

**PLEASANT PRAIRIE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING
VILLAGE HALL AUDITORIUM
9915 39TH AVENUE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE, WISCONSIN
5:00 P.M.
February 25, 2008**

A regular meeting for the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission convened at 5:00 p.m. on February 25, 2008. Those in attendance were Thomas Terwall; Michael Serpe; Donald Hackbarth; Wayne Koessl; Andrea Rode; Jim Bandura; John Braig; Larry Zarletti; and Judy Juliana. Also in attendance were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator; and 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 11, 2008 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING.**

Jim Bandura:

Move for approval.

John Braig:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY JIM BANDURA AND SECONDED BY JOHN BRAIG TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 11, 2008 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING AS PRESENTED IN WRITTEN FORM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

5. CITIZEN COMMENTS.

Thomas Terwall:

If you're here for Items A through H on the agenda tonight, any of those items are matters of public hearing. We would ask that you hold your comments until the public hearing is held so we can incorporate your comments as an official part of the record of that public hearing. However, if you're here for Item I or J or if you're here with a question on an item not on the agenda, now would be your opportunity to raise that issue. We would ask that you step to the microphone and begin by giving us your name and address. Anybody wishing to speak under citizens' comments? Hearing none, we'll move on then to Item 6.

6. NEW BUSINESS

A. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF PLAN COMMISSION RESOLUTIONS #08-06 and #08-07 to amend the Village Comprehensive Land Use Plan and to adopt the Pleasant Farms Neighborhood Plan. The Pleasant Farms Neighborhood is bounded by the CP Railway east of 88th Avenue on the east, IH-94 on the west, Bain Station Road on the north and at approximately 93rd Place on the south.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission and the audience, the first item is consideration of the Plan Commission Resolutions 08-06 and 08-07. This is to amend the Village Comprehensive Land Use Plan and to adopt the Pleasant Farms Neighborhood Plan. Pleasant Farms Neighborhood Plan is bounded by the CP Railway east of 88th Avenue on the east, I-94 on the west, Bain Station Road on the north and at approximately 93rd Place on the south.

The Village of Pleasant Prairie, pursuant to the provisions of Section 62.23 of the Statutes, has created a Plan Commission and the Plan Commission has the authority to adopt master plans, comprehensive plans and portions thereof. Neighborhood plans are a component of the Village's master plan or the Comprehensive Plan. The hearing tonight is to consider an amendment to the Village's Comprehensive Land Use Plan and to approve a Neighborhood Plan for the Pleasant Farms Neighborhood. The Pleasant Farms Neighborhood, again, is bounded by the CP Railway on the east, I-94 on the west, Bain Station Road on the north and 93rd Place on the South. The neighborhood is located in U.S. Public Land Survey Sections 16, 17 and 18, Township 1 North, Range 22 East in the Village of Pleasant Prairie.

This afternoon between the hours of 3 and 5 the Village hosted an open house to answer any questions that we could relating to the Pleasant Farms Neighborhood. We did have the boards available showing how the land would be proposed to be developed along with an aerial photograph of the area, the Village's Comprehensive Plan, as well as some copies of how the neighborhoods are divided up in the Village. Again, we held that neighborhood meeting in order to get comments from the neighborhood, and we do have a number of comments that as I go through this presentation at the end I will introduce some of those comments that I had heard this evening and hopefully that might even answer some additional questions that the audience may have.

This Neighborhood Plan was prepared for the Pleasant Farms Neighborhood because the Village had received several inquiries over the last several years and development proposals to develop some vacant properties within the neighborhood and revised community facility information was given to the Village. As I mentioned in my portion of the open house to the people I spoke with, there's actually one active developer at this point that is looking to develop within that neighborhood. At this time we are not working with any other property owners so there's one active developer that has been advancing this neighborhood plan.

This Neighborhood is primarily farmland with a number of home sites adjacent to the arterial roadways, with the exception of residential development in the vicinity of Highway C and 104th Avenue along Bain Station Road, along River Road, south of Highway C in the Heritage Valley Subdivision in the center of this neighborhood.

The Village's Comprehensive Plan indicates that a high school site with a major park is proposed to be located in the southeastern portion of the neighborhood. A community commercial development is proposed to be located on the very west end of this neighborhood at Highway C and I-94. The area east of the CP Railway would be identified as light industrial, and the remainder of the land within the neighborhood would be developed as residential uses, specifically single family residential uses with the preservation of the Des Plaines River Watershed which contains the primary and secondary environmental corridor, wetlands and floodplain in that area.

Specifically the Neighborhood Plan identifies the following uses:

First of all, the areas that are identified in red on the Neighborhood Plan are the freeway commercial areas. Approximately 14 acres of land within the neighborhood is identified as freeway commercial. Again, this is at Highway C and I-94. The freeway commercial area is an area that has been more clearly defined now that the State has defined where the new frontage road will be realigned as part of the new interchange improvements to Highway C. Again, the Highway C interchange improvements in the frontage road work is still projected to begin in the spring of 2009, next year, by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation.

The next area that's identified as gray on the plan is the industrial area. This area is largely located on the east side of 88th Avenue. Approximately 54 acres of land within the neighborhood is identified for industrial purposes. The industrial area includes the area of land on the east side of 88th which is just adjacent or west of the Pleasant Prairie Power Plan.

The third area that I'd like to identify is the government and institutional area. Approximately 102 acres of land within the neighborhood has been identified as governmental and institutional use including the existing sewerage treatment plant which is at 10201 Wilmot Road owned by the Village of Pleasant Prairie; the Kenosha County Cemetery which is located on the east side of 88th Avenue; and the 90 acre future high school site in the southeast portion of the Neighborhood. The Village staff is continuing to work with the Kenosha Unified School District on proposed developments and the locating of future schools. This site is intended for development in approximately 15 to 25 years, so depending on when the need warrants for a fourth comprehensive high school that's when this site will further develop in this area.

Then in addition I'd just like to mention that the high school site could share some athletic facilities and storm water management facilities with a major park which is adjacent to Prairie Springs Park to the south of the future school site.

The next area which is a very large area in this particular neighborhood are the open space areas. This Neighborhood Plan identifies approximately 472 acres of land or 39 percent of the lands within the neighborhood to remain as open space.

The first open space area is the floodplain areas. The 100 year floodplain, which is approximately 336 acres, is currently located adjacent to the Des Plaines River in the west and central portions of the neighborhood, as well as adjacent to a segment or a portion of the Jerome Creek which is located south of the Neighborhood Plan area and along the CP Railway on the eastern portion of the neighborhood. Prior to consideration of any conceptual plan within this particular neighborhood, the precise locations of the floodplain will have to be field verified by topographic elevations. This is information from our 1998 floodplain maps as originally prepared by SEWRPC and adopted by DNR, but it still needs to be field verified for its precise location. But this is the best available information that we have as to the floodplain locations.

The next area is the wetland areas. The Neighborhood Plan identifies approximately 210 acres of land as wetlands. Prior to consideration, again, of any conceptual plans the wetlands will need to be field verified by a certified biologist in accordance with the Village wetland regulations and the wetland regulations and approvals of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. Some of the wetlands within the undeveloped area have been field verified. For example, the area where one developer is proposing to move forward with his project the wetlands have been field verified and that's in an area known as land owned by the Jolly Jay group or Jolly Jay, LLC. All of the wetlands that have been identified within this particular neighborhood have been identified to be preserved and protected.

The next open space area is a neighborhood park area. This Neighborhood Plan identifies approximately 14 acres of land for a neighborhood park to be located south of Bain Station Road and west of 88th Avenue and along 94th Avenue. The Plan also indicates the location of an interconnection of a pedestrian trail system. The park location and the trail system is consistent with the Village's Park and Open Space Plan. And as you can see, the neighborhood park that is shown, Peggy is identifying for you on the slide, there is a large stand of oak trees that's identified within that neighborhood park that is proposed to be preserved and protected.

One other thing I'd like to mention, and Peggy can go around with the pointer, is that there is a system of walkways, sidewalks and trails that we are identifying not only on the west end adjacent to the wetland and open space area and on the perimeter of that particular area, but also along where 94th Avenue would be and some of the other roadways that will interconnect both to the high school and then eventually north to the elementary school and Prairie Ridge. So we do have some select areas where we've identified walking trails as well as sidewalks.

The largest area within this neighborhood has been identified for future residential purposes. And as I mentioned earlier this particular project identifies that all of the residential area is identified for single family purposes, not for any type of multifamily or higher density residential uses. Currently there are 79 existing single family lots and homes within the neighborhood, and at full build out 791 new single family lots would be proposed to be developed within this

neighborhood. Therefore, full development of this neighborhood could provide for a total of 870 dwelling units to be developed on approximately 437 acres of land.

In accordance with the Village's Comprehensive Plan, the overall net density for the neighborhood is recommended to be within the lower-medium density residential land use category which means that the lots need to be between 12,000 and 19,000 square feet per dwelling unit. This allows for some of the areas of the neighborhood to have larger lots while other areas have smaller lots. The net density of the neighborhood as shown on the proposed neighborhood plan shows that the lots would average 21,880 square feet per dwelling unit which is approximately one-half acre would be the average residential lot within this neighborhood.

Under population projections for the neighborhood, the vacant portions of the neighborhood will not develop until the property owners wish to develop their land, which makes neighborhood planning essential for the orderly growth of our community. It also establishes a framework as to how development should occur if and when it does occur in this Village. The neighborhood plan is a guide for property owners and developers. Therefore, the population will increase but only on an incremental basis. As I mentioned earlier, even the high school site is not proposed to develop for at least 20 years in this particular area.

Current population in the neighborhood with 79 dwelling units, it's approximately 216 persons. Projected population, again, at full build out of the entire neighborhood area 870 dwelling units or approximately 2,375 persons. As always, the Village provides copies of all proposed developments even at the neighborhood plan level to the Kenosha Unified School system for evaluation and determination of where potential school sites should be located in our community and when they would develop in this community. I sit on the long range committee for Kenosha Unified, and we have been looking at various sites and locations for school in this Village, and in this particular neighborhood it's been identified as a site for a fourth comprehensive high school.

Access to arterial roads, 94th Avenue, and Peggy will identify that for you, is intended to be a collector street extending through the neighborhood. 94th Avenue connects Highway 50 on the north all the way through Prairie Ridge, through Ashbury Creek, and all the way through this neighborhood all the way south to the future high school site and then accesses all the way to Highway H or 88th Avenue. There's very limited and no direct driveway or private roadway access primarily on this roadway because it will serve to convey traffic north and south for about two and a half miles.

A proposed roundabout is shown at Highway C and Bain Station Road. This roundabout location will be further evaluated at the time that future development is being considered. A traffic study will need to be done to evaluate traffic impact on Highway H as well as Bain Station Road and Highway C. And we will be looking at a potential roundabout, again, at that intersection at C and Bain Station with Kenosha County.

With respect to Comprehensive Land Use Plan amendments, the Comprehensive Land Use Plan is proposed to be amended by the Plan Commission Resolution 08-06. And this is to conform with the Neighborhood Plan as it gets presented this evening. Specifically, some of the changes to the Comprehensive Plan as shown on the exhibit in your packet include the following: First of all a portion of the low density residential area shown on the Land Use Plan at the southeast corner of I-94 and Highway C is changed to a freeway commercial area. The urban reserve designation will remain at this time.

The property located at 10201 Wilmot Road, which is owned by the Village of Pleasant Prairie, and shown as lower medium density residential area with an urban reserve is identified for government and institutional purposes. An area south of Bain Station Road and west of 88th Avenue shown as the lower medium density residential is being changed to a recreational area for a neighborhood park. The urban reserve designation will remain. Again, what the urban reserve designation means as part of our planning process is that until such time as municipal improvements, sewer and water, are available to service an area and neighborhood planning is completed, that urban reserve area will remain on the map. It's intended that those areas will not likely develop until sometime after 2010. It made much more sense when we first put these reserve areas on in 1996 because some of these areas are now starting to come into development potential. But, again, they do need to have municipal services in order for them to develop.

The next area that will be amended is the existing Kenosha Cemetery which is located east of 88th Avenue and south of Bain Station Road. It's proposed to be changed from the lower medium density residential area with an urban reserve designation to a government and institutional area. That area in particular I think might have been an error on one of SEWRPC's original maps from 1996 because it was never the intention of the Village to develop that cemetery. So some of these are actually some corrections that are being made from the original 1996 map.

The next is a portion of the lower medium density residential area with an urban reserve designation, and the transportation and utility area east of 88th Avenue within the neighborhood is proposed to be changed to an industrial area. A portion of the lower medium density residential area on the west side of 88th Avenue is proposed to be changed to a government and institutional area and this is for a future high school site. A portion of the government and institutional area for future high school and the designation of a major park on the west side of 88th Avenue is changed to a lower medium density residential area. Again, I think this is an error. The M for the major park was shifted north as opposed to being shifted south where Prairie Springs Park is located, again, reflecting a correction to the map.

With that, those are the formal written comments that the staff has prepared for you this evening. I know that there are some of the people still here that were here this afternoon. A couple of things that I did want to bring to your attention. First of all, within the neighborhood one of the things that was brought to our attention is that, I don't know if you can see all the way across the room to the other side, there are two oak savannah areas that have some significant oak trees that Mr. Christiansen tells me are five to six feet in diameter that have been there several hundred years. Those are two areas that were not first identified on our neighborhood plan resource map, and so we wanted to make sure that those two areas do get preserved and incorporated into the residential development. It would be a shame if those two areas would be clear cut or removed from the site. They've been there for so many years we'd like to see those areas preserved. So we'll be making that correction or adjustment to the plans.

Something else was brought to our attention from Pat Finnemore from the Kenosha Unified School District. He was here earlier this evening. I'm not sure if you can see this and maybe it would be easier this way. At the extension of this roadway towards the school site, instead of having a municipal roadway that connects from this local road to 94th Avenue, he's recommending that there be a pretty defined walking trail so that the students that live west of the school site, once they came down to the end of that road, that they could walk on a nice walking trail to 94th Avenue to get to the high school site. Again, we decided against putting a public

roadway connection point there just because of congestion that we felt would be generated down at that location. So putting a walkway connection seems to make a lot of sense so we'd like to make that change as well.

There were some concerns that were raised by Mr. Powell with respect to some of the lots just east of 88th Avenue and just south of Bain Station Road and how some of the future lots may not fall on the current alignment of current properties. That's always our intention to try to do that, so we will re-look at that area in particular a little bit more closely to make sure we're not splitting properties amongst future lots because that makes it very difficult if and when it ever does develop in that particular area.

And one of the other things that I don't think the future developer would mind me saying, there's a large green space that's south of the sewage treatment plant. A large portion of it is currently identified for wetland and floodplain protection, but there was quite a bit of open space that was adjacent to those areas as well. In my discussion with him this evening, I had asked what he's looking to do with that large tract of land, and he asked what my opinion was and I encouraged him that that area be either donated to the Village or to the Kenosha-Racine Land Trust because they're in the process of identifying areas in the Des Plaines Basin for wetland restoration projects. And this was one of the areas that they believe would be a great opportunity to restore, and some of the open space adjacent to that could be incorporated into that restoration project. So I would like to continue those discussions with him in creating that outlot so that entire land area could be transferred for benefit for the area.

So with that I'd like to continue the public hearing for these two items.

Thomas Terwall:

This is a matter for public hearing. Is there anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? Yes, sir. You need to come to the microphone, sir, and give us your name and address please.

Charles Powell:

My name is Charles Powell, 8603 Bain Station Road. I talked to Jean earlier like she said. I'm just wondering just in case it ever does get developed and stuff my lot, I'm on Bain Station, if I could divide it possibly to seven lots, a little more feasible to pay frontage costs and stuff on that. Is that something I'd talk to Jean later on?

Thomas Terwall:

It certainly wouldn't be determined tonight but that is an item to discuss with the staff.

Charles Powell:

That's about all I have to say.

Thomas Terwall:

Thank you. Anybody else? hearing none, I'm going to open it up to comments and questions from Commissioners and staff?

Jim Bandura:

Jean, you mentioned a roundabout at Bain Station and Highway C. I would also kind of recommend you taking a look at 104th and Highway C for some kind of traffic control. I've noticed in the morning that 104th is starting to get a little bit more traffic on it, and that's kind of a curve right there on Highway C, so I'd look at something to slow traffic down right there.

Jean Werbie:

I think that the traffic study parameters will be much larger than just those two intersections. I think we're going to need to look from the terminus on 88th Avenue north, 88th and Bain Station, we're going to have to look at Bain Station and Highway C and 104th. I think we're going to have to take a look at the much larger area, and I'm sure that the County is going to request that we look at the larger area to see how one intersection will impact the other, as well as the work that's being done at the Interstate with the new interchange. So we'll have to find out how that's going to be impacted, the development on Bain Station and C as well.

Jim Bandura:

I did notice an increase in traffic coming from Highway C going west and 104th.

Donald Hackbarth:

A couple of comments. I'm grateful for consideration of the trees. But I would recommend that the industrial area, since it's right across from a school, it might be prudent, and I know that's way into the future, but it may be prudent to make that more light manufacturing rather than heavy. Because if you've got a lot of truck traffic coming out of there with buses and students' cars it might get kind of dicey there.

The other comment I have is, boy, I'd sure like to try a roundabout someplace to see how they work because we're putting them in kind of regularly here now. It would be kind of nice to take one for a spin rather than going to Madison or whatever it is.

The other thing is in regard to the school. Now, there's a proposed site on 39th. I thought that was proposed for a high school.

Jean Werbie:

No a middle school and an elementary school.

Thomas Terwall:

Jean, some time ago there was a developer who was interested in possibly putting in a storage area on Bain Station Road. Is that area east of this neighborhood, though?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Thomas Terwall:

So that would not be affected by whatever we do tonight?

Jean Werbie:

Correct.

John Braig:

Maybe just a comment. I'm looking at the Des Plaines Watershed area. From this area all the way down to State Line that's really going to be an extremely valuable natural resource area in the years to come. The only comment I have is while it's good to preserve it I would hope that our long-term plans provide for good access to it with trails and walkways and things like that, because while it's nice for the wildlife to enjoy it, I think our citizens should enjoy it, too.

Thomas Terwall:

John, on that note, John Steinbrink, Jr., with the parks people along with Kenosha Unified School system is in the process of installing a path with a pretty significant bridge from the west side of Prairie Springs Park to the Des Plaines River. And that should be open this spring, Mike?

Mike Pollocoff:

If it doesn't flood.

Thomas Terwall:

But that will be an access point.

Mike Serpe:

I recommend the plan but I often wonder when do the roads get looked atwhen development starts to take place, and I'll give you an example. In the City, Highway 50, and for Pleasant Prairie residents as well, Highway 50 is almost impossible in the morning and in the afternoon to get anywhere. And that's the main route out of the City and for the north side of Pleasant Prairie. Nothing is being done with 158. Nothing is being done with 60th Street and they have two schools just west of 31. Does the County take an active interest in the future of these roads before this massive congestion takes place? When does it actually going to lay out and say, look, if this all happens this is how we want to see it look when it's together?

Mike Pollocoff:

The Village has approached it differently than the City of Kenosha has with respect to both State highways and County highways. We required developers that are engaging in development that abuts either a State highway or a County highway to provide funds for making roadway improvements so that as those developments roll out over time, because they don't happen overnight, that funds are set aside to make improvements to the highway. That's true with the VK development with the improvements along Highway 50. And it would be true on that section of H between Bain Station and basically Prairie Springs Park.

Back in 1990 we didn't have that policy when LakeView Corporate Park was established so we're just kind—in that we're relying on the County to make improvements as time goes on. But on those other highways you mentioned the City has not had a policy that required the developer to set that money aside so that as they sell lots or homes or divide their land in the future that there's money set aside. In the case of the Village Jean requires the developer to engage in a traffic study so we'd have the amount of traffic that's going to go onto a highway identified and we can prorate what that's going to cost per development so that maybe we don't get 100 percent of it paid for but over time we'll get a good chunk of it paid for. At that time, like in the case of H, we'd be ready to ask the County to help pay for restoring what they have there as a road but also paying for those additional improvements.

When it's one of our streets such as Bain Station we have that in place already with Ashbury Creek. There's the land on the south side where no matter which owner it is that develops they're going to have to provide money and an agreement to make those improvements so that when that road needs to come up from a two lane rural road to a four lane urban road that that money is in place. Otherwise you never catch up with these roads as they get improved and they will look like 158.

Mike Serpe:

I just see a whole lot of road improvement going on within the Village on 104th just north of C and to C itself for that matter. 165 I can envision in the next number of years being four lanes all the way out to the I. You have to keep people moving the best you can, and right now our neighbors to the north aren't doing a very good job of that and I don't want to see us get caught in the same thing and I'm glad you answered that the way you did. Thank you.

Donald Hackbarth:

Just talking about Highway C, too, Highway C and Bain Station is a killer intersection. I don't know if that's appropriate for a roundabout or not, but that intersection is really difficult to get across.

Mike Pollocoff:

It is and it's probably a classic application for a roundabout because we don't have and neither does the County enough land to really widen that out and kind of make those streets hit at a 90 degree angle. So it is a good application for a roundabout. I think that as well as some improvements to Highway C because Highway C carries a lot more traffic than what it's designed for right now. The Village I think it's been 10 years ago now we removed the trucks from

Highway C to at least get that truck volume down. But there's still a significant amount of traffic and this will add to that traffic as well. So Highway C is definitely in need of improvements.

The County had shifted money from Highway C to 39th Avenue on the north side because they were having equal problems on that highway. If I recall right Highway C is in the six year plan for this coming six years to get an upgrade. If the development has proceeded long enough so that they can contribute to that then we'll have the developers do that. If not, as developers come on we'll be securing funds from them to reimburse for the improvements because we'll require more improvements than they will just of their own design.

Donald Hackbarth:

The other thing, Mike, is I don't know where we are with the railroad on Bain Station trying to abandon that road. With this development I think that's a natural for people to go Bain Station into Kenosha rather than shoving more traffic on C or whatever to get up to Highway 50. So I would really oppose the railroad from saying we have to abandon Bain Station. I say we should improve it. We should improve it to make it an easier route to get to 31.

Mike Pollocoff:

Bain Station is identified by the Regional Plan Commission as a transfer—to be upgraded to a County highway. So the transportation plans for years now have not seen Bain Station as being a minor arterial but a major arterial for Kenosha County, and the housing plans and development plans bear that out that it should be improved to a greater extend and not to close down. We don't have a hearing date on that yet but we'll confront that as it comes.

Mike Serpe:

In the talks about Bain Station, Mike, is there any talk about maybe putting an overpass over those tracks?

Mike Pollocoff:

We've given that some thought and that might be an ultimate possibility. I think that land that is, and you can kind of see it, and it's hard to visualize, but maybe you can see it on that right up here, but this kind of piece here almost shows as green over here. Our initial thought was that would be on the west side of the tracks an embankment to bring the bridge down. You'd have to build that up with an earthen bank and we wouldn't want a structure bridge there, and then come back down and span this. So we think we have enough room to work with given the way the land falls away, the way the tracks are, that at some point in the future to have that part be bridged. I think the real question is for the parcels here what that does for our residential use to be coming out on something that's becoming elevated as a bridge is. Mr. Powell asked the question about can I have smaller lots for my property. I think the real question is we shouldn't have any lots coming out on Bain Station but really coming in on that interior road so that we have some space, and they're not coming into a road that could be 20 or 30 years from now be the downgrade from a bridge over the tracks.

John Braig:

The other thing is the unit train, the coal train, is a fact of life. We're going to be dealing with that until the plant falls down, and that frequently blocks Bain Station Road for extended periods of time. Maybe we can put a little heat on . . . to help with that bridge.

Jean Werbie:

Tom, I also wanted to mention that as part of this plan, and we just started to touch on this, and I'm not sure how well you can see it, but there are a lot of sidewalks or interconnected trail systems that lead down to the school. There's walkways around the school. There's interconnections that lead to this Des Plaines area that come in at this location. You've got another one that comes down and leads into this connection at the north end. And eventually there will be a trail system that wraps around the outer portions of the Des Plaines and then links all the way south. We would like to work with John Steinbrink, Jr. and the Park Commission and with VK Development in doing a wetland restoration project and developing a trail system. It would be a benefit if once everything is completed that people can actually access it and see it and look at it and walk by it, not through it but adjacent to it. So it would be a benefit to the community. So we are looking more keenly at those particular details. Again, we're going to be getting into the details more as we get into the conceptual planning level and then the preliminary and final platting levels of this process. But we just do want to bring it to your attention that we do want to see these nice amenities created and people being able to view these areas.

Donald Hackbarth:

I move approval of Item A.

Wayne Koessler:

I'll second, Chairman.

Thomas Terwall:

We need both 6 and 7?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Thomas Terwall:

So we need a motion first to adopt Resolution 08-06?

Donald Hackbarth:

So moved.

Wayne Koessl:

I'll second.

Thomas Terwall:

Moved and seconded to adopt Resolution 08-06.

Jean Werbie:

Is that including some of the comments that I made this evening that we'll make some minor modifications with respect to the savannahs and some of those?

Thomas Terwall:

RIGHT. SO THE MOTION BY DON HACKBARTH AND SECOND BY WAYNE KOESSL THEN IS TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 08-06 SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM INCLUDING THE COMMENTS THAT WERE MADE TONIGHT DURING PUBLIC HEARING. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

Wayne Koessl:

Mr. Chairman, I'd move we approve 08-07 with the comments made at the hearing here today.

Jim Bandura:

Second.

Wayne Koessl:

I think it's a good neighborhood plan.

Thomas Terwall:

MOVED BY WAYNE KOESSL AND SECONDED BY JIM BANDURA TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 08-07 SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM INCLUDING THE COMMENTS MADE TONIGHT DURING THE PUBLIC HEARING. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

John Braig:

I think I'm certainly in favor of this plan but I'm also pleased with the comments that the staff makes and the thought process that the staff is putting into this. I think I'd like to be around here 15, 20, 30 years from now to see the results of this.

Thomas Terwall:

Jean, before I move onto the next item you made a comment about the fact that you serve on the Unified School District's long range planning. I'm wondering maybe if you have connections, in the past two weeks a large number of signs have been placed illegally throughout the Village in support of the school referendum which I support, by the way, but I don't support illegal placement of signs in the right of way. That election is a week over and the signs are still there. So if you have any contact with any of the people that were responsible for the placement of those signs I would ask that they be contacted and have them removed. They shouldn't have been there in the first place. We didn't anybody else do that and yet somebody from the school system went and put up a whole bunch of them, stuck them in a snow drift.

John Braig:

In that same vein on weekends there's a whole host of signs that seem to crop up. Am I correct that it would be appropriate if we saw some that were in the right of way that we could remove them and dump them off at the Prange Center?

Jean Werbie:

If I saw illegal signs in the right of way and I had the ability to take them down I would be taking them down.

John Braig:

That's what I wanted to hear. Thank you.

B. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF PLAN COMMISSION RESOLUTION #08-08 related to an amendment to the Village Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

C. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF SEVERAL ZONING TEXT AND MAP AMENDMENTS: to amend Section 420-126, relating to the I-1 Institutional District regulations, to amend Section 420-148 relating to Conditional Uses; and to consider several Zoning Map Amendments.

Jean Werbie:

I would ask that Item C be taken up at the same time.

John Braig:

So moved.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

MOTION BY JOHN BRAIG AND A SECOND BY MIKE SERPE TO TAKE ITEMS B & C TOGETHER. ALL IN FAVOR SAY AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

So ordered.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman, Item B is a public hearing and consideration of Plan Commission Resolution 08-08 and it's related to an amendment to the Village's Comprehensive Land Use Plan. And Item C is a public hearing and consideration of several zoning text and map amendments to amend Section 420-126 relating to the I-1 Institutional District regulations, to amend Section 420-148 relating to conditional uses, and to consider several zoning map amendments.

On January 22, 2007, the Plan Commission adopted Plan Commission Resolution 07-03 to initiate the review of the I-1 Institutional District which may also include amendments to other sections of the Village Zoning Ordinance, such as but not limited to specific regulations relating to conditional uses within the Institutional District, definitions and amendments of the official Village zoning map.

In addition to reviewing the Institutional District requirements and the Village zoning maps, the staff also reviewed the Village's Land Use Plan to ensure that the zoning map and the adopted Land Use Plan are consistent with the required State of Wisconsin Smart Growth Law.

In general, Smart Growth requires that on or before January 2, 1010 all municipalities who participate in planning, development and zoning activities shall prepare, adopt and maintain a Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan shall be the cornerstone of all local land use decisions. Therefore, all land use related ordinances shall be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan on or before January 1, 2010.

The Village's current Comprehensive Plan is currently being updated as part of a three year process that began a little over a year ago. The plan serves as a master plan for the Village and is used for development decision making as well as projecting the direction of future growth of our Village. The staff is continuing to re-evaluate the Comprehensive Plan as part of the State of Wisconsin Smart Growth requirements. As a result of re-evaluating the Institutional District regulations, the Land Use Plan Map, which is the community's guide for development, was reviewed to ensure that the Institutional District regulations are compliant with the Comprehensive Plan. As you know, that three year effort we are working with Kenosha on that effort and there's another chapter on the agenda tonight for that plan.

Comprehensive land use amendments. The following changes are proposed to be made to the Village's Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map as shown in Exhibit 1 of the Plan Commission Resolution 08-08 before you.

First, to change the Governmental and Institutional designation shown on the Land Use Plan that is located at the northwest corner of Cooper Road to the Upper-Medium density Residential designation. This is to reflect the currently existing residential property. I'm still not quite sure how that was originally shown as a government and institutional property back in 1996 by SEWRPC, but it should have been a residential designation. So we feel that that is a correction, and that is to Tax Parcel Number 91-4-122-113-0455.

Thomas Terwall:

With that description, it's the northwest corner of Cooper Road and what?

Jean Werbie:

I'm sorry, and 85th Street. The second is to change the Upper Medium Density Residential designation shown on the Land Use Plan that is located south of 85th Street and west of 43rd Avenue. The parcel is identified as Tax Parcel Number 92-4-122-141-0030 and we're proposing that this designation be changed to Governmental and Institutional designation. This is land area that is owned by the Village of Pleasant Prairie and it's the access roadway to the Village's detention basin which is located south of 85th Street. Again, merely a correction to the original Land Use Plan Map.

The next is to change the Industrial designation that is shown on the Land Use Plan that is located south of 116th Street and west of the CP Railway. This parcel is identified as Tax Parcel Number 92-4-122-331-0300. This designation should be to the Governmental and Institutional, industrial, but Governmental and Institutional designation. This is to reflect the existing WE Energies utility substation.

The fourth change is to change the Low-Medium Density Residential designation shown on the Land Use Plan Map that is located south of Springbrook Road and west of STH 31. The Tax Parcel Number is 92-4-122-334-0010, and this designation would be to the Governmental and Institutional designation and this reflects land that is owned by the Village of Pleasant Prairie. It's an extension of where our compost site is located and as shown on the slide.

With respect to the zoning text amendments this evening, the following text amendments are proposed. First, Section 420-126 of the Village Zoning Ordinance related to the I-1 District is proposed to be updated and amended. The I-1, Institutional District is intended to provide for areas which are under private or public ownership and where the uses in those areas are for public purposes or institutional purposes, whether public or private, and are anticipated to serve the needs of the community. No such district shall be established unless it is in compliance with duly adopted or amended comprehensive, neighborhood and conceptual plans. The proposed I-1, Institutional requirements are attached in your packets..

The one change that we do have is that the draft ordinance stated that a maximum height of 60 feet and the Village staff is recommending the following change. Again, because we made some modifications with respect to including some principal uses in the I-1 District, we want the Plan Commission to have some discretion with respect to depending on that use to allow the height of those uses to go from 35 feet up to 60 feet. We do not want an automatic 60 foot in height, for example, for a bank in an Institutional District that might be adjacent to a residential area. So the change that we wrote has to do with height. Except as expressly allowed in this Chapter the maximum height shall be 35 feet. However, the Plan Commission may allow, on a case by case basis, the height of a building to increase up to 60 feet; and further provided that the Plan Commission shall have the authority to require greater setbacks for buildings that exceed 35 feet in height.

The next change is to Section 420-148 B of the zoning ordinance, and that relates to conditional use standards for specific uses to reflect changes that were made to the Institutional District. There are four of them. First, Section 420-148B (82) related to conditional use standards for power and heat generating plants is proposed to be amended since power and heat generating plants are no longer allowed in the I-1 District. They are in the M-2 District.

The second is that Section 420-148B (101) related to conditional use standards for school auditoriums, gymnasiums and stadiums are proposed to be deleted since these requirements are already required by other sections of the Village zoning ordinance.

The third change is Section 420-148B (120.1) related to conditional use standards for Veterinarian Emergency Services Office is proposed to be amended since a Veterinarian Emergency Services Office is allowed in the I-1 District with approval of a Conditional Use Permit.

And, finally, Section 420-148B (121) related to conditional use standards for water storage tanks and towers and radio and television transmitting and receiving towers and relay stations is proposed to be deleted because they are also allowed with height exceptions in another area of the zoning district.

What I can do if you'd like me to now or later is we can go through some of the changes that we introduced to the I-1 District, or we can continue with the map amendments. Would you like me to just highlight some of the text changes that we made in the I-1 District? You have this before you in the Institutional District. Remember that the way the current ordinance had been written all uses were listed as conditional uses so they weren't permitted as a matter of right but they were only permitted with the approval of the Plan Commission subject to certain conditions.

We've made some modifications to that and we've actually listed a number of uses that we felt are not objectionable and should be listed as permitted uses including administrative offices, hospice facilities, financial institutions, libraries, nursing homes, office or clinic uses, post offices or postal stores, public or private community development organizations, public utility offices, storm water retention and detention facilities, water storage tanks, just to name a few that we felt could easily be permitted uses which means they don't have to come back for a specific public hearing before the Plan Commission. Their site and operational plan approval still does need to come back before you but they do not require a conditional use.

Also what we've done is we have modified the conditional use section and some of those uses which could need to be further reviewed by the Plan Commission and may involve more of a discretionary approval, we listed those specific uses as conditional uses. As you can see, what else we've done is the format for this district has now been updated to reflect the same format that some of our other districts that we have updated. The business districts for example, back from 2003, we've now updated from 1983 to 2003 with respect to the format of how the district is laid out. We have introduced information that addresses special use licenses, the combination of uses, prohibited uses in this district, dimensional standards, open space requirements, building standards, number of the things that weren't in this district before but again were reflected in some of the other business and other districts of the Village.

There's also some specific provisions that deal with operational standards. As you can see, what we have done is introduced more of a flexible provision in the hours of operation. Typically hours of operation are from 5 a.m. to 12 a.m. So there's not a 24 hour business, but we do have some exceptions such as hospitals, hospice facilities, nursing homes, emergency service facilities, but we added a provision that on a case by case basis the Plan Commission may allow other I-1 uses to increase their hours of operation. So, again, instead of requiring a variance or a change of the ordinance in the future, we wanted to introduce some flexibility with respect to the hours if a use comes before you that does need to be open 24 hours.

We also introduced some of the provisions, again, that are in the business districts that deal with municipal services that are required and some of the business activities that are prohibited or allowed on the I-1 Institutional District properties.

So with that I'd like to now continue with the zoning map amendments for the I-1 District. The following zoning map amendments are being proposed so that the zoning maps are compliant with the Comprehensive Plan.

The first, the following zoning map amendments are proposed for several properties generally located on the Dabbs Farm Drive east property east of Highway 31. In 2007 the Plan Commission approved a Comprehensive Land Use Plan Amendment to reflect the amended Highpoint Neighborhood Plans for the development of the area. The zoning map amendments are proposed so that the official zoning map is compliant with the Village's Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map. so here are these changes.

- To rezone a portion of the property located south of Dabbs Farms Drive and east of 31 identified as Tax Parcel Number 92-4-122-222-0210 from the B-2, Community Business District, to the R-4 (APO), Urban Single Family Residential District, with and an Agricultural Preservation Overlay District.

- The second change in this area is to rezone the property located at the northeast corner of Highway 31 and Dabbs Farm Drive identified as Tax Parcel Number 92-4-122-222-0205 from the B-2, Community Business District, to the I-1 (AGO), Institutional District, with a General Agricultural Overlay District Overlay District.
- The third is to rezone the property located at 6831 93rd Street from the B-2, Community Business District, to the R-4, Urban Single Family Residential District. This parcel is identified as Tax Parcel 92-4-122-222-0300.
- And, finally, to rezone the property located at 9335 Old Green Bay Road identified as Tax Parcel Number 92-4-122-222-0155 from the B-2, Community Business District, to the R-4, Urban Single Family Residential, which is the western portion, and the I-1, Institutional District, for the eastern portion. The AGO, General Agricultural Overlay District, will remain on the property.

Finally, the last segment in that area, the last use in that area, the Holy Family Catholic Book store property located at the northeast corner of 93rd Street and Old Green Bay Road and further identified as Tax Parcel Number 92-4-122-153-0135 is currently zoned B-2, Community Business District. According to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and the adopted Whittier Creek Neighborhood Plan this property is classified as the Governmental and Institutional land use. Unfortunately, while reviewing the zoning maps comprehensively for the Village we missed this one. So we did have to notice it separately and we will have to bring that one use back to you on March 10, 2008 at a public hearing on that date.

The second, the following zoning map amendments are proposed so that the Village zoning map complies with the Comprehensive Plan. The following properties are designated in the Land Use Plan as governmental and institutional and are proposed to be rezoned into the I-1 District.

- The first is the property south of 85th Street and west of 43rd Avenue identified as 92-4-122-141-0030 from the R-4 (UHO), Urban Single Family Residential District to the I-1, Institutional District.
- The second is to rezone the properties generally located west of 31 on the southwest side of Springbrook Road from the PR-1, Park and Recreational District, to the I-I District. The FPO will remain. Again, that includes three uses, the Springbrook Cemetery, the City of Kenosha property commonly known as the old City landfill site and, finally, the Village's compost site property.
- The next is to rezone the Kenosha County Cemetery generally located south of Bain Station Road on the east side of 88th Avenue from the Agricultural A-1 District to the I-1 Institutional District.

Pursuant to Section 420-14 of the Village Zoning Ordinance, any rezoning of any parcel of land in the A-1, Agricultural Preservation District, shall be in accordance with § 91.77, Wis. Stats. The Village Board may approve petitions to rezone areas zoned for exclusive agricultural use only after making the following findings pursuant to § 91.77(1), Wis. Stats.

1. Adequate public facilities to accommodate development either exist or will be provided within a reasonable time frame.

2. Provision of public facilities to accommodate development will not place an unreasonable burden on the ability of affected local units of government to provide them.
3. The land proposed for rezoning is suitable for development, and development will not result in undue water or air pollution, cause unreasonable soil erosion or have an unnecessary adverse effect on rare or irreplaceable natural resource areas.

Again, this is the Kenosha Cemetery. This was probably an error made by Kenosha County when the initial rezoning took place in the 1983-84 time frame so there's no reason for this to remain an A-1 District so we're correcting the map for this particular parcel for that reason.

Jean Werbie:

So with that we'd like to continue the public hearing on the two items.

Thomas Terwall:

This is a matter for public hearing. Is anyone wishing to speak on this matter? Is anyone wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? Hearing none, I'll open it up to comments and questions from Commissioners and staff.

Mike Serpe:

Jean, with the changes in the zoning the only one that would really be affected would be the bookstore that would be legal nonconforming if this were changed the way you're recommending?

Jean Werbie:

No, it wouldn't be legal nonconforming because the bookstore would be a permitted use within the I-1 District. It's Item Number 14 under permitted uses, retail sale of religious affiliated merchandise. So they, in fact, would move right into a permitted use. They'd be legal conforming.

Donald Hackbarth:

We could still consider the cemetery agricultural because they say they planted people.

Thomas Terwall:

Any other comments?

John Braig:

Move approval. We're still on B, Resolution 08-08.

Thomas Terwall:

Motion to adopt Resolution 08-08.

Larry Zarletti:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

MOTION BY JOHN BRAIG AND A SECOND BY LARRY ZARLETTI TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 08-08. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered. Now we need a motion to send a favorable recommendation to the Village Board for C.

Mike Serpe:

So moved.

Wayne Koessl:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY MIKE SERPE AND SECONDED BY WAYNE KOESSL TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO ADOPT THE ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS AND THE MAP AMENDMENTS AS PRESENTED. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

D. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT to rezone the field delineated wetlands into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District and the non-wetland portions of the property would remain in the R-5, Urban Single Family Residential District on the property located at 11510 Lakeshore Drive as a result of a wetland staking being completed. The LUSA, Limited Use Service Area Overlay District will remain on the entire property.

Peggy Herrick:

This is a public hearing to consider a zoning map amendment to rezone the field delineated wetlands into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, and the non-wetland portions of the property would remain in the R-5, Urban Single Family Residential District, on the property located at 11510 Lakeshore Drive as a result of a wetland staking being completed. The LUSA, Limited Use Service Area Overlay District, will remain on the entire property.

On September 11, 2007 the Village received an application from Mary Lampman and Sherry Kroger, owners of the property who requested a wetland staking to be completed on that property which again is located at 11510 Lakeshore Drive. This property is further identified as Tax Parcel Number 93-4-123-293-0101. It's known as Lots 26 and 27 of Block 12, Carol Beach Estates Subdivision, Unit #2.

The Village received a letter dated December 10, 2007 from the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission that indicated that the Plat of Survey correctly surveyed and correctly identified the wetlands on said property as field staked on October 4, 2007. Those wetlands are shown on the overhead on the plat of survey. The areas in yellow were found to be wetlands on this property.

Pursuant to NR 117 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, the Village Zoning Ordinance and the wetland staking application filed by the property owner, on January 14, 2008, the Plan Commission approved Resolution #08-01 to initiate a zoning map amendment to correct the Village Zoning Map as a result of the wetland staking being completed.

Therefore, the field-delineated wetlands on the property are proposed to be rezoned into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, and the non-wetland portions of the property would remain in the R-5, Urban Single Family Residential District. In addition, the entire property will remain in the LUSA District which is a Limited Urban Service Area Overlay District and the shoreland jurisdictional area of Lake Michigan would remain as well. This is a matter for public hearing.

Thomas Terwall:

Anybody wishing to speak on this matter? Anybody wishing to speak? Hearing none, open it up to questions and comments.

Mike Serpe:

Is that structure right on the property line between the two lots?

Peggy Herrick:

These properties have been combined so it's one parcel right now. But when they were originally platted in the '40s, whenever that subdivision was platted, they were platted as two separate lots but they have since been combined by the property owner.

Wayne Koessl:

Mr. Chairman, if there aren't any other comments I'd move that the Plan Commission send a favorable recommendation to the Village Board to approve the zoning map amendment as presented.

Thomas Terwall:

Is there a second?

John Braig:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

Don, you had a question?

Donald Hackbarth:

Yes, looking at the access to this piece of property can he put access on the one that has available, it's not blocked with the—

Peggy Herrick:

There's an existing house on this and this property is actually on the corner. This is all the road right here. Their driveway access to the existing houses from their existing driveway I believe can get on this side or this side.

Donald Hackbarth:

Is he proposing to have a house built on that property, and if he is—

Peggy Herrick:

There is a house on that property already.

Donald Hackbarth:

I mean on the one that has all the—

Peggy Herrick:

It's part of the same property. It probably would not allowed to be subdivided. They would not have access.

Thomas Terwall:

MOTION BY WAYNE KOESSL AND A SECOND BY JOHN BRAIG THEN TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

E. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF SEVERAL ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS to Sections 420-139 B, 420-110 E (2) and Section 420-111 E (2) related to "lot widths at the building setback line" for platted lots.

Tom Shircel:

Thank you. I'll take this one. This is consideration of several zoning text amendments to Sections 420-139 B, 420-110 E (2) and Section 420-111 E (2) related to lot widths at the building setback line" for platted lots.

As the Commission will recall, on January 28, 2008 the Plan Commission adopted Resolution #08-02 to re-evaluate certain single-family residential zoning district regulations and certain parts of the Exceptions and Accommodations and Nonconforming Lots, Structures and Uses sections of the Zoning Ordinance related to lot area and width and more specifically related to lot width at the required building setback line.

The Village staff recognizes that there are certain situations within certain single-family residential zoning districts where the re-division of previously platted single-family lots is not feasible due to the lots not having the Zoning Ordinance-required lot width at the required building setback line.

In most of these lot combination/re-division inquiries it appears that these circumstances primarily occur in the Carol Beach Estates and Chiwaukee Subdivision areas of the Village. The Carol Beach Estates and Chiwaukee Subdivisions are located between Sheridan Road and Lake Michigan. These subdivisions were mainly platted in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s and a majority of these lots are not serviced by municipal water, storm water improvements and, moreover, the lots are not serviced by municipal sanitary sewer. The buildable lots within these subdivisions are zoned R-5 or R-6, both Urban Single-Family Residential Districts.

Over the years, some of these abutting vacant lots were legally combined by choice of the property owner. The reason for combining the abutting vacant properties may have been to take advantage of lower taxes or for some other financial reason. As years pass, some property

owners now realize the financial incentive to re-divide these combined lots, with the intent to sell the once combined lot as two, individual, buildable, single-family home sites.

However, at times, the re-division of the lot to the original platted dimensions and configuration may result in the possible creation of a non-conforming lot, which is not possible, of course, unless a variance would be granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

As an example, as you see in the slide, in a recent request a property owner on 3rd Avenue in Carol Beach Estates is requesting to re-divide a vacant parcel, that being Tax Parcel Number 93-4-123-184-0471, that was legally combined in June, 1996. Originally Lots 7 & 8, Block 48, Carol Beach Estates Subdivision, Unit 5-A. The current owner purchased this combined, R-5 zoned property in October, 1996, after the lot was combined. The re-division of the parcel back to the two originally platted lots will not meet the R-5 District regulation requirements for the lot width at the required building setback line. Specifically, the re-divided lots will not comply with Section 420-110 E (2), which requires that: All lots shall be not less than 75 feet in width unless located on a cul-de-sac or curve, in which case the lot frontage may be reduced to 40 feet of frontage, provided that there is at least 75 feet of width at the required building setback line.

These would-be re-divided lots have only approximately 70 feet of street frontage and the lots are the widest, approximately 75 feet, at the rear property line. Therefore, given the originally platted lot dimensions and configurations and the current Zoning Ordinance requirements, this 1996 combined parcel cannot be legally re-divided, then again, of course, unless the Board of Appeals granted a variance because it is not physically possible for the re-divided vacant lots to attain the Ordinance-required 75 feet of lot width at the required building setback line.

Again, if you look at the drawing there, these combined lots only have about 70 feet of frontage along 3rd Avenue, and as they go westward back to the rear property line, they're at their widest of 75 feet along the west property line, and the R-5 District requires 75 feet of lot width at the building setback line which cannot be attained. A note that the proposed ordinance amendment language if adopted by the Village Board will not alleviate the re-division predicament of this example that was just shown due to the fact that the example lots were legally combined after March 26, 1984.

So, with that, I'll read the proposed ordinance amendment language to Section 17 entitled Exceptions and Accommodations. It would read: Lot width at the required building setback line. Any existing platted lots of record that were legally combined prior to March 26, 1984 and that are located within an R-5 or R-6 District, which are proposed to be re-divided to the originally platted dimensions and area of the lots, including the original lot frontage dimensions, but as divided, the lots do not meet the required lot width at the required building setback line for the current zoning district in which the lots are located, may be re-divided, provided that all other Ordinance requirements are met. However, if the lots created through the re-division are not to be serviced by municipal sanitary sewer, then the lot re-division may occur only if sanitary permit is obtained for the re-divided vacant lots. So that's the proposed language.

And along with that, Section 420-110 E (2) and Section 420-111 E (2) would also need to be amended to provide for the reference to that language that I just read. So with that this is a public hearing and I'll turn it back over to the Plan Commission Chairman.

Thomas Terwall:

This is a matter for public hearing. Is there anybody wishing to speak on this matter? Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? Hearing none, I'm going to open it up to comments and questions.

Donald Hackbarth:

Looking at that map again, is that applied toe very, or not applied, but these lots were combined and now they want to re-divide them again?

Tom Shircel:

Yes. I received an inquiry from the current property owner right there where they were combined in 1996, and that property owner now wants to re-divide them. They're both vacant and under the current ordinance language they can't.

Donald Hackbarth:

It looks like everybody's property up there is under 75 feet.

Tom Shircel:

You're correct. Basically all those lots along the west side of 3rd Avenue have the same frontage of about 70 feet and they go back to 75 feet at the rear property line.

Donald Hackbarth:

So what does that mean to them, nothing?

Tom Shircel:

Nothing. Many of those lots are already developed with single family homes. However, like I said, if this amendment were to be passed by the Village Board, it wouldn't help this person with their predicament.

John Braig:

Unfortunately my packet did not include this item. But as I was listening to you near the end I think you made reference to lots that were combined before 1984? Was that correct?

Tom Shircel:

Right. Any existing platted lots of record that were legally combined prior to March 26, 1984.

John Braig:

So what you're saying is any lots that were combined after that date would not be eligible for this consideration anyhow?

Tom Shircel:

You're exactly correct.

(Inaudible)

Tom Shircel:

'84 is when the zoning ordinance went into effect, adopted.

Jean Werbie:

Adopted by the Town of Pleasant Prairie.

Tom Shircel:

So I guess the figuring was that the lot owner should have known of the combination and of the rules in effect in 1984 and that's the reason for that date being used.

Thomas Terwall:

If we're saying it can be less than 75 feet but we're saying how much less than 75 feet would be acceptable, 60 feet?

John Braig:

Are there side lot line requirements now? In other words, if they put in an improvement what's the setback from the side lot lines?

Jean Werbie:

The side lot line setback in an R-5 is 10 feet and it's still 10 feet. What we're saying is that we have a new regulation since 1984 that requires at the building setback line you have to be what the lot width is for the district. So it has to be 75 feet at the building setback, at 30 foot in, at least a 30 foot in. On a curve or a cul-de-sac it can be reduced you know below that 75, but at the building setback line it needs to be at 75 feet. So the problem that they're having is that these lots were combined and they sign a lot combination form and specifically on that lot combination form the previous owners signed it specifically said that any further subdivision of this land does need to meet with the current regulations for land division. It was the previous owner that had done it in June, and then it was sold to the new owner in October.

Mike Pollocoff:

A number of lot combinations were done in part out of fear of sanitary sewer extension and they wanted to escape the two lots, they didn't want to have to pay for a lateral and the sewer connection fee, so that was one way that if there was one lot that's all they got. But as Jean said everybody was told that, but then when the market got hot, the lots, and the property is sold and transferred then some people come back and say, well, now I'd really like to do that. So, one,

there's no lateral there and typically in the Carol Beach area you get typical construction sites and it doesn't match up with what the ordinance was and they were granted their combination.

John Braig:

So, in effect, if we approve this text amendment we're saying anybody before '84 has got a shot at splitting the lots again. Anybody after '84 is out of luck?

Tom Shircel:

Right. And, Mr. Braig, to add on I think your question was how does it affect other requirements of the zoning ordinance, the side lot line setback you mentioned, and it does say in the proposed ordinance language may be redivided provided that all other ordinance requirements are met. So those will still all be in effect.

Thomas Terwall:

Back to my recent question. What's the maximum possible variance that we're looking at here?

Tom Shircel:

For this particular example? Well, again, at the front of—

Thomas Terwall:

I realize in those two lots we're only talking about five foot. But are there other places where those lots started out at 60 feet and then combined and now they want to split them?

Tom Shircel:

We have no idea how many of these situations may exist in these R-5 and R-6 zoned districts.

John Braig:

But if at the 30 foot setback line the lot was 60 feet wide and there's a 10 foot side lot requirement, in effect this might be approved but the structure could only be 40 feet wide?

Tom Shircel:

Correct.

Mike Pollocoff:

Although in that district there's an 8 foot setback. There probably are—the cases that are sitting out there would be Carol Beach west of the tracks where we have some of those higher density Carol Beach subdivisions.

Thomas Terwall:

Anybody who owns one of these lots now either combined it themselves and signed a document saying I know what I'm doing here and I understand that, or they were sold and the party that bought the property was given a document that says this is what happened, this is the way it is. I don't understand who screwed but now they want to change it.

Jean Werbie:

They may or may not have been given the lot combination form from the seller with this warning statement on it. I mean it's a document that gets recorded at the Register of Deeds office so it should come up in title in a title search, but whether or not they went back and looked at every single document that was recorded on their property we don't know that.

Mike Pollocoff:

A lot of times these lots prices are not that significant so that it might be a cash transaction so you don't have a title company that's doing the research.

John Braig:

I think the proposal is reasonable and basically we're protecting the guys that didn't know any better before the ordinance was written in '84 and the rest of the people should have known better. So with that I would move approval of the zoning text amendment.

Wayne Koessler:

I'll second.

Thomas Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY JOHN BRAIG AND SECONDED BY WAYNE KOESSL TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO APPROVE THE ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? Aye.

Larry Zarletti:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Two opposed. If it was only five feet I guess I wouldn't have a problem with it. But we're going to get one of these that's going to come in where it was 60 feet and now they want to split that again. Now we're going to have a 60 foot lot in an area that's supposed to be 75 foot minimum.

John Braig:

To follow through on that what would be your recommendation?

Thomas Terwall:

I wouldn't change this. I liked it the way it was. We made it very clear to those people. I agree with what they're saying, but the reason that most of these lots were combined was to avoid a second sewer lateral charge and so on which never happened because we never let sewer and water down there. But that's okay.

Mike Serpe:

One question. Where's the R-6 and R-5 separation in this area?

Mike Pollocoff:

Separation?

Mike Serpe:

Where is it R-6 and where is it R-5?

Mike Pollocoff:

R-6 is up at 91st Street running south to about 95th Street, and then it gets pretty big between 97th and 102nd. Then you start R-5 again at 101st or 102nd. Then you start up with R-5. Then when you get on the other side of Jerome Creek it's kind of a funky R-5. It's a little bit different. But it's a mixed bag. But most of the lots at Carol Beach are 5 or bigger.

Mike Serpe:

Just for conversation if this area was all zoned R-6 we wouldn't have a problem?

Jean Werbie:

Correct.

Thomas Terwall:

You'll get another kick at this cat.

F. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE AMENDMENT to Section 395-60 D of the Village Land Division and Development Control Ordinance related to the temporary termination of public streets intended to be extended at a later date.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission, Item F is a public hearing in consideration of an ordinance amendment to Section 395-60 D of the Village Land Division and Development Control Ordinance related to the temporary termination of public streets intended to be extended at a later date.

The Village Land Division and Development Control Ordinance requires that any roadway that is proposed to be extended in the future by another stage of development or by developing an adjacent property have a temporary termination of a cul-de-sac that meets the Village's cul-de-sac requirements.

The Village Board has granted some exceptions to the temporary cul-de-sac requirements and has granted two variances recently to reduce the diameter of temporary cul-de-sacs from 150 feet to 100 feet. The following is the proposed new language for temporary cul-de-sacs: Temporary termination. The temporary termination of a public street that is intended to be extended at a later date shall be accomplished by constructing a temporary cul-de-sac as outlined below:

- (1) The divider or developer shall dedicate the required public right-of-way areas to the Village for the future public streets within a development. For temporary, dead-ended streets, the divider or developer shall also dedicate a temporary public street, access and maintenance easement to the Village and construct the temporary street cul-de-sac. Land for the temporary cul-de-sac shall come from within the development property or by acquiring an off-site easement from an adjacent property owner.
- (2) Temporary public street areas shall be constructed to meet the Village specifications for a typical urban cross section profile as illustrated in Chapter 405, with following exceptions:
 - (a) Temporary cul-de-sac rights-of-way may be reduced to 100 feet in diameter;
 - (b) Temporary cul-de-sacs shall not have a cul-de-sac planting island;
 - (c) Temporary cul-de-sacs shall not have curb and gutter installed along the cul-de-sac bulb; and
 - (d) Temporary cul-de-sacs shall not have street trees installed along the cul-de-sacs bulb.
- (3) Temporary cul-de-sacs shall comply with the required public improvement paving schedule, unless the Village Administrator allows for the temporary cul-de-sacs to remain gravel while the project is between construction stages of the development.

- (4) Temporary cul-de-sac street improvements shall be removed and the required street improvements shall be installed by the adjacent off-site divider or developer or owner at the time of the future street extension.
- (5) Temporary easement areas relating to the temporary cul-de-sacs shall be vacated by the Village Board when future off-site development completes its second phase of required public street improvements or the second stage of the next stage of the development is completed, inspected, accepted and dedicated to the Village.
- (6) The owner or developer shall be responsible for the Village's costs to install street signs that indicate that the dead-ended street is temporary and that the street is intended to be extended in the future to serve additional vacant lands.

Obviously we've had some issues over the last couple of years with respect to temporary dead ended streets and what is specifically the requirement of the developer with respect to the turnaround and how big and where it's located, who pays for it and what condition it's in and what it's made of. So we needed to instead of extending policy into this area we felt that it would be appropriate just to bring forth an official amendment of the Land Division and Development Control Ordinance to make it very clear to the developer that if they have dead ended streets that they have to deal with it up front and the roads either have to have temporary terminations on their property in a cul-de-sac or they have to acquire offsite easements so that that bulb can be extended on the adjacent property and their street can be straightened in front of their property. So this is the staff's attempt to try to bring some clarity to the many questions that have been raised by the developer. With that I'd like to continue the public hearing.

Thomas Terwall:

Anybody wishing to speak on this matter?

Mike Renner:

Mike Renner, 3211 122nd Street. I'd just like you to define temporary.

(Inaudible)

Jean Werbie:

The intent is that temporary for the Village has been anywhere from six months up to almost 20 years now. So because of that we want to make sure that we were creating a more permanent looking situation, because in temporary situation when we first wrote our Land Division Ordinance remember back in 1990 we allowed T turnarounds, temporary gravel T turnarounds. Well, some of those still exist today so that's a problem because they cannot facilitate the turning movements of garbage trucks and snowplows and so on and so forth. So temporary could be, as I stated, until such time as the developer moves forward to the next phase of his development or the next stage of the subdivision moves forward or the adjacent landowner develops that land. So that's why we want these temporary cul-de-sacs to be paved, so unless the Administrator waives that requirement we want them to be paved because we recognize it will extend at some point in the future but we don't know when. And so we want to have a temporary permanent solution to these cul-de-sacs.

Thomas Terwall:

Has John Steinbrink, Jr. and Chief Guilbert signed off on the 100 foot radius?

Mike Pollocoff:

We have. That's something we can work with. It's a tight radius on a tandem to get around but we can get a garbage truck or one of the larger engines in and around that cul-de-sac. And it's definitely better than the situation we have now where it's a dead end or a T turnaround. These things right now we have a couple of subdivision that have been kind of in the twilight zone where we've tried not putting the sewer and the water underneath where the street is going to go but not the street because we'd only be paving a street to nowhere and then having to plow that and keep it open. If the street is not there then the people living next to that street are going to say I don't want that street to go through. I bought a house on a dead end lot. It's a dead end lot and I don't want any streets going through. So this appears to be the best of all cases where there is a place to turn around and we can maintain it.

At such future time as an abutting developing that the Land Use Plan such as the one we looked at tonight, we've had these in almost all our neighborhoods. When those land use plans, especially when you have an area that's going to develop that might be surrounded by agricultural land, that farmer isn't ready to go for 20 years, the transportation plan is still premised on all those streets connecting. This gets us through that cycle where the street is there and we do maintain it. So the question is what's temporary. Temporary is as land development occurs. If anybody knows how fast that will happen then you have the answers that we don't have. If we buy into the plans that we've been promulgating and adopting it shows these transportation corridors between property owners, this is the only thing that's going to enable us to connect them in the future without this consternation of I really don't want that street to go through anymore or does it really go through? How are you going to maintain it?

Thomas Terwall:

And what criteria will you use to determine whether it should be paved or not?

Mike Pollocoff:

Basically where they are in their construction cycle? If there's nothing happening, if they've gone through one development and they've achieved 50 percent of that subdivision where there's actually homes, then I'd permit that first course of pavement to go in. Only if there's an abutting development that's maybe tagging along about a year later would I say let's just leave it and let that other development go through so we can get that connected. So it really kind of depends on how fast the first development is going and how fast that second development is going.

Thomas Terwall:

But if the adjacent property owner says I want to grow corn on this land until I die, you'd make the original guy pave it then?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. We're going to pave it and we want that road established so that we don't end up with a screwed up traffic pattern later on where if there isn't a road there--sometimes if there's a road there people will say the road was never going to go through. But definitely if there's not a road there then that will be the fight that we'll fight later on and everybody gets tight jawed over it.

Thomas Terwall:

If developer A comes in and says I'm going to develop this part and I don't own the part to the west, do we at least contact the guy who owns that land to the west and say you're not under any obligation to develop but when you do this is where the road is going to come through?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right, we would enforce the Land Use Plan. We would require Developer A to put in the sewer, the water, the storm, everything based on how that lays out and it would stop at the property line with a cul-de-sac. Then we would talk to the property owner and say this is probably your one last chance before that develop gets approved if there's any changes to the land use plan that would alter that road. But typically the first ones in if they follow the land use plan we've adopted that ends up being the backbone for the transportation system. That pretty much the die is cast.

Mike Serpe:

The 100 foot turnaround then the developer who is putting this in would probably have to eliminate two lots at the end temporarily.

Mike Pollocoff:

It depends on the size of the lots. They have to lose a lot. That's too bad. But if they have large size lots they might be able to accommodate it.

Mike Serpe:

And then this would eliminate our barricade at the end of these. That's a great idea. I wish that was done a long time ago. Because you get into a nice subdivision and you turn a corner and you see these green barricades and it does not look good.

Donald Hackbarth:

With that explanation I'd move approval.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY DON HACKBARTH AND SECONDED BY MIKE SERPE TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

John Braig:

At the last Village Board meeting the Board determined that it would be desirable to have a temporary construction roadway from The Orchard Subdivision through to Prairie Trails East. Excellent idea. Is there a possibility that that could become permanent?

Mike Pollocoff:

If that would become permanent we would need to have the developer from The Orchard be willing to modify his preliminary plat as well as the other developer who has already submitted a plat. So they've gained some rights and privileges in the plats that the Plan Commission and the Board have adopted. The other thing that would have to happen is the traffic transportation plan in that area assuming that these aren't a straight shot the traffic is finding its way to 26th and 28th. If that was bypassed then you'd have a certain amount of increased traffic going up 26th, coming out at a T intersection and make a left turn or right turn. Right now the transportation plan hasn't looked at that. So I think the people who live right around that intersection they weren't happy that the development was going in to begin with, but if we were to stop traffic in front of their house as you waited to make a left turn or right turn they might not be happy about that. But as we laid out the transportation patterns for that area we didn't assume that we were going to direct traffic through the new subdivision and then have it intersection on the other one. I think that might be one that would certainly deserve some more engineering. But I'd be surprised if you'd be able to get both of the developers—you could probably get them to give up those lots during construction so that that's not going down the street, but to give them up permanently so they have two streets to drive on they could within their rights say you've already given me the plat and you can't take it away from me and by statute they're right.

G. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT to amend Sections 420-120 76 T and Y of the Village Zoning Ordinance related to the area, height and setbacks for Primary and Secondary Monument Signs.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission, public hearing and consideration of a zoning text amendment to amend Sections 420-120 76 T and Y of the Village Zoning Ordinance related to the area, height and setbacks for Primary and Secondary Monument Signs.

On January 28, 2008 the Village Plan Commission adopted Resolution #08-04 to evaluate size and setback requirements for Primary and Secondary Monument Signs.

Currently the area and height of a primary and secondary monument signs vary depending if the property in which the sign relates abuts an arterial or a non-arterial street. The Village staff is recommending that these types of signs have a maximum size, height and setback that is not depended on the type of street that it abuts. The ordinance amendment proposes that the maximum area for primary monument signs would be 130 square feet per face, except if located in the B-1 Business District, which is the neighborhood business district, then the maximum area would be 36 square feet per face and the maximum height would be 10 feet, except if located in the B-1 Business District then the maximum height would be four feet.

The Village staff has evaluated a number of existing Primary Monument Signs in the Village that abut an arterial street which are currently allowed to be 160 square feet and 16 feet in height. The ordinance amendment proposes that the maximum area for secondary monument signs would be 24 square feet per face, have a maximum height of 4 feet and be located a minimum of 6 feet from the property line.

There are not very many developments in the Village that currently have Secondary Monument Signs, the size and height of two secondary monument signs include: BP Amoco and Care Animal Hospital which are listed in the staff memo. They have heights of 6 and 4 feet respectively.

Larger existing developments that have multiple sign requirements due to the nature of their development, the Plan Commission and the Village Board have written specific sign requirements as part of a Planned Unit Development, including Prime Outlets and the Shoppes at Prairie Ridge. These specific PUD Ordinances are not affected by these proposed changes.

Any primary or secondary monuments signs that fully conformed to the applicable sign requirements when it was installed or constructed but which have become nonconforming as a result of this amendment would be considered valid nonconforming accessory signs, which are allowed to continue subject to certain restrictions pursuant to the sign ordinance.

Section 420-78T specifies that a valid nonconforming accessory sign shall be allowed to continue until such sign becomes obsolete or becomes an illegal sign. Any obsolete or illegal sign shall be removed or reconstructed to conform to the current sign requirements in effect. In addition, any nonconforming accessory sign that is destroyed or damaged to the extent of 50 percent of the cost of replacing the sign shall be illegal and shall be removed or reconstructed to conform with the current sign ordinance requirements.

What the staff has done is we've taken a look specifically at the B-2 District for example, and depending on where that B-2 District is located, if it's located on an arterial even if it has a very small parcel it could have a 16 foot high sign. And so the staff is concerned that the building itself that could be located on that property might not even be 16 feet in height, and the sign could

be huge in size and area, and so it could almost overpower or seem like half the size of the building that's located there. So what we wanted to do is try to look on a case by case basis, and then we came back to the fact that we should probably reduce the heights of the sign for some of the signs in the Village based on the district that they're in. When we were looking at some of these signs, even if it's on an arterial highway, Highway 50, it may or may not warrant such a huge sign if it's just a single business.

Again, Highway 50 is proposing to be widened, a number of other arterials in the Village are proposed to be widened, and that means it will bring in the traffic that much closer to the business. And we just felt the height of these signs is not necessary. Again, if the Plan Commission does feel and the Board do feel that it's necessary and it's a larger commercial development, then it could be incorporated as part of this PUD development for this particular site and project. With that I'd like to continue the public hearing.

Thomas Terwall:

Anybody wishing to speak on this matter? Anybody wishing to speak? Hearing none, I'm going to open it up to comments.

Donald Hackbarth:

Along with this change in the sign ordinance, I call them the plasma TV signs. I know we have very stringent rules on flashing and all that kind of jazz, but these plasma signs is this something we would accept or is that something we-

Jean Werbie:

We do have provisions for electronic scrolling message board signs and electronic signs. We do have provisions in the ordinance now. We do allow them.

Donald Hackbarth:

Not that we would do it, but just looking at our sign I think it's a pretty attractive sign but the face is getting old and the next step is somewhere in the future that might happen. I know there are some communities that have an ordinance or they wrote it into their sign ordinance that the thing can't be changing all the time but that it can change once every 24 hours or something like that so we don't have a constant. It's something we should look at.

Jean Werbie:

We have a provision on how fast that a sign can pulsate while you're driving by. But electronic scrolling message signs are allowed, and we did decide a number of years ago that we would allow those. But it couldn't pulsate.

Donald Hackbarth:

Technology has changed. Like Sparks has that very attractive sign. And I'm saying is that the kind of face that we would allow on a sign?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Donald Hackbarth:

Move approval.

Mike Serpe:

I'll second Don's motion with a comment. If anybody ever had the opportunity to visit Hilton Head, South Carolina, on the island itself, if we could ever get a copy of what their sign ordinances read it is the most attractive layout of any signage I've ever seen anywhere in the country. Not that I've traveled all over the country, but wherever I've gone, nothing I don't think exceeds, and a lot of golf courses down there, nothing I don't think exceeds six feet. Very, very tasteful and very nice. Just an attractive setup the way it's laid out.

Thomas Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY DON HACKBARTH AND SECONDED BY MIKE SERPE TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO ADOPT THE ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

H. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT to amend Section 420-119 E(1)(e)[1] related to setback separation distances for special licensed uses in the B-2 District.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission, consideration of a zoning text amendment to amend Section 420-119 E(1)(e)[1] related to setback separation distances for special licensed uses in the B-2 District..

On January 28, 2008, the Village Plan Commission adopted Resolution #08-03 to clarify the setback distances to zoning district boundaries in the B-2, Community Business District.

The proposed ordinance clarifies that the separation distance for any adult-oriented use allowed in the B-2 District shall be a minimum of 300 feet from any land area zoned residential including

street and railroad right-of-way and a minimum of 300 feet from the nearest lot line of any lot on which any school, church or day-care center for children is located or has vested rights to locate.

What we did was we took a look specifically at the B-2 District and the separation spacing for adult-oriented uses, and we found that there was a little bit of confusion or there was a need for a clarification of the wording with respect to the separation setback distances. So what we did was we pulled the paragraph apart and actually put three separate sections to the separation spacing definition in order to make it a little bit more clear for anyone who may be reading this.

So adult-oriented uses are allowed in the B-2 District subject to the requirements of Article 9 and all other applicable provisions of this chapter and of other Village ordinances and codes provided that at the time the application for site and operational plan approval for the commencement or expansion of such proposed adult-oriented use is decided by the Village Plan Commission or the Zoning Administration:

(i) The physically separate defined area of the building in which an adult-oriented use is proposed to be commenced or expanded shall not be less than 300 feet in a direct line from the nearest lot line of any lot on which any school, church, day-care center for children is located or has a vested right to locate.

(ii) The physically separate defined area of the building in which an adult-oriented use is proposed to be commenced or expanded shall not be less than 300 feet in a direct line for any land area zoned residential and this includes any land area that is being used for street or railroad right of ways that is zoned residential.

(iii) The physically separate defined area of the building in which an adult-oriented use is proposed to be commenced or expanded shall not be less than 300 feet in a direct line from the physically separate defined area of the building in which any separately located adult-oriented use is located or has a vested right to locate.

With that I'd like to continue the public hearing.

Thomas Terwall:

Is there anybody wishing to speak on this matter? Anybody wishing to speak? Anybody wishing to speak? Hearing none, I'm going to open it up to comments.

Donald Hackbarth:

Is 300 feet enough?

Jean Werbie:

300 feet was the number that the staff had determined with Attorney Jim Baxter that was a reasonable separation spacing, and he felt that it was a justifiable separation spacing between an adult-oriented use and the uses as listed.

Mike Pollocoff:

We really established that based on the study we did.

Donald Hackbarth:

I'm personally opposed to that 300 foot. I think it should be more because when you have a childcare or a daycare or something like that, to me—

Wayne Koessl:

300 feet is the length of a football field. I think that's long enough.

Thomas Terwall:

My concern is whether it's defensible or not. More than 300 feet we're going to find ourselves in court with one of these operators taking these offenders. So I'm sure Baxter made that recommendation based on some investigation or litigation that's already occurred. This would only be affecting add on uses, nobody else in the B-2 District, right?

Jean Werbie:

That's correct.

Thomas Terwall:

And did I understand you to say that this separation of 300 feet between these types of businesses as well, correct?

Jean Werbie:

That's correct.

Thomas Terwall:

So if we have more than one they have to be at least 300 feet apart?

Jean Werbie:

Correct.

Wayne Koessl:

Mr. Chairman, I'd move approval.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

MOVED BY WAYNE KOESSL AND SECONDED BY MIKE SERPE TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO ADOPT THE ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed?

Donald Hackbarth:

Aye.

I. Consider the request of Akil Ajmeri, agent for Matsus, LLC owners of the Shell gasoline station located at 4417 75th Street for a Sign Special Exception to reface the Primary Monument Sign and change two wall signs for the new Ayra's gasoline station.

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission this is a consideration of a request of Akil Ajmeri, agent for Matsus, LLC owners of the Shell gasoline station located at 4417 75th Street for a Sign Special Exception to reface the Primary Monument Sign and change two wall signs for the new Ayra's gasoline station.

The petitioner is requesting a Sign Special Exception Permit to change the Primary Monument Sign, two Gasoline Canopy Signs from Shell to Ayra's at the gasoline station/convenience store facility located at 4417 75th Street.

The subject property is currently zoned B-2, Community Business District. A gasoline station is allowed in that district only if a Conditional Use Permit is granted. In review of the Village property records for said property it was noted that on December 17, 1968 the Kenosha County Board of Supervisors granted a Permitted Use to operate a Mercantile Establishment and Service Station on this parcel. Therefore, since the gasoline station at the time it was constructed was built in accordance with the then-zoning ordinance, the County Ordinance, in effect at that time, the facility is classified as a legal non-conforming use.

Pursuant to Section 420-78 T (6) of the Village Sign Ordinance all sign changes for a legal non-conforming use requires approval of a Sign Special Exception Permit by the Plan Commission. Furthermore the Plan Commission shall have authority to impose conditions which are more stringent than such regulations if it specifically finds that:

1. Such conditions are required to avoid a nuisance, to protect the value of neighboring properties from significant diminution or otherwise to avoid serious interference with the rights and reasonable expectations of owners and users of property within the zoning district where the nonconforming use exists which would otherwise result from the proposed sign; and
2. The imposition of such conditions will not substantially interfere with the right of the nonconforming use to continue.

The Plan Commission has, in fact, approved sign special exceptions in the past on this property. You did so on May 14, 2001 when the sign was changed from a Super America to a Marathon and then again on March 24, 2003 when the exception permit was granted to change it from a Marathon to a Shell.

Due to the time constraints in changing the signage and the need for the owner to operate in a timely manner and to get the store open and the gas station open, he is not going to be submitting for a Conditional Use at this time but rather just the sign special exception. At some point in the future he has indicated that he would come back and actually apply for a Conditional Use Permit so we have a legal conforming use at this particular property.

That being said the item before you is the Sign Special Exception Permit application, and this would be to reface the existing 11 foot by 5 foot Shell Primary Monument Sign with the Ayra's branding information as shown on the slide. This would include gasoline prices and the property address. Second would be to replace the two existing canopy signs so they would say Ayra's on the gasoline canopy on the east and west sides of the facades. Each new gasoline canopy sign is 20.5 square feet or a total of 41 square feet for both canopy signs. And, finally, to remove the 9 inch by 60 inch food mart wall sign on the north side of the building. He has no interest of having that at that location.

So pursuant to the sign ordinance, the special exception permit for an accessory sign related to the nonconforming use shall not be granted unless the Plan Commission specifically finds that the use is a valid nonconforming use regarding which the owner and applicant has a burden of proof with respect to all elements of nonconforming status by preponderance of the evidence which we have found. And, two, the permit will not allow and is not associated with an expansion, extension or change in the nature of the nonconforming use and he is not requesting any of that this evening.

Akil has been with us all evening. He is in the audience and he would be happy to answer any questions that you may have. He has been working with the staff and the Village Clerk in order to obtain a liquor license, and any approvals that we grant, obviously, are subject to that final permit and the licensing and the final inspections to bring this site into compliance.

Thomas Terwall:

Any comments or questions?

Larry Zarletti:

I'm in favor of it opening and I'm also in favor of us allowing the signage to change. I do have a question to the staff with regards to what's on the sign, beer and cigarette outlet like gas is secondary. Do we have anything at all to say about that, or that just happens to be—I understand that gas stations sell beer and that they sell cigarettes and that you'll see a sign in the window that says beer or cigarettes or whatever, but this advertisement clearly seems to be for beer and cigarette outlet.

Jean Werbie:

The Village cannot legally tell him what to place on that sign. You can ask the question to the petitioner in the audience, but we cannot tell him it can or cannot have something that advertises something within his establishment on his sign. Would you like Akil to come to the microphone?

Larry Zarletti:

I guess I'd just like to know if that's going to be the main focus of the station and they're just going to happen to sell gas, or if it's going to be primarily a gas station and like other stations they'll sell cigarettes and beer. And if so then why the sign reads—

Thomas Terwall:

Come to the microphone, sir, if you would. Name and address for the record.

Akil Ajmeri:

Good evening. My name is Akil and I'm from Racine. I used to live in Kenosha. My home address is 2714 4½ Mile Road, Racine, Wisconsin, 53402. The question you have is why I'm having a beer and cigarette outlet. The number one is it's a big sign and I'm not making any changes on the sign size wise, but it's big enough for advertisement just for the customers to know we do carry beer. A lot of stations, I have a lot of stores in Milwaukee, and we don't have beer in those stores. If you don't want me to have it I'm fine. I have no problem with that.

Jean Werbie:

How would you modify the sign, Akil?

Akil Ajmeri:

See, I tried to get the largest number as big as I can because you can see on the Shell you can hardly read the lettering. So my main focus was to get it as large and big as I can. Now, the space on the top it would not look good just putting Ayra's up there so big. So just to fill in the gap kind of thing to make it look more presentable and that's why I did it. The gas letters are huge, they're 17 inches, and I asked them to put 24 inches and they said, Akil, that's not possible. So I want to put as large as the gas price numbers because that's my main focus. I don't want to put just one letter . . . people will know what's there, too. So the main purpose for me to do this so it looks more presentable, and I like the stores to look very pretty and very clean, very presentable. That was the whole purpose.

Larry Zarletti:

I appreciate that. Again, we can't dictate as staff said what you put on the sign, but it just appears to me to be more of a draw to beer and cigarette outlet versus come to the station, get your gas and pick up some other items on the way.

Akil Ajmeri:

The gas for regular will be 17 inches. The beer and cigarette outlet is not going to be so large so a person reads it before the gas prices. So I think the letter size is so nice and beautiful and that's the main purpose to put people in the store actually, not the beer. With the canopy people know you have gas prices. Gas price being so competitive anywhere in the country that's why I'm focusing on the largest number I can so it's the first thing they see. I have a beautiful store in Caledonia and they offer the same thing next to Grossman Meat Market. That looks nice in the nighttime. I take pride in my stores look better than the main focus on beer or cigarettes.

Mike Pollocoff:

One of the connotations is a beer/cigarette outlet doesn't carry the connotation in a neighborhood that is conducive to what you're indicating in your statements that it is. If it was rephrased to say Ayra's convenience and groceries rather than beer and cigarette outlet I think that might—

Akil Ajmeri:

If that's what you want I have no problem with that.

Thomas Terwall:

Akil, I have a question. Are you going to sell branded gas or unbranded gas.

Akil Ajmeri:

That's a good question. I know somebody will ask me that. That's good because people always ask why unbranded gas. We have a chain of stores . . . in Milwaukee. Unbranded and branded the difference is if I do BP, BP comes in and offers me \$70,000 just to sign a contract. If I do Shell they'll give you \$80,000. Mobile will give you \$90,000. But the point is when you do a contract with them then you are married to them for ten years, number one. Then they dictate the price, number two. Number three is they say we'll give you one penny rebate. By going on our own brand the gas still comes out from the same refinery. It's not from a different refinery, but the only benefit you have is that Shell is always as a gas station owner for 15 years they're always three cents higher than a Mobile or Marathon or BP or any other brand. So it's best to not have a contract. In order to do a contract, if a guy needs money that bad, and needs a start, I'm building a gas station now Marathon or BP or Shell is going to give me \$80,000 right away I can use that money. I'm not interested in that. I prefer to be on my own. The gas still comes from BP, Shell, Marathon, it doesn't matter. But the only thing is you're not married to those big oil companies. As you know the Mobil profit for the quarter. And we don't make money by doing contract, but you can see the profit and loss for a Mobile station billions of dollars.

Thomas Terwall:

If you don't have a contract in periods of gas shortages are you still able to get gas?

Akil Ayra:

Oh, yes, sir. That doesn't affect at all with the unbranded. Again, it comes from the same refinery. The same guys deliver the gas. The same trucking company delivers it but you don't take that \$80,000 from them and they charge four cents more.

Thomas Terwall:

Thank you.

Akil Ayra:

Thank you, sir.

Larry Zarletti:

If the beer read beer, cigarettes, snacks, I think the word is outlet that is really—

Akil Ayra;

I'll have snacks. I'll get that out. I'll do it right away.

Larry Zarletti:

Thank you very much. I look forward to having the station open, though. It's long overdue.

Thomas Terwall:

Are you a new owner?

Akil Ayra:

Yes. I'm taking on another station, BP on 75th Street you used to call Shaun's BP. I owned it and sold it to the guy and things happen. So I'll be taking over.

Thomas Terwall:

Thank you. Is Mobile across the street closed, too?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Larry Zarletti:

Mr. Chairman, with that correction I would move approval.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

IT'S BEEN MOVED BY LARRY ZARLETTI AND SECONDED BY MIKE SERPE THEN TO GRANT THE REQUEST SUBJECT TO THE CONDITION THAT HE'S GOING TO CHANGE THE WORD OUTLET TO SNACKS ON THE SIGN. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

Jean Werbie:

Chairman Terwall, my staff is going to sit and visit with Akil and take a look at whether or not we can maybe even have the words cigarettes and beer off of that sign and see what he'd be willing to work with. So we're going to sit and visit. Specifically I know that you just mentioned your motion to put snacks up there instead of outlet, but if we could just work with them because we want it to be a neighborhood friendly sign.

Thomas Terwall:

We'll leave that to your discretion.

John Braig:

Food and beverage.

Wayne Koessl:

Do we need a motion for that, Chairman? Jean, you want a motion for that?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Thomas Terwall:

We will include the staff working out the wording with the owner.

J. Review and consider Chapter X, “Housing Element” of the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Kenosha County.

Thomas Terwall:

Briefly.

Jean Werbie:

This is an exciting chapter. This is the Housing Element chapter for the new Comprehensive Plan that the staff has been working on with Kenosha County. Chapter X, Housing Element, and this is the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Kenosha County. The housing element is one of the nine elements of the comprehensive plan. The statute does require specifically a housing element to assess the age, structure condition, value and occupancy characteristics of the existing housing stock in the County and the participating local governments. Again, the comprehensive plan up to this point has never had this particular element so it's nice to introduce this element for the community.

In addition, specific policies and programs but be identified that promote the development of housing for residents and participating local governments and provide a range of housing choices that meet the needs of the persons of all income levels and age groups and persons with special needs. The policies and programs must promote the availability of land for the development or redevelopment of affordable housing, maintain or rehabilitate existing housing stock. So very significant for this community and other communities in Kenosha County.

Part 1 of this chapter provides an inventory of existing housing stock including age, structural condition, value and occupancy characteristics. Part 2 provide a description of the government programs which facilitate the provisions of housing for residents including affordable housing. And Part 3 includes information on community policies and ordinances affecting housing. Part 4 sets forth housing goals and objectives to the planned design year of 2035.

Again, Part 1, inventory. What SEWRPC did is they took a look at the existing housing stock in the County to help determine the number and the type of housing units that will best suit the needs of the community to 2035. The existing housing stock inventory includes total housing units, vacancy rates, value of owner-occupied housing units, median sale price of housing units, monthly cost of housing units by tenure, number of bedrooms, structure type and year built and condition of existing housing stock.

The first table that I put in for discussion was the total housing units by tenure in Kenosha County. If you just direct your attention to Pleasant Prairie the total number of owner-occupied housing units was 4,805 as of 2000. The number of renter-occupied units 1,014. The total housing units in 2000 was 6,050. Keep in mind that as we go through this process some of this information is going to be updated at least to 2006 or 2007 especially for projection purposes.

One of the points that HUD wanted to make and the County did as part of this analysis is that HUD has standards as to what the vacancy rates need to be for owner-occupied housing as well as renter-occupied housing. And, as you can see on the slide, that there needs to be a minimum overall vacancy rate of 3 percent to provide for housing choices in the community which would include 1.5 percent for vacancy rate for owner occupied and .5 vacancy rate for rental units. And as you can see Pleasant Prairie does a pretty good job because we do allow for those vacancy rates and owner-occupied and renter choice in this community.

Donald Hackbarth:

Jean, can I interject a comment here? I see 2000 data as really being really old.

Jean Werbie:

And that's correct. I mentioned that the last time with the population data. The best available data that they had from the sampling and the detailed inventory from the U.S. Bureau of the census was from 2000. We won't get better data until 2010. So a lot of the charts and the graphs and the tables in this document is from 2000 data. We recognize and I brought that up to SEWRPC as well as Kenosha County that this is old information for our community.

Donald Hackbarth:

So are we going to get the next new data in 2010 and 2018?

Jean Werbie:

Well, you don't get the new data until almost 2012. It takes two years from the completion of the census before you get it.

Mike Pollocoff:

The Legislature in their infinite wisdom it would make more sense to have the plan dates always be at least two years after the census. So as soon as that was done that would be the base for your decisions, but when you have it happen the same date the census starts you're going to always be 10 years behind.

Jean Werbie:

So wherever possible the Village of Pleasant Prairie working with our Village Assessor and our planning staff will be trying to obtain 2006 or 2007 data so that we can use it as part of our Comprehensive Plan update. And there are a couple of sections in here that you'll see that SEWRPC has introduced those numbers but for the most part we are looking at 2000 data and projecting it forward. It's for that reason that SEWRPC asked for us to forward to them projected population and housing unit numbers in order to work backwards to see where they think we should be with respect to our growth over the next 25 years. So it is a little outdated.

One of the next things I was going to show you is the median value for owner occupied housing in the County and in Pleasant Prairie. And as you can see the median value in the year 2000 was \$159,800. Median value today, again, based on what I know from the Village Assessor is

probably \$259,000. So, again, what we will do as part of the Village Comprehensive Plan is we will get more current information and put it in our plan. But it was not possible to go through the entire County and try to go through everybody's inventory and go through all the analysis to try to get better data.

There's another table provided that talks about median monthly costs, and it sets forth the monthly housing costs for specified owner-occupied housing units with a mortgage in the County and each local government in 2000. The median monthly housing cost for homeowners with a mortgage in the County was \$1,113 in 2000. In Pleasant Prairie it identifies that we were just over \$1,318. Again, something that we believe is probably much higher in the Village of Pleasant Prairie but, again, I don't have the data to support that projection. It does not include taxes.

Values for owner-occupied housing, again, bringing your attention just to Pleasant Prairie it talks about \$159,800. Looking at total values County wide at about \$120,900. Again, we can project some of this up to 2006 or 2007. The next one is monthly housing costs. Table 11 sets forth monthly housing costs for rental units or gross rent for each local government in the year 2000. And it gives you percentages as to where people pay housing units costs. Again, it's a little misleading because we're still looking at 2000, but it does give us some basis for doing some of the projection work.

Structure type and year built this is pretty current information. Our Village Assessor keeps this information for Pleasant Prairie as well as other communities in our assessing consortium, and it does have pretty good data here with respect to the structure type in Kenosha County and how many housing units we have single family, single family attached and detached, two family, multifamily and mobile homes and the total number of housing units. So as you can see from the previous slide in the year 2000 to the total housing units now 7,511 as of year 2000. Again, the 2006 information is more or less the information we're going to use to project the future of housing in Pleasant Prairie.

In addition, our assessor keeps track of condition of housing type for four other communities in Kenosha County. According to the Village Assessor in Pleasant Prairie, 74.9 percent of the housing units in Pleasant Prairie are rates as good, very good or excellent. 24.6 percent of the housing units in Pleasant Prairie are rated as average or fair. And .5 percent were rates as poor or very poor. Again, this is very important when looking at the availability of good quality housing stock in your community.

Housing demand, looking at household income and demographic characteristics of Kenosha County, and local governments have been inventoried and analyzed with housing supply inventory items to determine the number and type of housing units that will best suit the needs of the residents through 2035. Housing demand inventory includes affordable housing needs assessment, affordability information, income, housing need for non resident workers, specialized housing facilities, household size and projections of households for 2035.

With respect to Kenosha County affordability information, 24 percent of the households in Kenosha County spent over 30 percent of their monthly gross income on housing costs in 2000. Based on an estimate from the Wisconsin Realtors Association, the median sale price of a single family home in Kenosha County was \$169,200 in 2006. The minimum annual household income needed to afford a median priced home in the County was \$64,312. Household with a median

annual gross income of \$54,989 could afford \$140,000 in value of a house. The minimum annual household gross income needed to afford a \$150,000 home was \$57,508. And jumping down to a \$250,000 home in Kenosha County the gross income needed to afford that would be \$91,766 when looking at all the costs associated with that home.

The fair market rent in Kenosha County for a one bedroom apartment was \$596 in 2006. We do have information on two and three bedrooms as well.

Monthly income spent on housing, back in the year 2000 owner-occupied with a mortgage almost 21 percent of your income was spent on housing in Pleasant Prairie. Without a mortgage 12 percent, renter-occupied 23.4 percent.

Household income should be considered when developing policies intending to provide housing units within a cost range affordable to all income groups. The median household income in the County was \$46,970 in 1999. This is comparable to an income of \$54,989 in mid 2006. A household earning in estimated 2006 median household income then could afford a home of \$140,000 if they paid 30 percent of their income on housing.

Housing facilities for seniors, age distribution in the County has important implications in planning and the formation of housing policies. We need to consider when forming a housing policy it's important to consider not only the current age but what the age of our population is going to be in 2035. One of the things I had identified for you at one of the last meetings is that the percentage of residents that will be 65 years or older is expected to increase from about 17,169 persons to 34,147 persons. That's a pretty big jump. And what that's telling me is that we need to make sure that the housing that we are developing today, or future development of housing, that we'll have specialized housing units to address the needs of older citizens and senior citizens and those with specialized need or care, especially for those that are disabled and especially with retirement communities in our own community.

Other types of facilities include nursing homes, assisted living facilities and other type of housing based on care needs. Housing facilities with persons for disabilities are another segments of the County's population that have special needs. 38 percent of people 65 and over reported having a disability, 17 percent of people between the ages of 21 and 64, and 8 percent of people between the ages of 5 and 20 reported having a disability. So, again, as our population continues to grow and age we need to take this into account when designing our future housing.

With respect to household projections for 2035, a number of the additional housing units needed in the 2035 plan design year is determined first by selecting a population projection. The number of residents expected to reside in group quarters is subtracted from our total population and the result is divided by the projected household size. This number is then multiplied by the desired vacancy rate to determine the total number of housing units in the County. We will be doing this analysis for Pleasant Prairie and bringing this back to you. We have determined and projected what our population would be in 2035, a very conservative number of just under 32,000, and we will work backwards with respect to putting all these facts and figures and populations together for you. The other thing that we do recognize is the persons per household size is declining, and so we will have to adjust our population projections or persons per household and our total number of housing units based on that reduction in persons per household.

Part 2 includes housing programs for Kenosha County. There are a number of government sponsored housing programs that have been inventoried to assess the government's potential to help the private sector meet housing needs. A full array of these sponsored programs and funding availability is continually changing. There are a number of these programs and ideas for offering low cost loans and housing for people in Kenosha County that are listed in this chapter. Possibly by the time this chapter and this plan is completed we'll have many more. I'm not going to go through all those in detail for you.

Donald Hackbarth:

On Table X-31 on 12a they're talking about reported disabilities. They say sensory, physical employment is a disability? What are they saying there?

Jean Werbie:

What page are you on, Don?

Donald Hackbarth:

It's 12a. It's Table X-31. They're saying type of disability, sensory, physical, mental, self-care, outside home and then they say employment. Do you know what that means? Are we all disabled?

Jean Werbie:

I don't know but I have a meeting tomorrow and I will ask the question. I think what it means is that the total number of people that have any one of these disabilities, the total number that are employed I think this is the number. Because these are the people that have the disabilities. For example, in Pleasant Prairie there are 682 people that have some type of disability that are employed that live in Pleasant Prairie.

John Braig:

That's under mental.

Jean Werbie:

But that's what I believe that indicates and I'll confirm that tomorrow. But not everyone who has a disability is employable. But at least 682 in the year 2000 lived in Pleasant Prairie. Part 3 is the community policies and regulations affecting the provision of housing. The zoning districts of the various communities in Kenosha County have an important influence on the housing development patterns. Zoning regulations determine the location, size and the type of housing. An inventory was conducted of the existing districts in each local government and this information provides a basis for determining the effect of zoning regulations on the various types of housing. All of the various communities are listed in the chapter.

Table X-33 is for the Village of Pleasant Prairie only, and here we're just listing the 12 different residential zoning districts in the Village of Pleasant Prairie. Districts 1 through 6 are for single family, 7 is a multifamily district, 8 is a two family, 9, 10 and 11 are multifamily districts depending on density, and R-12 is our manufactured housing and mobile home park district. The minimum lot sizes, density and minimum floor area information is all provided for each of these district.

Part 4 is the housing goals, objectives, policies and programs section of the chapter. This section sets forth housing goals and objectives to the plan design year 2035. Policies which are steps or actions recommended to be taken to achieve housing goals and objectives and programs which projects or services are intended to achieve housing policies are also identified. The housing element recommendations focus on the provision of housing for households that earn less than median income, housing for an aging population and housing for people with disabilities.

The following specific housing issues have been identified for Kenosha County. Housing supply issue, housing quality issue, housing cost issue, aging and disabled population issue, household size issue, housing distribution issue and fair housing issue. Recommendations have been developed to address all of these policies within the chapter.

Overall housing goals, there are a number of goals that have been identified in the chapter. First is to promote a range of affordable housing choices for all income levels, age groups and physical abilities in the County; promote adequate housing choices for consumers; to allocate sufficient land for housing development and to accommodate current and future populations; encourage the development of life cycle housing; promote safe and decent housing for all Kenosha County residents; encourage energy efficient housing; promote a range of affordable housing choices at all income levels; promote the conservation of existing housing stock as one source of affordable housing; and promote a range of affordable housing choices for the aging and disabled population; promote housing options that allow elderly and disabled persons to remain in their homes; promote a range of housing choices for households of all sizes; promote the distribution of variety of housing structures and types; and promote fair housing practices in Kenosha County.

And, finally, in summary the first three parts of this chapter provide inventory information on existing housing stock and housing demand information including an affordable housing needs assessment, a description of government housing programs and information on community policies and ordinances that affect the type of housing permitted in each local government in the County. A summary of the inventory information is all provided at the end of the chapter. I'm not going to re-read those things for you.

But, again, keep in mind as we go through and complete our work on the County wide level we are going to be coming back with a plan that is unique to Pleasant Prairie. It won't be at this length but it will be specific to Pleasant Prairie with our own population projections and housing projections and our reasons for why we're doing what we're doing.

Mike Serpe:

With that I think we should receive and file the Chapter X of the Housing Element.

Wayne Koessl:

Second.

Jean Werbie:

I need more than just a receive and file. I need an approval, an adoption.

Mike Serpe:

To adopt it. Then I'll change it to adopt Chapter X.

Wayne Koessl:

Second.

Tom Terwell:

MOTION BY MIKE SERPE AND A SECOND BY WAYNE KOESSL TO ADOPT CHAPTER X.

Voices:

Aye.

Wayne Koessl:

Mr. Chairman, I'm going to make a little press release here. As you all know the carbon capture dedication was cancelled because of the weather that was slated for this week. They didn't want to put a tent up. But at 11 a.m. Wednesday morning they're going to have a press release at the power plant in one of the front buildings. There will be parking at the 8505 LakeView distribution center at 100th Street, and there will be buses there to take people that want to attend the 11 a.m. press conference and press release and there will be refreshments afterwards. When I came in this morning I had a notice from Jan it was cancelled. I received three phone calls from Milwaukee it was cancelled. Mid afternoon I received a phone call about the 11 a.m. press release. So you're all welcome to attend and it would be something to attend. Thank you.

7. ADJOURN.

Thomas Terwall:

A motion to adjourn is in order.

Mike Serpe:

So moved.

John Braig:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

All in favor signify by saying aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

Meeting adjourned at: 7:35 p.m.