remain in effect. 85th Street part of it is new. Part of it is very, very old and in bad condition, but people can bring a heavier truck than 7,000 pounds down 85th Street if they're making a delivery in the Village, they're using that road to get someplace in the Village. We won't permit 85th Street to be used as a through road.

John Braig:

And what is the fine for violations?

Mike Pollocoff:

It's based on how many pounds you're over. Take them to the weigh station.

John Braig:

It might be a revenue source.

Jim Bandura:

Mike. This is quick. I want to apologize to Jean. I had the opportunity of calling her a couple of Saturdays early in the morning regarding a property owner that was filling in and moving the floodplain and wetlands around and I got her out of bed. I do apologize for that. One of the things is, and I think John, Jr. was out there with her, she went out there to take a look at what this guy was doing. She took Saturday morning to get out there to try and reason with this guy and to no avail. But to have staff do that on a Saturday it just boggles my mind to have a good staff that would take care of and watch the property owners that are down stream from this guy.

My question I guess real quick, Jean, is what can we really do about this guy and is there anything? You didn't see the DNR out there with you standing by you or the Army Corps of Engineers trying to protect the floodplain or anything. Just with this recent rain you should just take a ride through our subdivision. I'm just about ready to float away.

Jean Werbie:

The developer was told that while the agricultural land can withstand some minor modifications and adjustments to its grade because it's considered farmland, any adjustments to the floodplain from the Village's perspective needs to go through a floodplain boundary adjustment. You just can't cut and fill floodplain lands. By the end of the two and a half hours I think I finally explained and he understood that floodplain cannot just be manipulated and changed without going through proper procedures and doing the cut and fill analysis. While he might have been adjusting that floodplain in that farmer's field, yes, people downstream would feel the results of that.

They're doing some significant surveying out there on the property now, and any adjustments that were made to create floodplain problems downstream will need to be adjusted sooner than later and he'll have to recreate those floodplain areas so that it doesn't continue to cause problems downstream. The wetland cutting that he did and the other work that he did before a lot of that wetland material is coming back, but some other wetlands that were disturbed by him once we have all the photographs and we have the documentation we'll be sitting down with the DNR on all of these issues and going through all of that with him.

Jim Bandura:

And how soon do you think that may come about?

Jean Werbie:

Probably in the next two weeks. This week the situation with the weather and how wet it's going to be I don't think anything is really going to change and he can't do any additional manipulation out there. But our attention is to sit down--I did talk with the warden and others and we're trying to get some resolve to this. Again, he has some rights to be able to do some movement, but where it starts to impact the floodplain and create hardship downstream that's where it becomes a problem, especially when he's done some of that work without permits.

Jim Bandura:

Especially through Chateau how can you gauge that? Is there way of gauging his impact on--

Jean Werbie:

Sure, it's all engineering. There were original surveys, topographic maps that were put together of that property a number of years ago and again in 1998 when we did the Des Plaines River Watershed Study. So we know what the elevations were at that time, and when the property is resurveyed we will see what the elevations are now and we'll be able to determine exactly how much the elevation has changed and if the floodplain has now shrunk because of his manipulation and if it has, in fact, caused some downstream problems.

Jim Bandura:

Again, Jean, I appreciate you and Steinbrink, Jr., out there. To stand up in front of these two or three big burly heavy equipment operators and that was impressive. I can't say anything more

about the staff that we have right now. I'm just amazed at it. I can't say anybody saying that you guys aren't worth your weight in gold.

Jean Werbie:

Just as a reminder, we have a special Plan Commission meeting next Monday at five o'clock. It's one project but three or four items related to the one project. So it should be done long before the Board meets at six thirty, but we do have one item at five o'clock next Monday. Packets and information should be going out in the next day or two.

8. ADJOURN.

John Braig:

Move adjournment.

Larry Zarletti:

Second.

Don Hackbarth:

I have a quick comment. I will not be able to make it. I'm doing some police chaplaincy training.

Mike Serpe:

MOTION MADE BY JOHN BRAIG AND SECONDED BY LARRY ZARLETTI TO ADJOURN. ALL THOSE IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Mike Serpe:

Opposed? The ayes have it.