

**PLEASANT PRAIRIE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
VILLAGE HALL AUDITORIUM  
9915 39TH AVENUE  
PLEASANT PRAIRIE, WISCONSIN  
5:00 P.M.  
February 23, 2009**

A regular meeting for the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission convened at 5:00 p.m. on February 23, 2009. Those in attendance were Thomas Terwall; Michael Serpe; Wayne Koessl; Dona Hackbarth; Andrea Rode (Alternate #2, voting member); Jim Bandura; John Braig; and Judy Juliana (Alternate #1, voting member). Larry Zarletti was excused. Also in attendance were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Peggy Herrick, Assistant Planner/Zoning Administrator; and Tom Shircel, Assistant Planner /Assistant Village Planner

- 1. CALL TO ORDER.**
- 2. ROLL CALL.**
- 3. CORRESPONDENCE.**
- 4. CONSIDER THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 9, 2009 PLAN COMMISSION MEETING.**

Wayne Koessl:

Mr. Chairman, I move the minutes be approved in written form as presented.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

**MOVED BY WAYNE KOESSL AND SECONDED BY MIKE SERPE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES IN THE FEBRUARY 9, 2009 PLAN COMMISSION AS PRESENTED IN WRITTEN FORM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.**

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

- 5. CITIZEN COMMENTS.**

Tom Terwall:

If you're here for either Items A or B on the agenda tonight, both of those items are for public hearing. We would ask that you hold your comments until the public hearing is held so we can incorporate your comments into the official record of the public hearing. However, if you're here for any other item not on the agenda, now would be your opportunity to speak. We'd ask you step to the microphone and begin by giving us your name and address. Is there anybody wishing to speak under citizens' comments?

## **6. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT at the request of Chad Olson, owner of the property located at 4730 87th Place, to correct the zoning map and rezone the portion of the property currently zoned C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District into the R-4, Urban Single Family Residential District as a result of the November 14, 2008 Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources determination that there are no wetlands on the property.**

Peggy Herrick:

Thank you. This is the request of Chad Olson. He is the owner of the property located at 4730 87th Place. The zoning map amendment proposes to correct the zoning map and rezone the portion of his property currently zoned C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, into the R-4, Urban Single Family District as a result of the November 14, 2008 Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources determination that there are no wetlands on this property.

The owner had requested that the Department of Natural Resources review the status of the small wetland area on the property again located at 4730 87th Place or Lot 3 of Cooper Heights Subdivision. In a letter dated November 14, 2008 from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, the DNR confirms that after several site visits over the past three years, the wetland area on this site no longer meets the State criteria for being classified as a wetland. The wetland, which once existence on the site, no longer exhibits the requisite plants and hydrology due to the modifications to the drainage and hydrological regime of the area. As such, the DNR no longer has jurisdiction over this area.

Just a little background information, in July of 1999, prior to the development of the Cooper Heights Subdivision, the developer had a wetland staking completed by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, wherein they found two wetland areas identified and subsequently rezoned in to the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, on February 7, 2000. That was pursuant to Ordinance #00-08. You can see these two areas that were rezoned and are currently still zoned C-1 in the Cooper Heights Subdivision. There's a small pocket that we're talking about right here and another area right in the central portion affecting a number of lots.

On November 23, 1999 the Village Board of Appeals approved a variance to construct the proposed 87th Place 14 feet from these wetlands and to construct the proposed 47th Avenue zero feet from these wetlands instead of the required 25 foot setback. The variance was approved subject to obtaining a DNR permit to fill approximately 286 square feet of wetlands for the

construction of 87th Place. The DNR did issue that permit to fill. This little wetland pocket was created as a result of drainage in that area before that subdivision was developed, and it was either broken drain tile or something that caused this little pocket of wetlands to occur.

During the construction of the subdivision and the new home on this property the wetlands were protected; however over the years with the change in drainage and hydrology by installing curb and gutter and storm sewer in the public roadways, the wetlands no longer meet the State's criteria as indicated in the November 14, 2008 letter from the DNR which is attached. Therefore, this is a public hearing to rezone this small C-1 area which is no longer wetlands back into the R-4, Urban Single Family Residential District. And this is a public hearing.

Tom 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 and questions of Commissioners and staff. Hearing none, what's your pleasure?

Andrea Rode:

So moved.

Wayne Koessl:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

**IT'S BEEN MOVED BY ANDREA RODE AND SECONDED BY WAYNE KOESSL TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE REZONING SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.**

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered. When's the last time we ever had one go from wetland into residential?

Peggy Herrick:

I do not recall an instance when that happened.

Wayne Koessl:

Tonight.

Tom Terwall:

Yes, I think this is a first. The other wetland area on that map they didn't look at that one?

Peggy Herrick:

No, the property owners have not requested anybody to look at that one. That one is a little bit different because that was a low area in the backyards. It was affected by drainage but not because of a storm sewer that was put right adjacent to it. So that one probably still remains out there. But those property owners could petition the DNR to take a look at it as well.

Tom Terwall:

Now, the one that was rezoned already has a home on it?

Peggy Herrick:

Yes, she already has a home on there.

Tom Terwall:

So the driveway must be north of that wetland area?

Peggy Herrick:

Correct. I'm not sure if his driveway comes off of 87<sup>th</sup> Place. I think it comes off of 87<sup>th</sup> Place and not 47<sup>th</sup>.

Tom Terwall:

Okay, thank you.

**B. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT for the request of Mark Eberle, P.E. with Nielsen Madsen and Barber, agent for Paul Pignotti representing the Arthur J. and Bonnie Lou Pignotti Family Trust, owner of the vacant properties generally located between 83rd and 84th Streets and west of 108th Avenue to correct the zoning map and rezone a portion of the property into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District and a portion will remain R-5, Urban Single Family Residential District. The portions of the property located within the 100-year floodplain will remain unchanged.**

Peggy Herrick:

This is the request of Mark Eberle, P.E. with Nielsen Madsen and Barber, agent for Paul Pignotti representing the owners of the property which is Arthur J. and Bonnie Lou Pignotti Family Trust. They own the vacant properties generally located between 83rd and 84th Streets and west of 108th Avenue. They requesting to correct the zoning map and rezone a portion of the property into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, and the nonwetland areas will remain in

the R-5, Urban Single Family Residential District. The portions of the property located within the 100-year floodplain will remain unchanged.

Again, the petitioner is requesting a zoning map amendment for the vacant properties. Again, these are highlighted in yellow on the map. In particular, the smaller property to the east is the portion that had had the wetland staking done and that they are requesting to rezone at this time to put those wetlands into that conservancy district.

In addition, the petitioner is proposing to do a lot line adjustment to adjust the lot lines between these two parcels by creating not a new lot but adding onto this lot a little triangle piece right in here. That is something that does require approval by the Plan Commission or the Village Board because this is not in a platted subdivision, but their intention is to do that lot line adjustment. And as you can see from this overhead slide right here, this is that little triangle. They're looking to move this line to this location.

What they are requesting is a zoning map amendment to rezone the field delineated wetlands found on that smaller portion into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy district. The property is currently zoned R-5, Urban Single Family Residential District and C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District. A portion is also located in the FPO, Floodplain Overlay District. The lands to the north and east are zoned R-5, Urban Single Family Residential District, and the land to the south is zoned R-4, Urban Single Family Residential District which is the River Oaks and the Oak Hi Subdivisions.

The wetlands on the properties were field delineated by Natural Resources Consulting, Incorporated as indicated in their report dated November 7, 2003 that was approved by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources on October 25, 2004.

On January 7, 2008, the Village received letter from the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission which staked the wetlands on a property adjacent to this portion of the Pignotti property to the north, this property right here that there may be wetlands on a portion of the Pignotti property that was not field delineated by Natural Resource Consulting in 2003. So the Village sends that information to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources to evaluate and to determine if additional wetlands were on this portion of the Pignotti property.

According to Heidi Hopkins, Water Management Specialist with the DNR, the DNR would not require any additional wetland delineations on the site if development of the lot met the Village's 25 foot wetland setback from the 100-year floodplain assuming all the floodplain is also wetlands. And that portion she's referring to is this area. This area on the Pignotti property is also 100-year floodplain.

Therefore, the wetlands on the eastern parcel including the area for the lot line adjustment are proposed to be rezoned into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, including that area which she identified as 100-year floodplain that is also wetlands. The nonwetland areas on the property as shown on the application and shown on the overhead would remain in the R-5, Urban Single Family Residential District, and the 100-year floodplain on the property would not be amended as a result of this rezoning. So, the areas that are being rezoned to C-1 are these two areas shown on this map. The nonwetland areas of this parcel including the small triangle piece would remain in the R-5, Urban Single Family Residential District, and the floodplain locations would not change on this property. With that this is a public hearing.

Tom Terwall:

This is a matter for public hearing. Is anybody wishing to speak on this matter? Anybody wishing to speak?

Ron Kwasny:

My name is Ron Kwasny. I live at 11003 84<sup>th</sup> Street. It would be in the River Oaks Subdivision just across. I guess my comments are more or less questions relative to the—I'm still unclear as far as the purpose in the shaded area. That's new. That wasn't part of the information package that we received. There was no reference about an area being added to the parcel from the larger parcel. So I'm unclear as to what that's attempting to achieve. I guess looking I'm unclear whether that's intended to make that area developable or accessible from 84<sup>th</sup> Street location? And I'm still unclear as far as the C-1. I guess I'm just going over what was provided to us about to correct the zoning map and rezone a portion of the property into the C-1. So I guess I understand that that hasn't changed? It just remains in C-1?

Peggy Herrick:

The public hearing tonight is to correct the zoning map and put these two portions of the property into C-1. Those were areas that were found to be wetlands. The C-1 is the Lowland Resource Conservancy District so the wetlands are being put in that District for preservation and protection of them. This area right here is a lot line adjustment that's being proposed that does not require Plan Commission approval or Village Board approval. That's something they can do on their own. The R-5 District requires that lots have a frontage of at least 75 feet unless they're on a curve when their frontage can be reduced to 45 feet. So they are trying to make this lot a conforming lot to have frontage of at least 45 feet which is the minimum requirement in an R-5 District.

It's my understanding that the property owner is intending to sell this property for someone to build a single family home up in this general area. The ordinance requires that homes have frontage on a public road in the R-5 District of, like I said, 45 feet on a curve and that they access that from that public road. So it's my understanding the people that are looking to buy this four or so acre property will be putting a driveway in through here to access their home site which would be constructed right up in this area. But tonight the application is to rezone the wetlands and correct the zoning map to rezone what was found to be wetlands and to place that in a wetland zoning classification.

Ron Kwasny:

And there would be a subsequent hearing regarding the access at another time?

Peggy Herrick:

No, that is not required to have a hearing for access onto a public road.

Ron Kwasny:

Okay, I appreciate your patience with my understanding. So as far as the C-1 I guess the other concern I have has to do with the capacity for that area to hold waters? Again, I'm right across from the property there and I've lived there for 30 years and so forth, and probably some of those elevated sewers that you see on that property I think that was a result of my first meeting with Mr. Steinbrink many years ago when our basements flooded because of just the high level of water being consumed down to the sewers. So that's my concern is just simply the impact to me indirectly and as far as the future development of that and whatever actions are happening today.

Peggy Herrick:

The engineer is here that prepared this and submitted the application. Maybe he can shed some light on what impact a single family home on this large property constructed up in this area will have on the adjacent area.

Mark Eberle:

Mark Eberle, Nielsen Madsen and Barber, 1339 Washington Avenue in Racine. Actually, all they're proposing is one single family home on 3.3 acres. So there really is no ordinance or requirements of the Village or DNR that would require storm water management or storm water storage on this property. So those wetlands do trap and hold storm water at this point and they're going to trap and hold that storm water in the future. Originally the developer was proposing four single family homes on this lot which would have required storm water management and retention basins. I think this one single family homes works out a lot better and should not require storm water management.

Peggy Herrick:

Mark, have you done any soil borings so we know what the ground elevation is where he's looking to build?

Mark Eberle:

We have not.

Peggy Herrick:

But any home built there would have to meet the building code and the foundations would have to be able to be supported on whatever soil is there.

Mike Pollocoff:

Even though it wouldn't be a requirement for storm water management on the site as part of the building permit, the review is going to evaluate the existing floodplain on that line that can't be transgressed or filled in anything on that parcel whether it's driveway fill or any regarding on the site. That grading plan is going to have to be submitted as part of the building permit for the plan. At that point we're going to be evaluating what the impact is of the proposed home. I haven't seen a design yet for either the home or the access other than a conceptual plan.

Mark Eberle:

That's correct, that's all there is at this point is the conceptual plan.

Mike Pollocoff:

At that point the Village ordinance does require they submit their building plan and that plan addresses the existing drainage patterns on the land as well as the impact of the building and the grading after the construction has been completed.

Mark Eberle:

That is correct.

Jim Bandura:

With all the elevations.

Peggy Herrick:

Correct.

Jim Bandura:

And the reason I'm questioning it is because it does look like it's attached to the floodplain. It's part of it so I guess—

Mike Pollocoff:

The floodplain is on that parcel so that's why I say just as we do with any building permit they're going to have to at 25 foot intervals wherever that grading is going to take place identify the existing elevation of that, the proposed elevation and the finished elevation so that we know all the way through construction where we started and where we're going to end and we can monitor that as it goes through. When the plan is submitted for construction and we feel that the plan reveals or the elevations are in there would be a violation of the ordinance then they're going to have to make a modification or adjustment to the construction plans to be in compliance. While it doesn't meet the same ordinance as far as new construction for a subdivision, the rigor of going through the engineering on the building site itself and the road and stuff like that is no different. They're still going to have to meet those requirements.

Mark Eberle:

That's correct. And at this point the homeowner does not have a house designed yet. So we will be coming back with a grading and drainage plan with that house and driveway on it to ensure that the existing drainage patterns do not change in the site.



Peggy Herrick:

And there's no intention to build in the floodplain, and you are intending to meet the 25 foot setback to the wetlands?

Mark Eberle:

Correct. That's what we've done to date is just define exactly what the buildable space is on the lot so they can design a home and a driveway.

Mike Serpe:

Tom, could we make sure that one of the speakers is kept in the loop on this as to the progress of the future home building so he is made aware of what the elevations are going to be? Otherwise he's going to be left in the dark.

Mike Pollocoff:

Yeah, we could do that, or maybe we could send a notice to the homeowner's association—

Peggy Herrick:

When the permit comes in?

Mike Pollocoff:

When the permit comes in.

Mike Serpe:

Yes, okay.

Peggy Herrick:

Hopefully it comes in soon and not three years from now.

Tom Terwall:

Mark, I want to commend you for deciding that's going to be room for one house. Because if you would have come back here looking to put four lots on that I think we would have been here quite a while tonight before we turned you down.

Mark Eberle:

I agree. There was a conceptual plan that had four buildable lots on that parcel. It would have been a lot of work. Thank you.

Doug Noble:

Doug Noble, 11111 84<sup>th</sup> Street. I live in River Oaks and I did receive the information in the mail that this was apparently near enough to me that I did receive the information. But it didn't, again, say anything about adding that parcel in the gray area. And now I hear from Peggy that the intent is apparently to have access off 84<sup>th</sup> Street and the curve right there. So that begs the question of what about access? It looks to me there's three potential access points at 83<sup>rd</sup> Street, 83<sup>rd</sup> Place and 84<sup>th</sup> Street down in the right corner of that.

Peggy Herrick:

Our ordinance doesn't allow for driveway access to frontage on butt ends of roads like that. If they wanted to use those access points, for instance, if they wanted to use 83<sup>rd</sup> Place right here they'd have to put in a temporary turnaround in this location which would take up the space for the buildable area. The Pignottis own this piece and this piece, they are looking to do a lot line adjustment with the land that they already own, and that was not noticed because that's not a public hearing. It's not even being considered at tonight's meeting, but they are looking to do that so they can get a driveway access there so they can build one single family home on this property.

Doug Noble:

What about 84<sup>th</sup> Street?

Peggy Herrick:

Same thing. They'd have to put a temporary—84<sup>th</sup> probably stops right about here. They'd have to construct this road and put a temporary turnaround in and there's probably not enough room to do that with the wetlands here and the floodplain in that area. Same with 83<sup>rd</sup>. 83<sup>rd</sup> doesn't even come off of 108<sup>th</sup> so there's dedicated right of ways but not constructed fully to the end of those properties.

Doug Noble:

It just seems logically it would seem to be more efficient as opposed to having them run around that wetland to just have some type of access either 84<sup>th</sup> which doesn't come but just continue a driveway.

Peggy Herrick:

The ordinance doesn't allow for that and he'd need several variances. And this is a way he could do this without obtaining any variances because he does own the adjacent lands.

Doug Noble:

Okay. Right now there is nobody that has access to any roads in River Oaks that doesn't have to abide by the covenants of River Oaks which this would be setting sort of a new precedence at least as far as our association is concerned that someone basically would have now access to the

subdivision in essence but not have to pay the dues that we pay, they don't have to live by the standards that we have to live by and so on. So that is a concern that I have.

Tom Terwall:

But is that land in River Oaks?

Peggy Herrick:

No, and 84<sup>th</sup> Street is a public road so you or I could drive on that as well.

Mike Pollocoff:

I know what you're saying. But on the other hand he doesn't have access to the benefits of River Oaks that the homeowners association has control over. But the only way when there's a public road and people have access to it we can't take away that access in order to preserve a private association. I think all things being equal I don't know that there isn't another piece of property from this one all the way around the lake where someone can even though there's public access it can't be developed.

Doug Noble:

I understand. I understand it's a public road, but the entrances are also public entrances but we pay part of our fees that we pay goes to mowing those entrances to making them look attractive, the signage, the lighting at the entrances. And, of course, some of it goes for the park and the beach and everything else that's on that other end. But a certain portion of it goes to the very entranceway that he or she is now going to be having access to the money that we pay to keep that entrance.

Mike Pollocoff:

That would be true for anybody going down 108<sup>th</sup>.

Peggy Herrick:

Or anybody entering the subdivision I live in. I have to pay for those signs but other people connect to it and they don't pay for those signs.

Tom Terwall:

They've got the same situation where River Oaks people pay a pretty good assessment for those entrances, and now those entrances to Meadowdale Farms are now going to provide access into the new subdivision to the west. In fact, that road is already in. That's just the way it is.

Doug Noble:

It's kind of foreign to us. We've been there 25 years and it's the first we've had it happen.

Mike Pollocoff:

I don't know if the benefit is to the River Oaks people or to the person that's going to develop it, but as this thing has kind of evolved, that house really won't be much more as far as visible to River Oaks other than the driveway and the access going to it. It will really be off and away. So it won't be another house with a 30 foot setback from the right of way right on the drive there. It will be a driveway access for someone to go back to their house. So it would be farther away. I'm not saying it's a good thing or a bad thing but it would be different than having another house that would be right up on that street that didn't have to abide by the same covenants as River Oaks as far as the standard of instruction or what the home looks like. This sits back farther away.

I don't believe given what it's going to cost to develop this lot that they're going to be putting up a shack. It's going to be a fairly expensive project to get that long a run of asphalt. It's going to be quite a bit of run for sewer and water to get sewer and water to this site as well. So it's going to be a rather expensive parcel to develop. But allowing somebody their rights as a property owner to be able to develop their property I don't know that they've--given the environmental constraints on there I don't know that we'd really have--

Doug Noble:

I understand. If it's buildable they certainly have the right to build on it. I understand that. It just looks so obvious that 83<sup>rd</sup> Place and 84<sup>th</sup> Street would be the more obvious place to have access to it. Thank you.

Tom Terwall:

Anybody else wishing to speak?

Paul Pignotti:

My name is Paul Pignotti. I'm the representative for the family that owns the property. Just to alleviate their concerns, we've been dealing with this property for about six or seven years, so all the wetlands and all the floodplains have been addressed several times. So as far as the water movage that's been addressed on several occasions. But as far as coming off 84<sup>th</sup> Place, the person that wants to buy the property they actually wanted to come off 83<sup>rd</sup> Place. In fact, this house would be situated better for that than to come off 84<sup>th</sup> Place. But because, like Peggy said, they have ordinances to stop that and to speed construction they went ahead and we're making the lot line adjustment and we're coming off 84<sup>th</sup> Place.

So at some point in the future once the preliminaries are taken care of and before they start construction, if the Board would be willing to entertain a motion for a variance to come off of 83<sup>rd</sup> Place they might be willing to submit one because the owner or the future owner would actually like to come off 83<sup>rd</sup> Street in the future. But they would need a variance for that and that would be something the Board could provide him with. In fact, he has already had discussions with the owner of that property. They're going to need to move sewer and water over this property for an easement so we could exchange easements so he could use 83<sup>rd</sup> Place if the Board gives him a variance. It would alleviate some of these peoples' problems of coming off their property. But with the lot line adjustment it gives us the right to come off of 84<sup>th</sup> Place. But if you were so

inclined to give him that variance he'd be willing to come off of 83<sup>rd</sup> Street. 83<sup>rd</sup> Street, I'm sorry, I misspoke, 83<sup>rd</sup> Street. Because that's actually a private drive right now and he would need an easement to use it from the private owner. So he has actually had discussions with him and they'd be willing to work something out between them. But he would need a variance in order to build it in that scenario.

Mike Pollocoff:

The staff has advised Mr. Pignotti that given the fact that we've already had a fatality on a dead end street where someone was backed over—

Paul Pignotti:

But this is already used as such—

Peggy Herrick:

It's a driveway.

Paul Pignotti:

This isn't a new—

Mike Pollocoff:

I'm not talking about new. When we had our problem it was an existing street.

Tom Terwall:

It's currently a driveway but it would have to become a street if you were going to come in off of that, right? So we need a turnaround.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. We'd have to have room for a turnaround because otherwise we've already been put on notice that that's a problem. We've already killed somebody. To take and put a variance in to allow another situation where—

Paul Pignotti:

You know, excuse me, how many years have you had these kind of things? You've had one fatality in how many years?

Mike Pollocoff:

Well, we—

Paul Pignotti:

I'm sorry, how many years—

John Braig:

That's one too many, period.

Paul Pignotti:

Well, it's just the point that there's another house off there. So you have people that are concerned with coming off of 84<sup>th</sup> Street. That's all I'm saying. You don't have to. We have the road going in but the road is going to knock down—the driveway he's going to put down is going to do some environmental concerns to the property but it's within his right to do it. So coming off of 83<sup>rd</sup> Street would be—

Mike Serpe:

As a part of the settlement we agreed that we would not create any more streets like the one that caused the death of that woman.

Paul Pignotti:

That's fine.

Mike Serpe:

So that's a dead issue.

Paul Pignotti:

Well, then it's coming off of 84<sup>th</sup> Place and we have the plan for that and we're good to go with that. Thank you.

Wayne Koessl:

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

Judy Juliana:

Second to approve.

Mike Serpe:

I think we're still in the public hearing, aren't we?

Tom Terwall:

Is there anybody else wanting to speak? Hearing none, I'll close the public hearing and open it up to comments from Commissioners and staff. Now your motion is in order.

Wayne Koessl:

Want me to make it again?

Tom Terwall:

No, thanks. Does the second still stand?

Judy Juliana:

Second still stands.

Tom Terwall:

**MOVED WAYNE KOESSL AND SECONDED BY JUDY JULIANA TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT AS PRESENTED. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.**

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

Wayne Koessl:

Mr. Chairman, as added to this, as far as the variance I would never, ever be in favor of that and I would be there to protest it.

John Braig:

And you're not alone on that.

**7. ADJOURN.**

Mike Serpe:

Move to adjourn.

Judy Juliana:

Second.

Tom Terwall:

All in favor signify by saying aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Tom Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

**Meeting Adjourned: 5:45 p.m.**