

**VILLAGE OF PLEASANT PRAIRIE
PLEASANT PRAIRIE VILLAGE BOARD
PLEASANT PRAIRIE WATER UTILITY
LAKE MICHIGAN SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT
SEWER UTILITY DISTRICT "D"
9915 39th Avenue
Pleasant Prairie, WI
February 20, 2006
6:30 p.m.**

A Regular Meeting of the Pleasant Prairie Village Board was held on Monday, February 20, 2006. Meeting called to order at 6:30 p.m. Present were Village Board members John Steinbrink, Alex Tiahnybok, Steve Kumorkiewicz, Jeff Lauer and Mike Serpe. Also present were Mike Pollocoff, Village Administrator; Jean Werbie, Community Development Director; Kathy Goessl, Finance Director/Treasurer and Jane Romanowski, Village Clerk.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 3. ROLL CALL**
- 4. MINUTES OF MEETINGS – JANUARY 16, 2006**

TIAHNYBOK MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 16, 2006 VILLAGE BOARD MEETING AS PRESENTED IN THEIR WRITTEN FORM; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

5. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Mike Serpe:

There are no public hearings tonight, so if anybody wishes to speak we'd ask that you come to the microphone and give your name and address. Jane, any sign ups?

Jane Romanowski:

One sign up, Bob Babcock.

Mike Serpe:

And let the record show that President Steinbrink is in attendance.

Bob Babcock:

Bob Babcock, 11336 Lakeshore Drive. Just a couple of little things. I want to check again on the paving of 1st Court and find out what the situation is going to be on that. And that was all I was going to ask, but now that I have five minutes to talk, in the past I've been to a few meetings and we've had some local Boy Scouts lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance, I wondered if the Board would want to attempt to get some young person from Pleasant Prairie to come and lead us in the

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

Pledge of Allegiance at the Board meetings, maybe boys from a Boy Scout troop or a girl from a Girl Scout troop or somebody that's on the Dean's list at the schools or something like that. Thank you.

John Steinbrink:

Anyone else wishing to speak?

6. VILLAGE BOARD COMMENTS

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Bob, your idea is very good. Tomorrow I'm going to be in the PTA council meeting for schools and I will mention that to the PTA's . . . support and sponsor Girl Scouts and Boy Scout troops . . . I have been a Scout Master and also ex charter member of the Boy Scouts. I'll talk to several friends I've got and your idea sounds good. One of the issues is that usually the troops come here to the meetings when they have to get their badges. That's why they come. So, anyway, I will mention to them. Thank you for your input.

Jeff Lauer:

Just a quick comment. Bob, on your paving of 1st Court I'm not up to speed if there was ever a commitment or a promise made. Can anybody enlighten me if there was regarding the Village paving that or was it just a request to do it?

Mike Pollocoff:

The paving on that street was authorized by resolution that was adopted after a public hearing requesting that the road be paved. We put that project on hold in anticipation of whatever kind of storm water improvements might be made in Carol Beach rather than pave the road and rip it up or if we were going to do anything else with it. So right if the project proceeds as scheduled, the Village isn't doing any paving this year so we'd be looking to try and get that work placed on a contract if there's a developer doing paving somewhere or somebody we can jump on and get a better price than just doing it as a stand alone project. Typically we do our paving, we try to get it done late summer. That's typically when we get those things done. So we'll take a look at what the prices are. If it's any higher than what we think it's going to be then we need to reconvene a public hearing and let people know how much more it's going to be. Of course, if it's less, then they get whatever the new price is if it's lower. But right now that would be the only Village paving project this year.

John Steinbrink:

Any other Board comments?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

On the paving issue, wasn't that stretch of 1st Court originally paved and then the asphalt was stripped off and re-laid with gravel with the intention of putting asphalt again down and that never happened? Isn't that the historical sequence?

Mike Pollocoff:

No.

Alex Tiahnybok:

There was never asphalt there?

Mike Pollocoff:

That was a mix of oil and sand on not much of a gravel base, and then over time since there's no base under that road, when you get through the freeze and thaw cycle that occurs you get chuckholes. Back in the late '60s and early '70s the Town would take cold patch, which is an asphalt derivative, and put that down and roll it with a truck. As additional potholes would develop they'd put more cold patch in those and put those down. So that was a common practice throughout Carol Beach in that area because that was one way to keep the dust down. I want to say it was in '69 we were prohibited from putting oil down as a way to keep the roads bound up and keep the dust down. So the only thing we could use after the oil was calcium carbonate, so all throughout Carol Beach there was cold patch.

Cold patch is not asphalt. It's an aggregate with a tar in it and an oil base. It's easy to work with. You don't have to heat it up and you put it down. The classic problem in Carol Beach is there's no road bed. There's no road base. You need at least eight inches underneath all those roads to keep them up. I know that some people have indicated that we've ripped up paved roads and we've never ripped up a road that was paved. We have ripped up roads that had cold patch on them in spots. And we did in 1988 have a contract for putting gravel down on the roads and adding to the base. That was done by Resson and Company, and that was put down and we still put gravel down to this day. But a number of the roads where we had no base we did put gravel down.

It's been an ongoing policy in the Village that asphalt roads that are built to Village specifications when it's time to repave the Village will repave those roads. And we required for a long time in the '70s even, as new subdivisions were built or areas were developed even if it was an old subdivision, if they wanted asphalt roads the people that benefited from that road had to pay for the first paving of that asphalt. Subsequently the Village maintained them to whatever extent maintenance was required. That wasn't the case in large sections of Carol Beach.

John Steinbrink:

Any other Village Board comments?

Gus Hauser:

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

Can I make a comment, please?

John Steinbrink:

No, citizen comments are done.

(Inaudible)

John Steinbrink:

No, it's not an issue tonight. This is Village Board comments. It's not on our agenda.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I know Mr. Hauser has a different opinion about what used to be there. He's told me about it. As a matter of fact I think he even brought some samples that was put down recently that he referred to in the last meeting. But citizen comments are over and that's clear.

On a related matter, obviously Carol Beach was one of the first areas that got intensely developed in Pleasant Prairie and, therefore, it suffers with some of the infrastructure that was put in. Or course, under the specifications that the Village would do today, and as a result, there is little new construction that generates new dollars for builders to subsidize construction, and the whole neighborhood with the exception arguably of Lakeshore Drive itself, is in terrible disrepair. I continue to get e-mails and phone calls from people that live on the northern stretch of 3rd Avenue which looks more and more like a third world country than 3rd Avenue. But it's understood and I continually explain to the residents that the Village budget is tight and there's no money for repairs of that nature this year, but the situation only continues to get worse and it's going to have to get looked at seriously in the future.

On an unrelated matter ERU's obviously got some attention over the course of the last couple of weeks. I know I was initially, and I'm grateful this didn't work out for me, but in order to expedite some of the projects that the Clean Water Utility would fund I was sort of an advocate for making the ERU's a little bit higher than they are. Boy, am I happy that didn't work out. But one of the selling aspects of ERU's it certainly wasn't clear to me in hindsight and I'm sure to a lot of other citizens it wasn't clear. But the way it was understood was that it was an effort to recover some of the costs required to handle runoff from properties that are improved. Certainly, if you have a half acre or a one acre lot with a house on it and a driveway and a garage and all that sort of stuff it contributes to the problem, and I don't think anyone denies that.

Likewise with a 30 or 40 acre industrial site with a lot of warehousing and plant space and parking lots I don't think anyone denies that those improvements could contribute to water runoff, etc. The part that bothers me, and it was really just kind of brought to my attention over the course of the last couple of weeks since the bills went out, and I think there's a category we missed and frankly I think they're getting hammered way too hard, and that is the person that owns let's say a 20 acre parcel with a small house on it. I know my ERU bill was I think 25 cents plus 58 cents or something like that, so on a monthly basis 75 cents is not going to kills me. But

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

I've been made aware of properties that are private residential large parcels undoubtedly they're getting ERU bills of something in the range of \$28.

I guess my question in hindsight is are those parcels really contributing \$28 worth of impact on our ability to provide storm water abatement. It seems a real blow. I have a case in point where here's a retired lady with a \$28 a month new bill that she was not anticipating. So something needs to be looked at. I think in that case you have a 20 acre parcel with a small house and nineteen and a half acres of open land or wetlands that she can't do a thing with but she's getting charged for 20 acres of improvements or land and I think that's unfair.

John Steinbrink:

Once again it's a federal mandate and I wish you would write your Congressman or Senator and say where's the money for this project you thrust upon the local municipalities and the State of Wisconsin and see where they get the money from.

Mike Pollocoff:

I might add the formula as the Board adopted it, if somebody does have wetlands that's exempt because that's receiving water and not sending water. If you want to give us the address for the lady, anybody who calls us if they want to appeal it or question it we can show them the maps and see how we determined it. I think one of the things with the method that the Village chose if someone truly has 20 acres of land that's developable, and when I say developable the soils are such that something can be put on the property and the water drains off, that's where they're at. They have some inherent value in that property.

Now, if the property is in an agricultural use then by State law that's exempt. So if they're cropping that land as part of a bigger piece or even by its own piece, I know there's a lot of 20 acre parcels where farmers go in and farm those, then that's the case. But if it's a manicured 20 acres or what have you that's where we're at. It's kind of similar to property assessments. Assessments aren't derived on the person's income. It's derived on the value and the nature of the property and this is the same way. It's not based on someone's income. It's based on the size of their property and how the water drains off. The ordinance is always up for modifications if the Board would want to recut the pie. That's what happens.

Mike Serpe:

Just a question on what Alex is talking about, Mike. Let's say for the sake of conversation here that there was some forgiveness given on this parcel you're making reference to, and then down the road sometime that parcel was subdivided, would then the ERU's be brought back on that parcel? They wouldn't always be exempt I'm going to guess. If we were to do something, it would have to qualify in some way, either have wetlands on it or part of a floodplain I'm going to guess.

Mike Pollocoff:

Right now for the ordinance to have any credibility, with anybody else that has 20 acres, you'd need to say everybody with a 20 acre parcel or everybody with a 10 acre or wherever you draw

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

the line, there's a maximum that you have to pay on, and then you take the rest of that and you rebuilt it back into the base for everybody else if there's going to be discounts. The discounts that we provided for, the discounts that are mandated by the government is that ag land can't be charged because intuitively you want to keep as much land in agriculture because that's going to lead to less development and you're going to have less runoff with that. But if you're going to have open land that someone can develop that charges. The things that the Village added on is C-3 areas, scientific areas, and C-2 areas that we're not required to exempt but we do exempt those.

If we want to make an economic exemption we just need to make it across the board so that everybody who has a 20 acre piece gets treated the same. Or wherever you draw that line everybody above it gets treated the same if they're not farming the land. If it's ready for development, that's one of the prices for having that much land that's got that much value as this, and then hopefully having the charge as minimal as it is that helps. If you're going to put the charge on you might as well make it as small as you really can make it and make that across the board.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Not to beat a dead horse, but I think the ERU was sold as an impact from a residential unit upon the system. And it appears as though the charges are being assessed on the basis of acreage, and it's really not related to an ERU which I believe was an equivalent residential unit. I don't see how one house on 20 acres contributes more because of the improvements in the landscaping and all that sort of stuff versus a house on a half acre lot. That's the entire point. I think it flies in the face of what the original concept was. And if acreage is the only way to do it, I guess it's the only way to do it, but I would think there would be a way to make an assessment more on the basis of how much impact the improvements make on this storm system versus just the acreage of the property.

Mike Pollocoff:

The ERU is based on the typical Village lot which has both. It has impervious areas and it has non-impervious areas. The soils dictate and that's the other part of the equation is what the soils are in the area. For some reason yours is not as significant as someone else's because the soils are permeable. If you go through the maps that we went through when we created the ordinance, it's a whole mixture of things and acreage is one of them. The ERU's . . . rational to make sense. If the Board wants to change it so that the only thing that counts is what's impermeable, then the rates are going to change significantly because you're going to take what's based on developable land, which at least by the soils is still going to sheet drain off water given a lot of the clay areas of the Village, and then load that cost on totally on what's improved impermeable and it's going to make that rate significantly higher.

There's one other thing that Alex brought up, and maybe it's something I'm guessing I'm wondering if you want the staff to research it. And that's the past policy or logic of how we treat paying for public improvements on properties. The existing policy and the one that's guided the Village in our budgets is the Village will pay for improvements that have been paid for in the first instance by someone who benefited in those improvements. In the case of Carol Beach, I agree with Alex that that's one of the earlier developed areas. Cooper Road and there's some older

areas of the Village. In the case of Carol Beach there's a significant number of lots that were purchased with no improvements other than the plat and the gravel road was there.

If the Village wants to for the purpose of our budget and evaluate this as the coming budget year comes upon us, say even though we change the policy so that the people didn't buy an improved lot but they're not looking for an improved lot because they've been there or they want those types of improvements you get with an improved lot, should the Village after a certain amount of time say, well, you've been here X amount of time, the Village will make those improvements to your lot, or some half way method to get part of the way there, or some other way to address it.

To my mind or at least my understanding over the years it's not a method to exclude one group of property owners over another. It's just that everybody comes to the table and brings a certain amount of money, buys a lot whether it's got the full load of improvements or none, and every few years or so there's a subdivision that wants an additional level of improvements made to their property that don't exist. The past practice has been that the property owners had to pay for those new additional improvements, and then once those improvements are in the Village will maintain them in perpetuity until some other change is needed or there's some other additions wanted. It really colors how we do the budget. I think it colors how the Board looks at the budget and looks at capital improvements over time.

There are cities and Villages that don't follow that mind set, that they adopt a budget that makes a certain amount of improvements they make in a year, if they want to do \$1 million or \$2 million or whatever that number is. That every year they'll make that many improvements to properties to bring them up to what the city or village determined as an urban standard, if that's curb and gutter or storm sewers or sanitary sewers or whatever it is. That hasn't been the case in the Village. If the Board wants the Village staff to evaluate that, it won't be a quick evaluation, but I think that's kind of the tension or frustration that happens where people have built a home on a lot that is buildable but it just doesn't have the same menu of improvements that other people have, they pay taxes every year and they get frustrated because they don't see the same benefits that somebody else has.

In Pleasant Prairie historically and forever and ever has been based on what did you bring, what's here when you built your house, if that's the public improvements that's the public improvement. If it isn't then you have to pay to have that new improvement. But it is a philosophical change in how you look at making improvements for communities. There's nothing to say you have to keep doing it that way. There are communities that do it the other way. It's just a way of allocating our resources and how you want to approach that.

7. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider Ord #06-07 for a Zoning Map Amendment for the request of Martin Hanley, agent for Village Green Development, LLC owner to rezone two wetlands from the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District as a result of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources approval and permit to allow the owner to fill a total of 31,363 square feet (0.72 acres) of wetlands.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, Ordinance #06-07 is a petition requesting for the Village Board to amend the official Village zoning map to remove the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, designation on two small pocket wetlands that are located in outlots 3 and 5 of the Village Green Heights Subdivision.

The petitioner is requesting specifically to rezone two small pocket wetlands that have received permits for filling from the Wisconsin DNR. They have purchased wetland mitigation bank credits and have obtained their required site water quality certification from the DNR. The wetlands that are being mitigated and filled total .72 acre or 31,363 square feet of wetlands.

The two locations within the Village Green Heights Subdivision, the first is identified as wetland D within outlot 5 of the Village Green Heights Subdivision. It's proposed to be rezoned to the R-4, Urban Single Family Residential District, and it's proposed to be developed in the second stage of the single family lots known as Village Green Heights Addition #1.

The second wetland is wetland E within outlot 3 of the Village Green Heights Subdivision. It's proposed to be zoned into the R-8 (UHO), which is an Urban Two Family Residential District with an Urban Landholding Overlay District. Adjacent to and surrounding this particular wetland a retention facility is proposed to be developed for storm water management for the adjacent future condominiums that are to be constructed.

These two wetlands had been identified as very low quality wetlands by the Wisconsin DNR based on the analysis that was done by the field biologist. Basically these areas were created through some broken field tiles, and they had been farmed for a number of years, and the DNR had made a determination that these wetlands were not significant enough, but the developer would be required to set aside wetland bank mitigation dollars in order to purchase some additional wetlands elsewhere in order to try to create a larger wetland area someplace else in Pleasant Prairie or elsewhere in the State.

With that, this is a matter that was before the Village Plan Commission, and the Plan Commission held a public hearing and supported the zoning map amendment.

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

Mike Serpe:

Move to adopt Ordinance 06-07.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second for adoption. Any further discussion? Once again, they're creating one and a half times the area they're taking out, correct?

Jean Werbie:

That's correct. They're putting in money to acquire wetlands one and a half times.

John Steinbrink:

More than they had.

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT ORD #06-07 FOR A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT FOR THE REQUEST OF MARTIN HANLEY, AGENT FOR VILLAGE GREEN DEVELOPMENT, LLC OWNER TO REZONE TWO WETLANDS FROM THE C-1, LOWLAND RESOURCE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT AS A RESULT OF THE WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES APPROVAL AND PERMIT TO ALLOW THE OWNER TO FILL A TOTAL OF 31,363 SQUARE FEET (0.72 ACRES) OF WETLANDS; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- B. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider Ord #06-08 for a Zoning Map Amendment for the request of Mark Eberle, P.E. of Nielsen Madsen and Barber, agent for Quinton and Lisa Ackerman owners of the property located at 1804 116th Street for a Zoning Map Amendment to correct the legal descriptions of Ord. #05-40 related to the zoning map amendment for the proposed King's Cove Subdivision.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, Ordinance #06-08 is for a zoning map amendment, and this is to correct a previous ordinance that was adopted by this Board, 05-40. Upon review of the final plat by the State Department of Administration, the King's Cove Subdivision was re-

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

evaluated by the State, and it was determined that outlot 1 that was shown on their plat should be now divided into two separate outlots, an outlot 1 and outlot 2. So outlot 1, now that it's identified as 1 and 2, and outlot 2 now to be shown as outlot 3, it changed all the legal descriptions by which the previous zoning map amendment had been approved.

The area that is on either side of the creek, which is now outlot 1 and outlot 2, will be zoned PR-1. So we are correcting the legal descriptions for outlot 1 and 2. And then outlot 3, which is actually shown on the overhead still as 2, is the area which is going to be retained by the developer and it's going to be placed into the R-4, which is a single family designation, and to be developed at some point in the future with the land to the north and west when that develops. So basically the State in their plat review has identified that there needs to be three outlots. We need to correct the legal descriptions of the zoning in order for it to be reflected correctly on the zoning map.

With that, the Plan Commission held the public hearing at their last meeting and they recommended approval of Ordinance #06-08.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I make a motion to approve Resolution 06-08.

Jeff Lauer:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Any further discussion?

Alex Tiahnybok:

Jean, I recall at the Plan Commission, and I don't recall exactly what the question was but I think it may have been answered by what authority required that the outlots be divided up into three pieces. That's the State Department of Administration?

Jean Werbie:

Correct.

Alex Tiahnybok:

And that was the question that was asked at the Plan Commission meeting, correct?

Jean Werbie:

Right.

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

Alex Tiahnybok:

So that's the agency.

Jean Werbie:

Right, they have the authority to modify the plat and they are, in fact, one of the objecting agencies for plats in the State of Wisconsin, and they feel that a navigable body of water physically separates parcels and so they would prefer to see outlots on either side of that body of water, so that's how it was corrected.

John Steinbrink:

Further discussion?

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT ORD #06-08 FOR A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT FOR THE REQUEST OF MARK EBERLE, P.E. OF NIELSEN MADSEN AND BARBER, AGENT FOR QUINTON AND LISA ACKERMAN OWNERS OF THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1804 116TH STREET FOR A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT TO CORRECT THE LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS OF ORD. #05-40 RELATED TO THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT FOR THE PROPOSED KING'S COVE SUBDIVISION; SECONDED BY LAUER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- C. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider Resolution #06-11 for a Preliminary Plat for the request of Mark Bourque, agent for Alfa Land LLC, owner of the property generally located south of CTH C, north of Bain Station Road at 94th Avenue for the proposed 81 single-family lot subdivision to be known as Ashbury Creek.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President, I would ask that you read Item D as well. It relates to the same project and I'll make one presentation for both items as long as separate action is taken.

- D. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider Ord #06-09 for a Zoning Map Amendment for the request of Mark Bourque, agent for Alfa Land LLC, owner of the property generally located south of CTH C, north of Bain Station Road at 94th Avenue to rezone the proposed single family lots into the R-4.5 Urban Single Family Residential District; to rezone the field delineated wetlands (except the wetland area proposed to be filled) into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, and to rezone the non-wetland areas within Outlots 1 and 2 into the PR-1, Park and Recreational District for the proposed Ashbury Creek Subdivision.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, you have before you Resolution 06-11 which is for the preliminary plat for the Alfa Land LLC owner. This is for Ashbury Creek. And the second item is Ordinance #06-09 for the zoning map amendment for the same Ashbury Creek Subdivision. Ashbury Creek Subdivision is located south of County Trunk Highway C which is Wilmot Road, north of Bain Station Road at approximately 94th Avenue. In fact, the north/south road that runs from Bain Station Road north to Wilmot Road is 94th Avenue. It actually does serve as a collector road through this subdivision, and then it runs through Prairie Ridge all the way north to Highway 50.

The proposed single family development is intended to create 81 lots. The Ashbury Creek Subdivision is located within the Prairie Ridge Neighborhood Plan area. This property is specifically located in the south central portion of this neighborhood. The Ashbury Creek conceptual plan and the proposed preliminary plat are in compliance with the comprehensive plan as well as the Prairie Ridge Neighborhood Plan that is on file with the Village and adopted by the Plan Commission and the Board.

Just as an overview of some of the information on the property, approximately ten acres, or 19 percent, of the entire site is proposed to remain in open space. Under the wetlands category 3.47 acres of the site have been field delineated as wetlands. 2,300 square feet of wetlands are proposed to be filled for the construction of 94th Avenue. I don't have my pointer, but as you can see 94th Avenue does cross this small ribbon of wetlands that connects a larger portion at the south end and then a small piece on the northeast corner.

Other open space consists of six acres within outlots 1 and 2 excluding that 3.47 acres of wetlands, a 35 foot wide landscape easement, and this is going to be located adjacent to Wilmot Road which is on the north end, Bain Station Road on the south end and the industrial property which is the former Alfa Laval property which is kind of to the north/northeast on the site. Typically the landscape easement area will include berming as well as landscaping, trees, plants, bushes in order to create a visual as well as much as possible a sound barrier between the various highways and the adjacent use. A number of trees are proposed to be preserved on the site. The way this development was laid out many of the trees are located within outlots 1 and 2 on the south end, and then there's three very large oak trees that are going to have deed restrictions and easements around them, and those areas will be protected during construction of the subdivision and construction of the homes.

Under public improvements, an additional 27 feet of right of way is being dedicated for County Trunk Highway C for future widening at some point. An additional 15.25 feet of right of way is being dedicated along Bain Station Road. Bypass and acceleration and deceleration lanes will be required on County Highway C and 94th Avenue and at Bain Station Road and 94th Avenue. Currently as this is laid out there are two public roadway connections to this development, and there will be a third public roadway connection that is going to go from 94th Avenue to the vacant farmland to the east. All improvements will be made at the developer's cost or the developer's expense.

The entire development will be serviced by municipal sanitary sewer, water and storm sewer. Municipal water is going to be extended by the developer west on Bain Station Road from 88th Avenue adjacent to the development property which is along Bain Station. The water then will

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

loop through the development and then will eventually connect its way into Highway C at 94th Avenue. Municipal sanitary sewer will need to be extended from the existing sewer that's located at the intersection of Bain Station and C and Bain Station Road to the western portion of the development property, and then extended through the development through an easement in outlot 2 in between lots 17 and 18 to serve the entire site. Sanitary sewer shall be extended west of 94th Avenue in Bain Station Road to also service lots 44 and 45 which are actually along Bain Station.

All residential lots shall be provided with nine foot gravity basement service. Sanitary sewer will not be installed in Bain Station Road the entire length of the property because of the fact that it does not have the depth and capacity to service all the adjacent lands. So eventually there will be a sanitary sewer that's south of this development that will run towards the north that will service those adjacent lands.

Under the zoning map amendment, the current zoning of the property is M-2, Heavy Manufacturing District, A-1, Agricultural Preservation, and C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy. The A-1 area is actually a strip of land that runs east/west but north side of Bain Station Road. That area is eventually proposed to be lot line adjusted to the land to the north so for that reason that land that's identified as A-1 will remain as A-1. The area that's going to be rezoned or is petitioned for rezoning is the single family proposed to be rezoned into the R-4.5, Urban Single Family Residential, and outlot 4 will also go into that classification. Outlot 3, which is that strip of land, will remain in A-1. The outlots 1 and 2 which contain the open space and the detention/retention facilities that will be put into the PR-1. And the field delineated wetlands will go into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District.

With that, these two items received public hearings before the Village Plan Commission and the Plan Commission recommended approval subject to the conditions in the staff comments. The Village staff recommends approval of Resolution #06-11 for the preliminary plat and Ordinance 06-09 for the zoning map amendment for Ashbury Creek.

Mike Serpe:

Just a question. Jean, to you or Mark, when is final plat proposed to come forward on this, how long?

Jean Werbie:

You'd have to address that to the developer.

Mark Bourque:

Mark Bourque, Prudential, 6040 39th Avenue. Mike, did you ask when we're proposing to bring the final plat forward?

Mike Serpe:

Yes.

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

Mark Bourque:

We're expecting that we're going to be addressing the Village comments that are conditioned upon these approvals tonight back to the Village approximately in the next two weeks. Then pending their review, then we'll be back in the door making our application for final plat. Our anticipation, correction our hope, is to be able to get this done as soon as possible. Because of the size of this project the infrastructure is going to take such a long period of time and being in this part of the country that we are, we actually run a risk of not being able to get first year improvements completed to the satisfaction of the Village before bad weather breaks. Now, that might be a little bit on the outside but the sooner we can get started the less risk we all have.

Mike Serpe:

You have an aggressive schedule here. Okay. Are you ready for both motions on this?

John Steinbrink:

Yes, just one motion or two?

Mike Serpe:

One at a time. 06-11 I'd move approval of the preliminary plat.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I second.

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Any more discussion on Resolution 06-11?

Jeff Lauer:

I just have a couple questions, Jean. It says a few trees are being moved. Do you know approximately how many?

Jean Werbie:

Two.

Jeff Lauer:

Okay. Second, if I remember correctly from our last Board meeting site access. Is it true that it's recommended to have three site accesses when you have 81 or more homes? Do I remember that correctly?

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

Jean Werbie:

More than 81 you should have three access points. So he has two for 81.

Jeff Lauer:

And then the third?

Jean Werbie:

And then the third one is actually identified on the plat. It's hard to see it with the gray, but there's a third access point for which public improvements, the undergrounds, will be put in that will connect to the east.

Jeff Lauer:

And the final one, for the 27 feet in case it has to be widened which I'm sure it's going to be, is that the County's recommendation that we keep 27 feet so when they have to widen it they can?

Jean Werbie:

The County's long-range plans identify the amount of right of way that should be identified as new plans develop in the Village, and then we also contact Gary Sipsma who is the Director of Highways, and we ask for his recommendation as to how much right of way would be needed on a County Highway and so he gives us that information for us to convey to the developer.

Jeff Lauer:

Okay, good, I just want to make sure they gave it. Thanks. That's all.

SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE SERPPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND CONSIDER RESOLUTION #06-11 FOR A PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR THE REQUEST OF MARK BOURQUE, AGENT FOR ALFA AND LLC, OWNER OF THE PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF CTH C, NORTH OF BAIN STATION ROAD AT 94TH AVENUE FOR THE PROPOSED 81 SINGLE-FAMILY LOT SUBDIVISION TO BE KNOWN AS ASHBURY CREEK, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS SET FORTH BY STAFF; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

John Steinbrink:

And the next motion?

SERPE MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION

RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT ORD #06-09 FOR A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT FOR THE REQUEST OF MARK BOURQUE, AGENT FOR ALFA LAND LLC, OWNER OF THE PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED SOUTH OF CTH C, NORTH OF BAIN STATION ROAD AT 94TH AVENUE TO REZONE THE PROPOSED SINGLE FAMILY LOTS INTO THE R-4.5 URBAN SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT; TO REZONE THE FIELD DELINEATED WETLANDS (EXCEPT THE WETLAND AREA PROPOSED TO BE FILLED) INTO THE C-1, LOWLAND RESOURCE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, AND TO REZONE THE NON-WETLAND AREAS WITHIN OUTLOTS 1 AND 2 INTO THE PR-1, PARK AND RECREATIONAL DISTRICT FOR THE PROPOSED ASHBURY CREEK SUBDIVISION; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- E. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider Ord #06-10 for several Zoning Maps Amendments to rezone several properties purchased by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and The Nature Conservancy of Wisconsin in the Carol Beach/Chiwaukee Prairie to the C-3, Natural and Scientific Area Resource Conservancy District.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, you have before you Ordinance #06-10, and it's for several zoning map amendments to rezone several properties in the Chiwaukee Prairie/Carol Beach area. The Plan Commission adopted Resolution 06-01 to initiate this petition to amend the zoning map, and this is a result of several properties that were purchased by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources as well as The Nature Conservancy of Wisconsin.

Once these properties have been acquired in the public's interest, they are recommending that these lands then be placed into the C-3, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, and this is pursuant to Community Assistance Planning Report No. 88, and that's entitled The Land Use Management Plan for the Chiwaukee Prairie/Carol Beach Area of the Town of Pleasant Prairie. That plan was dated February of 1985. Eventually what that plan recommended is that all the lands that have been recommended for acquisition purposes that would be acquired in the public's or private's interest as a result of the study that was done, that they all be placed into that C-3 District.

The C-3 District, just to remind you, is the Natural and Scientific Area Resource Conservancy District down in Chiwaukee Prairie. It's designed to preserve and enhance existing natural features including scenic, historic and scientific areas and associated plant and animal communities, and to prevent the destruction of valuable natural, scenic and scientific resources. There are quite a few of them down in Chiwaukee Prairie including wetlands, shorelands or navigable waters, prairies, meadows, sand dunes, woodlands, wildlife habitat and areas with high erosion hazard. Again, as such time as the lands are acquired by any federal, State agency, Kenosha County or the Village in the public's interest, we would initiate this process.

Typically, as you know we do this once a year because we want to make sure that any individuals or any groups that have acquired the properties that we're not confusing people and we're not sending out multiple notices year around. They typically acquire anywhere from 5 to 15 lots in a

year. My understanding is the DNR has about 70 lots left to acquire themselves.

Just as a refresher here, the Land Use Management Plan seeks to preserve a substantial portion of the existing natural features of the area through maintenance of continuous environmental corridor, and this extends from the Kenosha Sand Dunes on the north end, which is just north of 85th Street, down to the Chiwaukee Prairie which is on the south end south of 116th Street all the way down to the State Line. The Land Use Management Plan identifies that lands are to be acquired and maintained as a natural area, wildlife area by a combination of public as well as private interests. The Wisconsin DNR and The Nature Conservancy have identified these lands, and as part of their acquisition efforts are ongoing with respect to acquiring the lands.

The following properties were recently acquired by the DNR and The Nature Conservancy and are located within the respective acquisition areas pursuant to the management plan and they're proposed to be rezoned into the C-3 District. The parcels include Tax Parcel Number 93-4-123-194-0416; 93-4-123-194-0417. Just north of 116th Street we have two parcels 93-4-123-304-0010, 93-4-123-304-0030. And then down at the State line at 128th Street we have five more parcels, 93-4-123-323-1380, 93-4-123-323-1385, 93-4-123-323-1390, 93-4-123-323-1395 and 93-4-123-323-1400. All of these lots will still remain within the Village's Limited Urban Service Overlay District. As you know, none of these lots are intended for any type of urban development.

With that, the staff recommends approval. The Plan Commission held a public hearing at their last meeting and recommends approval of Ordinance #06-10.

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND ADOPT ORD #06-10 FOR SEVERAL ZONING MAPS AMENDMENTS TO REZONE SEVERAL PROPERTIES PURCHASED BY THE WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE NATURE CONSERVANCY OF WISCONSIN IN THE CAROL BEACH/CHIWAUKEE PRAIRIE TO THE C-3, NATURAL AND SCIENTIFIC AREA RESOURCE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- F. Receive Plan Commission Recommendation and Consider the request of Ajay Kuttemperoor, agent for VK Development Corporation, owner for approval of a Certified Survey Map to subdivide Lot 1 of CSM 2314 into two (2) properties for the expansion of Hospice Alliance located at 10220 Prairie Ridge Blvd.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, Ajay Kuttemperoor, agent for VK Development Corporation, owner, is requesting to subdivide lot 1 of CSM 2314 into two properties. The property is located in the Prairie Ridge Development west of 104th Avenue and east of St. Catherine's Hospital between 76th and 77th Street and Prairie Ridge Boulevard.

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

The property is currently vacant and zoned B-2, PUD, and a small portion of the property has field delineated wetlands and is zoned C-1. Specifically, if you can look on the slide, the lot 2 area is the area that we have identified that would be transferred to Hospice Alliance. The balance of lot 1 which also includes that wetland area that would be retained by VK Development.

As you know, the master conceptual plan was approved by the Village Plan Commission, and on August 1, 2005 the Village Board approved a master conceptual plan for the development of this portion of the Prairie Ridge area. The master conceptual plan at that time proposed 131,000 square feet of office space and a total of 437,200 square feet of retail space. Again, this proposed lot 2 fits in with the plans of the Hospice Alliance by squaring off that rectangle piece of property extending north from Prairie Ridge Boulevard.

The CSM proposes to subdivide and create a 1.075 acre parcel which is lot 2. That will be purchased by the adjacent property owner, Hospice Alliance. They are currently located at 10220 Prairie Ridge Boulevard for a future expansion of the facility. Lot 2 of the CSM is proposed to be combined with lot 2 of their other CSM, 2314, within 30 days of the land being sold to Hospice Alliance. Lot 1, the remaining portion of the site, will be 43.017 acres, again, to be retained by VK Development.

With that, the staff recommends approval of the certifies survey map as did the Plan Commission subject to the comments and conditions as outlined in the staff memorandum.

John Steinbrink:

Jean, is there any reason why VK kept the wetland area or divided it off?

Jean Werbie:

The only portion of this entire area that Hospice was interested in was lot 2.

John Steinbrink:

Just the lot 2 portion, okay.

Jean Werbie:

Right, and this C-1 area is actually going to be incorporated into their commercial development as a green space wetland area with some attractive landscaping around it. They wanted to keep that as a natural area as part of their larger retail development. And it's pretty far from the Hospice property so it really doesn't affect Hospice one way or another. It's not proposed to be filled or developed. It will remain in a natural state.

John Steinbrink:

But is that separated from lot 1 then or is that still part of lot 1?

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

Jean Werbie:

That's all part of lot 1. What you're seeing on there is where the future sanitary sewer is going to be realigned. As you can see, the sanitary sewer kind of juts straight north through the property. You can see the easement in the dash line and then goes directly to the west. In order to create a more buildable piece of land here for retail development, they are going to be re-routing the sanitary sewer adjacent to the wetlands and along the south end of their property so as to allow buildings to be located on that site.

John Steinbrink:

Thank you.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

One question, Jean. Actually the Hospice right now that's the maximum they can expand?

Jean Werbie:

This would be the extent of their expansion at this location.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

That's it?

Jean Werbie:

Correct, at this building, at this location.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

I was looking at that because I remember when they built it they were talking about limited and that's it.

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO CONCUR WITH THE PLAN COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVE THE REQUEST OF AJAY KUTTEMPEEROR, AGENT FOR VK DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, OWNER FOR APPROVAL OF A CERTIFIED SURVEY MAP TO SUBDIVIDE LOT 1 OF CSM 2314 INTO TWO (2) PROPERTIES FOR THE EXPANSION OF HOSPICE ALLIANCE LOCATED AT 10220 PRAIRIE RIDGE BLVD., SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS SET FORTH BY STAFF; SECONDED BY LAUER; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

- G. Consider Resolution #06-12 for support of an amendment to a portion of the Village Green Neighborhood Plan for the area generally located between STH 165 and 93rd Street from approximately 43 to 57th Avenues (the tower lines).**

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

Jean Werbie:

Mr. President and members of the Board, the Village of Pleasant Prairie, pursuant to Section 62.23 of the Wisconsin Statutes, has created a Plan Commission, and the Commission has the authority to adopt master plans, comprehensive plans or portions thereof, and neighborhood plans are components of the Village's master plan.

On February 13, 2006, the Plan Commission held a public informational meeting and adopted Plan Commission Resolution #06-02 related to amendments to the Village Green Neighborhood Plan. On the Board across the hall from me is a large scale version, and then we'll be presenting it also on the slides.

The neighborhood plans, as a reminder, are based on geographical areas or neighborhoods that are delineated in the Village's Comprehensive Land Use Plan. They are intended to provide the Plan Commission and the Board and the residents with an early opportunity to review future probable patterns of existing and proposed land uses within a particular neighborhood. The neighborhood plans take into account the compatibility of land uses, identifies how future land divisions could occur, plans how access roadways to land divisions could be provided, examines the practicability of providing certain lot layouts, road layouts, parkways, open space area, park area, preservation areas, public community facilities, infrastructure improvements and municipal services to service an area. Specifically this neighborhood plan has all of those things. Neighborhood planning is essential to the orderly growth of this community and it establishes a framework as to how development should occur when and if it does occur.

The Village Green Neighborhood is located in the central portion of the Village. It's approximately located between Highway 165 which is 104th Street, extending north to 93rd Street, and approximately from 43rd to 57th Avenues which about the tower lines on the right. The entire neighborhood is bounded by public streets on the north and the east and the south and, again, tower lines and eventually a public roadway on the west.

There have been several plans and amendments for the Village Green Neighborhood Plan which have been presented to the Plan Commission and the residents and the Board since 1996. I'll briefly highlight some of them for you. We made some modifications to this neighborhood plan in 1996 through Resolution #96-04 and 96-05, and those were adopted on April 22, 1996. They specifically refer to and reference some changes that we made to the Village Green Center. At that time we had a very active Village Green Technical Advisory Committee, and we were working to try to create a very unique center for the Village. At that time there was an active

developer. There was a period of time between '96 and about '98 or '99 or 2000 where plans were put on hold, but the neighborhood plan stayed the way it was for that period of time.

The next was Resolution 99-12 adopted on June 14, 1999, and that related to amendments, again, to this '96 neighborhood plan. These amendments occurred at the northeast corner of 165 and County Trunk Highway EZ and at the southeast corner of Springbrook Road and County Trunk Highway EZ. So a number of the changes at that time were because there were some suggestions and recommendations regarding some proposed development very close here to the Village Hall.

So there were various alternatives and recommendations that were put together at that time.

The next resolution was Plan Commission Resolution 99-20, and that was adopted on November 22, 1999. It related to amendments, again, to the '96 neighborhood plan, and these were a result of developments that occurred at the southwest corner of 93rd Street and County Trunk Highway EZ. These changes were as a result of the Meadowdale Estates plat that was being brought forth by the VK Development operating as Crestwood for this particular area.

The next modification was with Plan Commission Resolution 00-21. That was adopted on November 27, 2000. It related to amendments in the southwestern portion of the neighborhood, and this plan incorporated those changes as adopted in 1996 within the entire neighborhood. Again, those changes came as a result of the Village Green Heights neighborhood and subdivision that were being presented.

What happens is initially when the staff, the Plan Commission and the Board puts together these neighborhood plans we are doing a little bit of looking into the future as to how a developer or landowner wants to develop their property. So when and if the land comes to a point that it's ready to develop, the property owner has the right to take a look at that neighborhood plan and modify it and bring it back for an amendment to see how it fits in with the rest of the neighborhood. Specifically what's very important is the interconnection of roadways from one neighborhood to another to interconnect the subdivisions to make sure that we've got roadways and public infrastructure improvements like sewer and water that can be extended to adjacent areas, and to make sure that we have movement throughout the neighborhood in order to get to the public facility such as the parks that are identified within these neighborhoods.

The next was Plan Commission Resolution #04-01 that was adopted on January 4, 2004. This related to amendment to the 2000 neighborhood plan. It generally was located north and west of Springbrook Road at County Trunk Highway EZ. There was a request for a change for Dr. Johnson to build his office building, and he was requesting a modification so that the area that's just north of Gordy's Tavern over here could be modified and put into that commercial designation. But, again, it required an amendment to the neighborhood plan to allow that to happen.

The next is the 2000 neighborhood plan is proposed to be amended for the area generally located between Highway 165 and 93rd Street from approximately 43rd Avenue to 57th Avenue. The amendments include changes to the road and lot configurations as a result of some detailed wetland delineations on the property west of the Meadowdale Estates on the south side of 93rd Street and revisions to the location of the neighborhood park. The remainder of the neighborhood remained unchanged, however, the entire neighborhood plan is now being prepared in a digital format. Up to this point, all of the changes that you've seen have been hand drawn by the staff, and we are now at a position where the changes are all being made in a digital computerized format, and any changes subsequent to this will now be in a computerized format.

Specifically, the staff is working with some developers. They are looking to continue the development of this neighborhood in the northern section, and so they have brought forth some revised layouts to the neighborhood plan based on wetland delineations as well as modifications to some road patterns as well as, again, a neighborhood park that is to be shown in the center.

The remainder of the neighborhood remained unchanged, and this is a larger scale version of that entire neighborhood. As you can see, 93rd Street, 39th Avenue, 165 are the main arterials surrounding this particular neighborhood. There's also an arterial that runs east/west through the development area which is known as main street. That eventually will connect 39th Avenue all the way through this neighborhood, through Highpoint and all the way to Green Bay Road. There's another north/ south road that will actually serve as a collector through this neighborhood, and that will be Cooper Road. It's proposed to be extended from 93rd Street straight south to Highway 165.

Overall, within this neighborhood commercial areas total approximately 43 acres, institutional areas approximately 114 acres, residential areas 519 acres. Open space comprises 107 acres, 3 acres of floodplain, 32 acres of wetlands, 53 acres for parks including the Kenosha County Bike Trail, and 19 acres of other open space.

As I mentioned previously, here is a neighborhood park that is located pretty much in the central portion of this neighborhood. It's proposed to be approximately 33 acres, and it's proposed to be located at the west central portion of the neighborhood. It's proposed that several park amenities would be constructed in the park including softball fields, soccer fields, tennis courts, play equipments, shelter and parking. This particular neighborhood plan, as well as this neighborhood park in the center of this plan, have been presented to and have been reviewed by the Village's Park Commission, and they have made several recommendations as to its location, its size and the uses in this particular neighborhood.

One of the things I'd like to add is that coming up before the Plan Commission and the Board in the month of March will be consideration of the Village's park and open space plan which will serve to modify the Village's comprehensive plan as well as set forth a great framework for future development of park areas within the Village of Pleasant Prairie, and will serve as a guide for the neighborhood plans because we'll be identifying not only the open space areas, the park areas, but the trail systems that interconnect the parks as presented by the Park Commission.

I mentioned previously that our intention is to create a park corridor that will run through this neighborhood and also through the Highpoint neighborhood to the west. There will be a pedestrian interconnection which is going to serve as a trail system to interconnect these two neighborhoods. Eventually it will connect again all the way to Highway 31 to the west and will connect all the way to the Kenosha County Bike Trail through the Rolling Meadows neighborhood park to the east.

Access to arterial roads, access shown to Highway 165 is based on the best available information known at this time. Long-range transportation plans indicate according to the plans that we have on file is that Highway EZ, 93rd Street and Springbrook Road are proposed to be improved or widened when traffic counts and new developments warrant such improvements. As you know, we're in the midst of a Highway 165 corridor study. The next public informational meeting on that highway corridor study is going to be coming up in March, and we will be seeing some more details as to what's being proposed by the DOT for that segment of highway.

Under population projections for the entire neighborhood, the vacant portions of this

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

neighborhood will not develop until the property owners wish to develop their land which makes the neighborhood planning essential for the orderly growth of this community and establishes our framework for development. Current population within the neighborhood includes 395 dwelling units and 1,078 persons. Projected populations within the neighborhood based on total number of households proposed when fully developed includes 1,193 dwelling units, 3,257 persons and 501 public school age children. Keep in mind that this will take many years for this entire neighborhood to develop, but we're setting forth the framework as to how it would develop when and if it does develop.

Then this is the Village Green Neighborhood Plan as presented by the Village Plan Commission. Again, just as a reminder the areas that are shown in the light brown or the peach areas those are existing areas that have been previously platted or developed or are already under construction. The areas that are identified in yellow are the new single family proposed lot areas. The areas that are shown in an orangish color are those areas that are proposed for some type of multifamily condominium development. The areas that are identified in red are the commercial areas that are being proposed. The areas identified in the lighter blue are institutionally identified areas. The large triangle area in the northeast corner is owned by the Milwaukee Archdiocese. It's part of the All Saint's Cemetery. Then we've got a Village park in there, the Village Hall property, a post office, there's a number of institutional areas in this particular area.

The green areas are those areas that are either nature areas due to woodlands or wetland protection. You can see there's some secondary environmental corridor on the map, and right through the center is a proposed Village park. With that the staff recommends approval of Resolution #06-12 for the Village Green neighborhood plan.

John Steinbrink:

Jean, as you stated, the street layouts there provide that interconnection between all these different neighborhoods. But one of the most important things is it also provides the Village Green Plan, the transition between these neighborhoods, and they're pretty diverse neighborhoods some of these. And I think the unique thing was on that Commission, the Village Green Commission, you have representatives for all these neighborhoods, so they had input into there and everybody seemed pretty satisfied with the order of the layout that's there nor for the future. I think that goes a long way to make that development work for everybody without a lot of disagreement in the future. So I commend the Commission on their work.

Mike Serpe:

Jean, the Village Green Center is going to be serviced by sidewalks, is that correct?

Jean Werbie:

That's correct.

Mike Serpe:

Is there any other area in the Village Green development that's going to be serviced by sidewalks.

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

Jean Werbie:

Main Street.

Mike Serpe:

And what about the area where the proposed school is going to go?

Jean Werbie:

There's no schools shown in this neighborhood. The school is proposed west of here in the Highpoint neighborhood. And we are proposing the Highpoint neighborhood and community park and then main street will run along the south end of that school site, and we are proposing sidewalks from the Highpoint at that school all the way down main street, through this neighborhood, all the way into the Village Center. So only on Main Street but it will link all the way through. There's also an east/west recreational corridor, walking, recreational biking trail that will link, again, through the center of this neighborhood all the way to Highpoint. So that's another opportunity to be pushing a stroller or to be running or to have a recreational bike ride through the center of the neighborhood and then through the center to the next neighborhood to the school.

Mike Serpe:

As John said, there's been a lot of time spent on the Village Green Center area by the Committee. We see higher density, and this isn't that high and the further west as we go, but I think in certain areas it's a good idea to start looking at sidewalks in some of these areas as well. You can only put so many people on the street and kids on the street and things are going to start happening. I think as we grow we just have to start considering that in the future.

Jean Werbie:

I'd just like to add a footnote. The Village Green Technical Advisory Committee is still busy meeting and they're going to continue to meet, and they are going to be presenting a plan that refines this neighborhood even further for the Village Center. I envision they will be back sometime late spring or early summer then to complete the neighborhood as to how that would develop and how that interconnects. They're going to be tying into all the adjacent subdivisions, but how that exactly develops will be submitted later this summer.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Question for Jean. Jean, in one occasion I recall it was discussed ML was going to go west of the post office and that way we were going to have a large section for commercial over there. Remember we discussed that? What happened with that?

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

Jean Werbie:

Well, we've had many, many meetings and field trips with the Technical Advisory Committee as well as our consultants, and that's one of the things that we're looking at right now is what percentage of the Village Green Center should be identified for commercial purposes. Those field trips and all that work has taken place over the last six to seven months. That's not reflected on here yet. This is still based on the 2000 neighborhood plan because we didn't want to change anything until it's gone through the Technical Advisory Committee process, Plan Commission and Board. And that will take a lot more work so we did not want to show it in advance on here yet until we've done and completed our study of what we have determined that the Village needs and what we want and what can be absorbed by the market based on what the development community is telling us.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

Thank you.

Jeff Lauer:

When I got this and reviewed it I really liked the park layout. The only thing missing from it is Mike's golf course, but other than that I think it could be the envy of Pleasant Prairie. I mean the park just looking at it you've got nighttime tennis as well as other nighttime activities there, so I think it's really a nice area. Do you know in advance, just out of curiosity because I used to play night tennis, is it going to be coin operated so if someone wants to use it they have to pay for the electricity?

Mike Pollocoff:

It probably will be just to control so you don't have lights out there when nobody is there for the neighbors that are around it.

Jeff Lauer:

And I'm assuming when the park is done obviously it's for the whole--anybody can go and it's just not like my neighborhood thing?

Jean Werbie:

Yes.

Mike Pollocoff:

It's public.

Jeff Lauer:

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

It's a great layout. I don't know if anyone wants to see it but it looks good. I move for approval of 06-12.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second.

Jean Werbie:

I just wanted to mention as I mentioned earlier the Park Commission has been working very diligently on putting together very detailed park plans for the next upcoming neighborhood parks. Alex sits on the Park Commission. They did a great job. You're going to be seeing that very soon. It's already posted to the website for people to start viewing and providing comments, but you'll see all of the neighborhood parks that they've worked on. They're outstanding. There's opportunity for great amenities and opportunities. Of course, it will take some time for these to happen, but at least it's planned out so that when the funds are available that those park amenities will develop so it's very exciting.

LAUER MOVED TO ADOPT RESOLUTION #06-12 FOR SUPPORT OF AN AMENDMENT TO A PORTION OF THE VILLAGE GREEN NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN FOR THE AREA GENERALLY LOCATED BETWEEN STH 165 AND 93RD STREET FROM APPROXIMATELY 43 TO 57TH AVENUES (THE TOWER LINES); SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

H. Consider Agreement for Engineering Consultant Services for the King's Cove Subdivision.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, this is an agreement for engineering services for King's Cove Subdivision between Clark Dietz and the Village of Pleasant Prairie. It would be the responsibility of the developer to pay the Village for the work done. The Village administers the contracts, and we want the engineer working for us and on our behalf rather than the developer. I'd recommend that the Village President and Clerk be authorized to enter into an agreement with Clark Dietz & Sons for engineering services on this contract. The fee basically is an hourly rate based on how much time is spent.

Alex Tiahnybok:

And the developer of King's Cove agrees fully to compensate us for every dollar spent regardless of the total amount in the end?

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

Mike Pollocoff:

They have to. We don't have it.

TIAHNYBOK MOVED TO APPROVE AN AGREEMENT FOR ENGINEERING CONSULTANT SERVICES FOR THE KING'S COVE SUBDIVISION WITH CLARK DIETZ AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

I. Consider Agreement Engineering Consultant Services for the Woodfield Estates Subdivision.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, just like the previous item this would be an agreement between the Village of Pleasant Prairie and Clark Dietz for consultant services for construction of the Woodfield Estates Subdivision. Westfield is over north of Highway 50 on the west side of 88th Avenue. This is on the east side of 88th Avenue. It's on the screen.

Jean Werbie:

This is incorrect. Woodfield is actually on 39th Avenue adjacent to Mission Hills. That's Woodfield. Westfield is Doug Stanich's. We've already approved that and that's been final platted. This is actually Woodfield, Jerry Freeman's development on 39th Avenue just south of 110th Street just south of Mission Hills. So it should actually be Woodfield and the map shows Westfield and it should be Woodfield.

John Steinbrink:

Corrections will be made I take it.

Mike Pollocoff:

The document is correct. It shows Woodfield. It's significantly smaller. The development is estimated \$3,000 in engineering fees. I might add that the Village selects bids from qualified firms that we feel are competent to do the work. We have about three or four different firms that will do this engineering service for us. I'd recommend that the Village President and Clerk be authorized to enter into an agreement with Clark Dietz for the Woodfield development.

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE AN AGREEMENT ENGINEERING CONSULTANT SERVICES FOR THE WOODFIELD ESTATES SUBDIVISION WITH CLARK DIETZ AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

J. Consider Award of Contract to Purchase one Single Axle Chassis.

Mike Pollocoff:

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

Mr. President, sealed bids were received on February 14th at 2 p.m. and opened for the purchase of one single axle chassis for a dump truck snowplow. The low bid was submitted by Truck Country in the amount of \$55,824. The high bid was submitted by Lakeside International at \$59,637. I'd recommend that I be authorized to enter into a contract with Truck Country to purchase one single axle chassis in the amount of \$55,824.

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

So moved.

Mike Serpe:

I'll second that. Was this close to what we proposed in the budget?

Mike Pollocoff:

Under.

John Steinbrink:

We have a motion and a second. Further discussion?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

What type of truck?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

It's a Freightliner. It's the same as the last two that we purchased in 2005.

Mike Pollocoff:

Do you have the spread on the estimate to bid?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

What the spread was on the prices?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, the spread between the low bid and what was budgeted?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

I believe for the chassis and for the snowplow equipment we had budgeted \$120,000. I think this came in at around \$112,000. We were expecting a little bit more of an increase with the increase

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

of the price in the large amount of metals on the truck. But the price for the chassis was only \$400 greater from a 2005 to a 2006 so we were very happy with that.

Alex Tiahnybok:

A question for John Also. In our RFP's did we specify the model of the vehicle, or is it spec'd to attributes and not specifically to model?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Our specification is about 27 pages long of a detailed list of exactly what kind of tires, brake shoes, cam, horn, everything. So it's a very detailed specification to make sure we get exactly what we're looking for and what we pay for.

Alex Tiahnybok:

But not necessarily the model or the manufacturer?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

That's correct. It could be a Mac or a Ford or Sterling or Freightliner as long as they meet the specifications that are culled out in the bid package.

Alex Tiahnybok:

We do all our maintenance in house of the vehicles, etc.?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Yes, we do.

Alex Tiahnybok:

So if we spec all the brake equipment, hydraulics, etc., we're specing it according to our ability?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Right, and we want to make sure that it uses the same oil filter and same transmission filter. It has the same ply tires so we don't have to keep so much inventory for maintenance.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Okay, good.

KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO AWARD A CONTRACT TO TRUCK COUNTY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$55,824 TO PURCHASE ONE SINGLE AXLE CHASSIS; SECONDED BY SERPE; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

K. Consider Award of Contract to Purchase Snowplow Equipment.

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, on February 14th we received sealed bids for the purchase of snowplow equipment including dump body, front plow, side wing, hydraulic system, auger, spreader, liquid deicing tank and in cab controls mounted on the new chassis we just talked about. Two bids were received. The low bid was submitted by Monroe Truck Center in the amount of \$55,711. The high bid and only other bid was submitted by Casper Truck Equipment in the amount of \$58,395. I recommend I be authorized to enter into contract with Monroe Truck in an amount not to exceed \$55,711.

Jeff Lauer:

Just a quick question. I assume this falls under the budget amount or equal to?

Mike Pollocoff:

As John said before we're about \$5,000 under budget for the two items together.

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE AN AWARD OF CONTRACT TO MONROE TRUCK IN THE AMOUNT OF \$55,711 TO PURCHASE SNOW PLOW EQUIPMENT AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

L. Consider Award of Contract to Purchase Two Zero-Turn Lawn Mowers

Mike Pollocoff:

Mr. President, on February 14th sealed bids were opened for the purchase of two zero turn mowers less trade of our existing two mowers we have in our equipment list. Three bids were received. The low bid was submitted by Tractor Loader Sales to purchase two Kubota models in the amount of \$11,934. The high bid was submitted by Ninneman Trucks and Equipment, \$20,700. I'd recommend I be authorized to enter into a contract with Tractor Loader Sales to purchase two Kubota mowers in an amount not to exceed \$11,934.

Jeff Lauer:

Motion to approve.

Alex Tiahnybok:

I second.

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

John Steinbrink:

Motion and a second. Further discussion?

Steve Kumorkiewicz:

One question. How are we in the budget with this?

Mike Pollocoff:

This was under. This was significantly under.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Obviously the last bid doesn't include trade, but the first two items, tractor loader and Highway C do account for the trade in. Is that \$1,900 difference between the both of them, does it reflect \$1,900 more value in terms of the equipment? It looks like the recommended bid is the two Kubota ZD28F models. Is the model that was recommended by Highway C a better model than what we've got? I'm not looking to spend more money, but are we getting more bang for the buck and is it worth it?

John Steinbrink, Jr.:

Both of the lawnmowers from Highway C and Tractor Loader sales carried the same specifications. The final price difference was in the trade in amount. It's normally a combination of how much someone is willing to sell the lawnmower for and how much they're willing to give us for a trade.

Alex Tiahnybok:

Thanks.

LAUER MOVED TO APPROVE AN AWARD OF CONTRACTT WITH TRACTOR LOADER SALES TO PURCHASE TWO KUBOTA MOWERS IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$11,934; SECONDED BY TIAHNYBOK; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

M. Consent Agenda

- 1) Approve Staff Recommendation for Bartender License Applications on file.**
- 2) Approve LakeView Tech Request for Camping one night at Prairie Springs Park.**

SERPE MOVED TO APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS 1 AND 2 AS PRESENTED; SECONDED BY KUMORKIEWICZ; MOTION CARRIED 5-0.

8. ADJOURNMENT.

Village Board Meeting
February 20, 2006

**KUMORKIEWICZ MOVED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING; SECONDED BY LAUER;
MOTION CARRIED AND MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:55 P.M.**