

**PLEASANT PRAIRIE PLAN COMMISSION MEETING  
VILLAGE HALL AUDITORIUM  
9915 39TH AVENUE  
PLEASANT PRAIRIE, WISCONSIN  
5:00 P.M.  
February 26, 2007**

A regular meeting for the Pleasant Prairie Plan Commission convened at 5:00 p.m. on February 26, 2007. Those in attendance were Thomas Terwall; Michael Serpe; Donald Hackbarth; Wayne Koessler; Andrea Rode; Jim Bandura; John Braig; Larry Zarletti; and Judy Juliana. Also in attendance were Michael Pollocoff-Village Administrator; Jean Werbie, Community Development Director; Peggy Herrick-Asst. Planner/Zoning Administrator and Tom Shircel-Asst. Planner/Zoning Administrator.

1. **CALL TO ORDER.**
2. **ROLL CALL.**
3. **CORRESPONDENCE.**
4. **CITIZEN COMMENTS.**

Thomas Terwall:

If you're here to discuss or comment on any of the first four items on the agenda, those are public hearings. We would ask that you hold your comments until the public hearing is held so your comments can be incorporated as part of the official transcripts of that hearing. However, if you're here to discuss Item E or if you're here to raise a question about an item not on the agenda, now would be your opportunity to do so. We would ask that you step to the microphone and begin by giving us your name and address. Anybody wishing to speak under citizens' comments?

5. **NEW BUSINESS**

**A. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A FINAL PLAT, DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AND RELATED DOCUMENTS for the request of Mark Bourque, agent for Alfa Land LLC for the property generally located south of CTH C (Wilmot Road), 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. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission and audience, this first item on the agenda is the request of Mark Bourque, agent for Alfa Land LLC for the property generally located south of Wilmot Road and north of Bain Station Road at 94th Avenue for the proposed 81 single-family lot subdivision to be known as Ashbury Creek.

The Developer is requesting approval of the Final Plat for the proposed Ashbury Creek Subdivision. The property is located within a portion of the Prairie Ridge neighborhood. The neighborhood is generally located between Highway 50 and Bain Station Road, between 104th

Avenue and the Union Pacific Railway east of 88th Avenue. In accordance with the Village Comprehensive Plan, the neighborhood is classified as Upper-Medium Residential land use category which requires the average lot area per dwelling unit to fall within the range of 6,200 to just under 12,000 square feet per dwelling unit. The Ashbury Creek Concept Plan Preliminary Plat and the proposed final plat, which is on the agenda this evening, are all in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and the Prairie Ridge Neighborhood Plan.

For his residential development, the project consists of approximately 52 acres of land located within the south central portion of the Prairie Ridge neighborhood. The plat proposes to develop approximately 30 acres with 81 single family lots. Ten acres of land will be used for public road right of ways, and approximately ten acres will be designated as open space. The single family lots will range in size from 28,199 square feet to 12,611 square feet per lot. The average lot size in his development is 16,242 square feet which is just over a third of an acre.

Each of the lots meets and exceeds the minimum requirements of the R-4.5, Urban Single Family Residential District. The entire development provides for a net density of 2.1 units per net acre.

Under population projections, a total of 221 persons are likely to come from this development at its full build out. The Village provides copies of the proposed developments to the Kenosha Unified School District to assist them in their budgetary and long-range planning. 42 percent of the 81 households will generate 34 public school age children with this development at full build out.

Under open space, approximately ten acres or 19 percent of the site is proposed to remain in as open space. This includes wetlands and other areas of open space. Under wetlands, a total of 3.47 acres of the site have been field delineated as wetlands by Wetland and Waterway Consulting. That was done on August 10, 2004. It was approved by the Wisconsin DNR on January 19, 2005. A total of 2,300 square feet or .1 acre of wetlands is proposed to be filled with the construction of 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue. As you know, 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue serves as a collector street that will link Bain Station Road north across Wilmot Road and north all the way to Highway 50. Therefore, 3.37 acres of wetlands will remain on the property.

Under other open space, approximately six acres of other open space are located within outlots 1, 3 and 4. A portion of outlot 1 will be used for storm water retention facility for the development, and outlot 4 is proposed to be used for landscaping and signage. The developer's engineer has evaluated the development site, and based on actual field conditions has presented a storm water management plan that the Village has reviewed and approved.

In addition, and not included in the open space acres will be a 35 foot wide landscape easement along Bain Station Road and Wilmot Road as well as the industrial property to the north/northeast. A few trees will be removed as a result of this development. However, a number of the trees, most of the trees on this site are proposed to be preserved and placed within easement areas.

Site access for this project, the development will have one access point onto County Trunk Highway C or Wilmot Road at 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and one access point onto Bain Station Road at 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The other access point in the future will be 84<sup>th</sup> Place and that will link this development to the east.

Under public improvements, an additional 27 feet of right of way is being dedicated on Highway C for a total of a 100 foot wide right of way. An additional 15.25 feet of right of way is being dedicated on Bain Station Road by the developer for a future 85 foot wide right of way. Bypass and acceleration and deceleration lanes will be required on County Trunk Highway C at 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue and at Bain Station Road at 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue. All improvements will be made by the developer at the developer's expense.

Pursuant to the Village's Park and Open Space Plan, a bike lane will be constructed on Bain Station Road. The future on street bike lane will be constructed at the time that the Bain Station Road is widened. The developer will be responsible for the paying for their fair share of the widening Bain Station Road to an urban profile. These costs shall be paid to the Village as a condition of Final Plat and through the building process.

The entire development shall be serviced by municipal sanitary sewer, water and storm sewer. Again, this will be at the developer's cost.

- Municipal water shall be extended west on Bain Station Road from 88th Avenue adjacent to the development property adjacent to Bain Station Road. The water then shall loop though the Development and connect to the existing water main in CTH C at 94th Avenue.
- Municipal sanitary sewer shall be extended at the intersection of Bain Station Road and CTH C in Bain Station Road to the western portion of the property and extended into the development through an easement in Outlot 2 and between Lots 17 and 18 to service the entire site. Sanitary sewer shall be extended west of 94th Avenue in Bain Station Road to service Lots 44 and 45. 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 except to service Lots 44 and 45 because the depth of the sewer would not allow for the property to the south nor the east to be serviced. The agricultural land to the south and the east of the Subdivision would eventually be serviced by sewer in 88th Avenue or by a future extension running southeast from the vicinity of the Village Sewage Treatment Plant toward 93rd Street.

Under right of recovery, the developer is requesting the Village Board to approval a right-of-recovery for the extension of sanitary sewer to service vacant lands to the east of the development. For the abutting area south of Bain Station Road a right-of-recovery could be afforded to the developer for the sewer/water improvements installed in Bain Station Road, if permitted by state statues and if approved by the Board. However, pursuant to Section 91.15 of the Wisconsin State Statues entitled, Exemption from Special Assessments, a Village may not impose special assessments for sewer, water, lights or non-farm drainage on land zoned for exclusively agricultural purposes. However, land covered by this exemption shall be denied the use of these improvements created by the special assessment as long as the land has a recorded agreement under this subchapter or the land is zoned for exclusive agricultural use

Under zoning amendment, on February 6, 2006 the Village Board adopted an ordinance which rezoned the property from the M-2, Heavy Manufacturing District, C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District, and A-1, Agricultural Preservation District. The zoning map amendment rezoned the property as follows: The field delineated wetlands were placed into the C-1 category; the non-wetland areas in outlots 1 and 3 were zoned PR-1, Park and Recreation District; the single family lots, outlot 4 and the adjacent right of way within the property were placed into the

R-4.5 District; and outlot 2 remained as Agricultural Preservation District. Again, that outlot 2 is that narrow strip of land that is along the east of 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue north of Bain Station Road.

With that, this is a matter for public hearing. Again, we are seeing it as the final plat, development agreement and all the related documents. At this point everything is in order. They do need to follow up with some final approvals which would be done normally between the time that it comes before the Village Board after Plan Commission approval and before the Village Board's approval. The developer has representatives in the audience if you'd like to ask any questions and this is a matter for public hearing.

Thomas Terwall:

Mark, anything you wanted to add?

Mark Bourque:

Good evening, Mark Bourque, Prudential Premier Properties, 6040 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Just a few things to add that may be of interest. Our covenants will require an 1,800 square foot minimum ranch which is a slight increase from the time we were here for the preliminary plat. Two story minimum will be 2,000 square foot. And based on our calculations we expect the average to be about 2,600 square foot. The covenants will still require all natural exterior materials and, of course, a host of other conditions to enhance the values. Timing we do expect to get started as early as later next month in March with to be completed to wrap up phase 1 improvements by early summer. That's about it. Thank you very much.

Thomas Terwall:

Mark, one question. Will property owners be allowed to select their own builder?

Mark Bourque:

Yes. As you're aware, we do have a construction division, PX3 Construction Associates, however it is open to all builders. So we'll offer our building services through that other division, however it's not going to be a requirement.

Thomas Terwall:

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

John Braig:

A reference was made to storm sewer service but there was no indication how it's going to be done. My question is will storm water be removed from the site by pipe, buried pipe, or through a flow through ditches and to the nearest river?

Jean Werbie:

Are you addressing the developer and he can come up and answer the question? Or, the staff can pull out the plans?

John Braig:

Is the staff aware of it or can the developer answer the question?

Mark Bourque:

Mark Bourque again for the record. The entire project is being serviced by storm sewer pipe. And the entire drainage pattern of this particular land goes from the northeast at its high point down to this wetland complex at its low point, almost evenly like this. So all that pipe will eventually end up into this pre-basin which then drains into the regular retention basin, then is managed through control outlets into this wetland complex. Are you looking for any more than that?

John Braig:

No, that's good. The second question, looking at lot 52, if I were to buy that I would love to have my garage on the south side of the property with a driveway entering from the south from 84<sup>th</sup> Place, and yet I see a note here that no property owner shall use 84<sup>th</sup> Place right of way for their personal use or for a driveway. I'm curious as to why that restriction is there.

Mark Bourque:

Until such time as the neighboring development is constructed that roadway is going to be a dedicated right of way but will not be improved. So as a result people will not be able to install a driveway on the side. They will be notified of that as such if they chose to buy the lot and build prior to the completion of that improvement on 84<sup>th</sup>.

John Braig:

With today's weather you can get my point. I have a north facing driveway. Of course, my neighbor across the street has a south facing driveway, and there's a world of difference as to how the snow can be removed and how the driveway clears and melts and dries up. As I'm looking at this I can see the advantage of having a driveway to the south there. It's not important I guess.

Mark Bourque:

Perhaps ideally, yes, I would tend to agree with you, Mr. Braig. However, as a result we don't want to have Village municipal vehicles backing up. It would be a dead end road. It's not really desirable or feasible to construct temporary turnarounds or key turnarounds so, therefore, it was decided and determined that the best course was to not improve that roadway for the time being.

Donald Hackbarth:

I don't know if Pleasant Prairie is immune to this, but looking at the national trends on residential building, where do we stand in regard to national statistics? Because housing markets tend to be down, and I don't know if we're building something that is not going to be built?

Mark Bourque:

This will be built.

Donald Hackbarth:

No, just plain building homes, residential homes, because the market is kind of flat I believe right now around the country.

Mark Bourque:

I'm not an economist, Mr. Hackbarth, however I am of the belief that what we're seeing is a temporary correction in the market, probably a healthy correction at that. We're in a conservative Midwestern community. We've never seen the huge gains that were realized in some other parts of the country, Florida, California, Arizona. Some of those markets realized appreciable values in excess of 30 percent annually for a few years in a row. They were likely to see what was commonly called the bubble burst. I don't know if it actually burst but it certainly was a prick in that bubble that occurred last year. We're realizing a ripple effect of that and our markets are down here I think 15 percent right now on average. However, my expectation or perhaps hope is that we'll be seeing steady improvements in that condition until we reach normalization which would be back to the way things were last year probably this summer. Our project is expected to begin construction in March, complete late June. We should time fairly well with hitting the market. There's nothing economically that's changed in this geographic area that would cause people not to want to continue to buy homes.

Donald Hackbarth:

Because what I'm saying is if you go out west on Highway 50 there's just a lot of development going around. You get across the I and I was wondering if-

Mark Bourque:

But we're in Pleasant Prairie.

Donald Hackbarth:

I understand. The other question I have, Jean, is could you refresh me again, on one of the slides you had there you said that 221 persons could be realized from this development, 51 school age children, 34 public school age children. What's the disparity or what's the difference between school age children and public school children? Is it parochial school?

Jean Werbie:

Yes. 23 percent of our population is children but not all of the children go to public schools. A percentage goes to private schools.

Mike Serpe:

Mark, what John Braig brought up about lot 52 and lot 51 the portion where the right of way is going to go in between those two lots that's going to look like an empty lot, is that correct? And the reason I bring that up is at some time in the future when this thing expands towards Alpha Laval, if it ever does, people are going to say wait a minute, I didn't know I was going to be on a corner lot.

Mark Bourque:

We recognize that problem. I guess we've seen it with some other developments, not ours. And we're actually going to be posting a sign there that this is a dedicated public right of way for the purposes of the future, 84<sup>th</sup> Place. There's going to literally be a large sign there and we're going to delineate it as best we can even beyond that sign. We're making certain covenants that, no, it can't be used. It's going to be grass, lawn. The association is even going to go to the process of maintaining that. We're going to do our best to prevent what had occurred in perhaps some other projects.

Jim Bandura:

Mark, is that written into your covenants?

Mark Bourque:

It is written into the covenants very specifically. And more specifically the two neighboring lots that would be affected by this are going to even have further specific language in their contracts related to that issue.

Mike Serpe:

Good, thank you.

Thomas Terwall:

Good idea.

Jean Werbie:

Correct me if I'm wrong, Mark, but also aren't we running the curb line straight through so that 94<sup>th</sup> Avenue will have a straight curb, or are we doing the returns and then doing a type three barricade? I'd have to go back to the engineering plans to check. One or the other.

Mark Bourque:

I believe we decided that we're going to do the curbs and that was going to help delineate specifically so the curbs are going to be in. I can't be 100 percent certain on that. I just don't recall with that specificity. But we're doing something to that effect.

Jean Werbie:

In any effect, we might do the type three barricades just so that it doesn't become a dumping ground at the end or people don't go down there to go off roading.

Mark Bourque:

We're going to plan on placing a sign right at the right of way of 94<sup>th</sup>. We weren't going to put it back further.

Thomas Terwall:

Anything further?

John Braig:

We've kicked this thing around a number of times. I've got my licks in about the trees and everything else. I can't find anything else to find fault on this thing. With that I'd move approval.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

**MOTION BY JOHN BRAIG AND A SECOND BY MIKE SERPE TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE FINAL PLAT AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AND RELATED DOCUMENTS SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.**

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered.

**B. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A CONCEPTUAL PLAN for the request of Russ Swanson, agent for Westminster Swanson Land Partners,**



**LLC for the proposed 112 single family lot residential development to be known as Stonebridge Farms located south of 93rd Street and west of Cooper Road.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman, I am going to request that we take Items B and C one right after another. I'll make a presentation on B, and I can make a presentation on C, but then I'm going to be asking the engineer who has worked on a traffic study that impacts both developments to make his presentation so that you can see the interrelation of the traffic in that area on those two developments. So if I can, I'd like to entertain Item C as well and I'll make two separate presentations, then I'll introduce the traffic engineer then he can make a presentation. We can talk about them separately, but some of the items between the two subdivisions, even though they're totally different developers, they do interrelate because one needs services from the other and both of them are impacting the adjacent arterials.

John Braig:

So moved.

Jim Bandura:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

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

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? Motion carried.

**C. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A PRELIMINARY PLAT for the request of Kari Kittermaster, agent for Regency Hills-Devonshire, LLC for property generally located south of 93rd Street between 48th Avenue and Cooper Road for the proposed 120 single-family lot subdivision to be known as Devonshire.**

Jean Werbie:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Plan Commission and the audience, the first item is Item B, Public hearing and consideration of a conceptual plan. And this is the request of Russ Swanson, agent for Westminster Swanson Land Partners, LLC for the proposed 112 single family lot residential development to be known as Stonebridge Farms located south of 93rd Street and west of Cooper Road.

I'm going to start with the Village Comprehensive Plan Compliance for this development. In accordance with the Village Comprehensive Plan, the Village Green Neighborhood Plan, this area is classified as being within a Low Density Residential land use category which means that the lots in this subdivision need to be averaging 19,000 square feet or more per dwelling unit. This allows for areas of the Neighborhood to have larger lots while some areas to have smaller lots. On February 13, 2006, the Plan Commission held a public hearing and approved a revised Neighborhood Plan for the Village Green Neighborhood. The proposed Stonebridge Conceptual Plan complies with the that Village Green Neighborhood Plan.

Residential development within the Stonebridge Farms Subdivision, approximately 70 acres of land are proposed to be developed into 112 single-family lots and 7 Outlots. The subdivision is proposed to be developed in at least two stages. The Stage 1 of Stonebridge will include Lots 1 through 62 and provide for a 55th Avenue connection to 93rd Street and a 97th Street connection from Village Green Heights Addition #1 as Cooper Road, Cooper Road will connect to the south into Village Green Heights and access to 97th Street. So there's a number of things going on just so that you're not confused here. Each of these developments is interrelated.

On the very northwest corner is 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue and it connects into 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. Now, their stage 1 is everything to the far east side of their development, and as you can see it runs north/south. But a portion of Cooper Road is not going to be developed with their first stage, and it's not being developed with the first stage of Devonshire. So their other connection is actually Cooper Road at the very southeast corner. And as you can see, there's a road that goes to the east, and that's 97<sup>th</sup>, which will link through Devonshire and then go to Meadowdale Estates, and then the other connection is Cooper Road to the south and to the Village Green Heights Development. All of these developments are under construction at the same time, but as you know Meadowdale is completed with respect to the their initial improvements. Village Green Heights is almost completed. Devonshire will happen next and then Stonebridge will happen next. So each of them will have interconnecting roads from one subdivision to the other so everyone will have at least two points of connection if not more as each development proposed continues through the process.

The single family lots in this subdivision range in size from 15,000 square feet to 30,362 square feet per lot with the average lot size just under 17,000 square feet per lot. Along Cooper Road, a lot line adjustment is proposed between the adjacent land Developers of Devonshire and Stonebridge so that Outlot 8 would be transferred from the Stonebridge to Devonshire development and Lots 60 and 61 would be located entirely within the Stonebridge development.

So what's happening, again a little unusual, is that there is an area here and an area down here that criss-crosses the two properties, and so two lots are going to go to one development and two lots are going to go to another development.

Each of the lots meets or exceed the minimum requirements of the R-4, Urban Single Family Residential District, which requires each lot to be a minimum of 15,000 square feet with 90 feet of frontage.

Outlots 1 and 2, Peggy is going to show you on the wall where these are. Outlots 1 and 2 are proposed to be dedicated to the Homeowner's Association. The Outlots shall be labeled as Dedicated by the Developer to the Homeowner's Association for Open Space, Tree Protection and Preservation, Access and Maintenance Purposes.

Outlot 3 is proposed to be dedicated to the Homeowner's Association. And this one will be for open space, wetland protection and preservation, floodplain protection and preservation, woodland protection and preservation, storm water management, retention basin, access and maintenance.

Outlot 4 is proposed to be dedicated to the Homeowner's Association for storm water drainage, retention basin, access and maintenance easement purposes.

Outlot 5 is proposed to be transferred to the Homeowner's Association and, again, this one will be for wetland protection and preservation, woodland protection and preservation, access and maintenance.

Outlots 6 and 7 are proposed to be dedicated to the Village of Pleasant Prairie. The Outlots shall be labeled as dedicated to the developer for public park, trail, open space, access and maintenance purposes. And there will also be a portion of Outlot 6 that will be dedicated for wetland preservation, protection and storm water management purposes. And Outlot 8 is proposed to be transferred by the developer of Devonshire for single family development purposes.

The entire development provides for a net density of 2.25 units per net acre.

Under population projections at full build out, there would be 112 dwelling units or 306 persons or 70 school age children or 47 public school age children.

Under zoning map amendment, the properties are currently zoned R-4 (ALHO). That's an Urban Single Family Residential District with an Agricultural Landholding Overlay District, and a portion is also zoned FPO. Towards the north there's a floodplain overlay district. A zoning map amendment and a floodplain boundary adjustment will be required to develop this property as proposed.

A Zoning Map Amendment will be required to rezone the field delineated wetlands into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District. There's a very, very small portion of a wetland at the very northeastern corner that they are proposing to be filled on Lot 96. All of the wetlands that are in Outlots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 will be zoned into the C-1, but the nonwetland area will be put into the PR-1, Park and Recreation. The rezoning is proposed to be requested at the time the Preliminary Plat. The 100-year floodplain is proposed to be amended at the time of the Preliminary Plat as well.

Under open space within this development, approximately 11.9 acres or 17 percent of the site is proposed to remain in open space. The open space within the development includes public park, floodplain, wetlands, woodlands and other open space.

Under public parkland, the developer is proposing to dedicate Outlots 6 and 7 which is just under two acres to the Village for the Village Green Neighborhood Park. A wooded 9.36 acres of land to the east of this development within the Meadowdale Estates Addition #1 Subdivision was already dedicated to the Village for park purposes, and the developers of the Village Green Heights Addition #1 Subdivision have also dedicated 6.62 acres for parkland south of this development. The developers of the Devonshire Subdivision have also agreed to dedicate 8.02 acres of land. So as you can see, with the cooperation of all of the developers within this

particular area, we've got approximately 24.5 acres of land that are going to be dedicated for the Village Green Neighborhood Park.

The wetlands on this particular site, .86 acres of this site have been field delineated as wetlands. They were done so by Hey and Associates. They were staked except for the wetlands in Outlot 6 on November 23, 2004, and on April 5, 2005, and approved by the Wisconsin DNR on August 30, 2005. And Wetland and Waterway Consulting staked the remaining wetlands on Outlot 6 on September 26 and October 1, 2002, and the DNR approved these wetlands on January 21, 2003. Just as we discussed previously, all these wetlands are valid for five years so they would need to final plat their development by that point or the wetlands would need to be redelineated and reverified by the Wisconsin DNR. A total of 319 square feet of wetlands are proposed to be filled. Again, it's for a very small area of 94<sup>th</sup> Street and a tiny little corner of Lot 21. The developer will be required to obtain permits from the Army Corps of Engineers and the DNR to fill the wetlands. This will be a condition to be satisfied as part of the preliminary plat process.

Under 100 year floodplain, approximately 2.59 acres in the northern portion of the site is located within the 100 year floodplain. No public roadways or lots can be located within the 100 year floodplain. Therefore, the developers have indicated that they are going to be doing a floodplain boundary adjustment. Again, what that means is that they're going to fill in a small portion of floodplain, but they need to create that equal volume of wetlands contiguous to the area that's being filled. And they will be going through that process and be requesting approval from the DNR as well as from the Federal Emergency Management Agency for that approval.

Once the floodplain boundary adjustment as been approved, five full sets and a reduced set of the revised plans and six copies will need to be submitted to the Village so that we can finalize the process through the Village of Pleasant Prairie. The plans will need to clearly illustrate the area to be added to the floodplain and the area to be removed. Again, approximately 3.27 acres of floodplain with the same or greater storage capacity will be located on the site after the adjustment is completed.

Under woodlands, a detailed tree survey for the site was prepared. Some of the trees greater than eight inches in diameter will be removed. However, approximately six acres of wooded areas within outlots are going to be preserved. In addition, along the rear lot lines, and you can kind of see that on the slide, Lots 14 through 25, 29, 31 and 71-85 all the trees along the rear portions of these lots will be preserved through tree preservation easements. I know a question came up once before, once these easements are identified on the plat We Energies and others that are looking to put other easements will look to see that there are already preservation areas, so they won't place their easements over those easement areas. They will have to bring utilities into the site to service the subdivision in a different manner.

Under other open space, approximately 6.28 acres of other open space is located within the development. A portion of Outlots 3 and 4 will be used for storm water retention facilities. The developer's engineer will need to continue to evaluate the development site based on actual field conditions. He has already presented a storm water management plan to the Village for the staff's review and approval. An off site retention basin is proposed for a portion of stage 2. Easements will need to be obtained for construction of any off site basins or grading that will be needed for this development to proceed.

In addition and not included in the open space is a dedicated 35 foot wide landscape access and maintenance easement that will be located along 93<sup>rd</sup> Street along Lot 29. As a part of this process, detailed landscaping plans will need to be submitted and reviewed.

Under site access as I mentioned previously, the development will have that one access point from 93<sup>rd</sup> Street at 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue. There will be three other access points to the east at 94<sup>th</sup> Street, 96<sup>th</sup> Street and 97<sup>th</sup> Street where these will intersection Cooper Road, and then this will connect into the Devonshire Development to the east. Additional access points are also located at 94<sup>th</sup>, 96<sup>th</sup> and 97<sup>th</sup> Street as this subdivision will connect to the lands to the west when that area does develop. In addition, Cooper Road will connect to the south as mentioned previously to the Village Green Heights Addition #1 Subdivision which will eventually connect down to Highway 165.

Under public improvements, municipal water, water will be extended into the development from 93<sup>rd</sup> Street throughout the development and connect to municipal water in 94<sup>th</sup>, 96<sup>th</sup> and 97<sup>th</sup> Streets to the east and Cooper Road to the south. Again, all the extensions of municipal improvements will be at the developer's cost. Municipal water shall be extended in all roadways to the property boundary lines. Fire flow information shall be provided to verify the need to loop water from 96<sup>th</sup> Street south on Cooper Road to 97<sup>th</sup> Street as part of the stage 1 of Stonebridge's Development.

For municipal sanitary sewer it will be extended into the development from the east at 94<sup>th</sup> and 96<sup>th</sup> Streets from Cooper Road and from 96<sup>th</sup> Street to the south to service Lots 62 and 63. Municipal sanitary sewer shall be extended in all roadways to all property boundaries. Sanitary sewer may not be required to be installed in 93<sup>rd</sup> Street from the east adjacent to the property. Again, typically we put in boundary mains, but in the event that it can't service a particular area, then those mains would not be required. The existing properties on the north side of 93<sup>rd</sup> Street would eventually need to be serviced by municipal sanitary sewer, however, the exact location of the sanitary sewer to service these lots shall be evaluated and determined if sanitary sewer is not required to be extended. So they have to do a little bit more work to evaluate how the area can be completely serviced by sanitary sewer. Again, we're still at the preliminary stages of the conceptual plan.

Storm sewer will be provided throughout the development and retention facilities will be located within Outlots 3 and 4 at the first stage of their development.

Under roadway improvements, in order to efficiently, effectively and safely move traffic into, out of and throughout the subdivision, multiple roadway connections to 93<sup>rd</sup> Street as well as other future connections to the proposed Devonshire Development to the east and proposed development to the west and to the south are all being contemplated with this development.

With respect to 93<sup>rd</sup> Street, and I'm just going to be touching on it briefly right now, formerly known as County Trunk Highway T, it's classified as a local arterial. Pursuant to the Village's Long Range Transportation Plan, 93<sup>rd</sup> Street should be improved and widened to increase the roadway capacity when traffic counts and new developments warrant the improvements. As part of the conceptual plan for the proposed Devonshire Development, the Village Board required that a detailed traffic study be completed to determine the future roadway profile for 93<sup>rd</sup> Street and to evaluate if the traffic warranted a four way stop, a signalized intersection or a roundabout at the intersection of 93<sup>rd</sup> Street and Cooper Road based on future traffic counts.

The Developers of Devonshire contracted with Wayne Higgins with Traffic Engineering Services, to prepare a traffic study report. The traffic report after I complete the Devonshire presentation will be presented by Wayne Higgins. Now, the Village staff sat down with both Devonshire and the Stonebridge Developers several times over the last couple of weeks to talk to them about working together to complete this traffic study so that there could be one presentation made to the Plan Commission and to the Board. So that's why Mr. Higgins was retained, and he is actually going to be making the presentation taking into account traffic not only from Devonshire but the Stonebridge Development as well as off site traffic that's coming to that particular area which includes Village Green and traffic coming from the north on Cooper Road and east and west on 93<sup>rd</sup>.

A couple other things I wanted to mention is Cooper Road is an important local arterial for all proposed developments in the area including Stonebridge, the Village Green Heights Development and Devonshire. Each of these developments needs this connection in order to provide adequate access to their respective developments. Each developer will dedicate their respective portions of Cooper Road to the Village. Stonebridge will dedicate Cooper Road as part of the first stage of the development, and Devonshire will dedicate Cooper Road as part of the second stage of their development, and Village Green has already dedicated their portions of Cooper Road.

It's been identified that Cooper Road will be designed with a 49 foot back of curb to back of curb urban profile within an 80 foot wide right of way with a five foot sidewalk constructed on the east side of Cooper Road, and the sidewalk will extend from 93<sup>rd</sup> down south into the Village Green Neighborhood Park area.

For the Stonebridge Development, they have a connection on 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue with 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. This intersection would be approximately 1,150 feet from the center line of the 93<sup>rd</sup> Street intersection of Cooper Road. 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue would align with the property lines of the properties to the north. Pursuant to the Village's transportation requirements, new public streets need to have a certain separation spacing and this road does meet that separation spacing. One of the items that we did identify is that acceleration and deceleration lanes would need to be installed at this intersection to allow for save and easy turning movements into 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

I am going to jump ahead at this time to construction access. Construction access for the installation of public improvements and house construction will be 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue. No construction access will be allowed from 97<sup>th</sup> Street from the east or Cooper Road from the south.

Then, finally, I wanted to add that a fiscal impact analysis will need to be completed by the Village for the proposed development like we have with other developments. The Village staff is aggressively working on completing the analysis for this development. The developer has willingly agreed to donate the park acreage and to pay for the portion of costs associated with the development in grading of the Village Green Park. In addition, there are impact fees and the developer is also paying for all of the improvements with respect to this development in his site and to cost share with Devonshire on 93<sup>rd</sup> Street.

So with that, that is the conceptual plan for Stonebridge. What I'd like to do now is present the preliminary plat information for the next item on the agenda which is the Devonshire Subdivision. And upon that presentation, I would like to introduce the engineer for us to listen to all of the details with respect to the traffic study work that was completed for this area.

The next item on the agenda then is the preliminary plat. It's actually two items, the preliminary plat and the zoning map amendment for the proposed Devonshire Subdivision.

**D. PUBLIC HEARING AND CONSIDERATION OF A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT for the request of Kari Kittermaster, agent for Regency Hills-Devonshire, LLC for property generally located south of 93rd Street between 48th Avenue and Cooper Road to rezone the field delineated wetlands (except the 0.73 acres of wetlands proposed to be filled) into the C-1, Lowland Resource Conservancy District; to rezone the non-wetland areas or the single family lots and Outlots 7 and 9 into the R-4 Urban Single Family Residential District; and to rezone the non-wetland areas within Outlots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 10 into the PR-1, Park and Recreational District in the proposed Devonshire Subdivision.**

Jean Werbie:

This subdivision is generally located south of 93<sup>rd</sup> Street between 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Cooper Road within the Village Green Neighborhood. This is the subdivision located immediately to the east of Stonebridge. The development proposes to create 120 single family lots in two stages. In accordance with the Village's Comprehensive Plan, the Village Green Neighborhood is classified as a low density residential land use category and has lots that average 19,000 square feet or more per dwelling unit.

On February 13, 2006, the Plan Commission held a public hearing and approved the neighborhood plan, and the proposed Devonshire Conceptual Plan complies with that neighborhood plan and the Conceptual Plan was approved by the Board on July 17, 2006.

Under residential development, 89.45 acres of land are proposed to be developed into the single family lots and ten outlots. The single family lots range in size from 15,000 square feet to 21,593 square feet per lot. The average lot size is 16,409 square feet. All of the lots meet or exceed the minimum R-4 size lots for this area.

Outlots 7 and 9 are proposed to be subdivided into additional single family lots when Cooper Road is extended and additional land is obtained from the adjacent developer.

Outlot 2 is proposed to be dedicated to the Village of Pleasant Prairie for park, trail, open space access and maintenance purposes. There will also be within Outlot 2 wetland preservation, storm water drainage, access and maintenance. Outlots 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 10 are proposed to be dedicated to the Homeowner's Association, and depending on where the outlot is located they will be dedicated for open space, tree protection, tree preservation, access and maintenance purposes. Those areas that are identified as wetlands will be preserved and dedicated as easements for those purposes.

The entire development has a net density of 2.16 units per net acres. Under population projections, based on the currently shown 120 lots it is projected that at full build out 328 persons will be added to the population. The subdivision would likely generate 75 school age children and 50 public school age children are likely to come from this development at full build out.

Open space within the development, approximately 18.45 acres of 21 percent of the site is proposed to remain in open space, and this includes public park, wetlands, woodlands, retention areas and other open space. Within the wetlands category a total of 7.81 acres of the site have been field delineated as wetlands. A total of 31,908 square feet or a .73 acre of wetlands is proposed to be filled for very small areas of public roadways such as Cooper Road, 96<sup>th</sup> and 97<sup>th</sup> Street and 50<sup>th</sup> Court. Therefore, over seven acres of wetlands will remain on the property and will be protected.

Under woodlands, a detailed tree survey was prepared by Natural Resources Consulting. There will be some trees removed that are located within the proposed right of way, however over seven acres of woodland will be preserved including 1.04 acres of wooded areas located within lots and an additional 611 acres of woodlands that have been placed within outlots. In addition, similar to the last subdivision there are tree preservation and protection easements that will be located on lots 27 through 31, 53, 61, 107, 111 through 120 and within Outlots 1, 2, 4 and 6 through 10. The easements will be legally described on the plat and shown on the engineering plans. As with the last development there will be penalties imposed by the Association and placed in the restricted covenants if trees are removed without any permission.

Under parkland, the developer is proposing to dedicate Outlot 2 which is just over 8 acres to the Village of Pleasant Prairie for the Village Green Neighborhood Public Park. The developer has also offered to donate \$200,000 for park related improvements. A wooded 9.36 acres of land, again as I mentioned previously, was previously donated by VK Development with the Meadowdale Estates Addition #1. Village Green Heights Addition #1 developers also dedicated over six, almost 7, acres of land for the park. And Stonebridge is looking to dedicate land, so total in this area we've got just under 25 acres of public park that's been dedicated by the developers.

With respect to site access, the development will have two access points onto 93<sup>rd</sup> Street, one at 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and one at Cooper road, and one access point to the east at 97<sup>th</sup> Street connecting to the Meadowdale Estates Subdivision. Additional access points are located at 94<sup>th</sup> and 96<sup>th</sup> Streets to the west. And this will occur when the Stonebridge Farms Development moves forward. In addition, Cooper Road will connect to the south to Village Green Heights Addition #1 Subdivision, and that will leak eventually to Highway 165.

As I mentioned previously, Cooper Road is an important arterial for Devonshire as well as all the developments in this area, and Devonshire, along with all the other project developers, are all going to be dedicating parts of Cooper Road for its eventual construction.

Under the staging plan, the first stage of Devonshire will include Lots 1 through 63, and it will provide access to 93<sup>rd</sup> Street at 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and access to 97<sup>th</sup> Street to the east. 97<sup>th</sup> Street to the west will connect to Cooper Road, again, with that first stage of Stonebridge Farms. Therefore, the connection of Village Green Heights Addition #1 to Cooper Road and 97<sup>th</sup> Street east of 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue or west of 55<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be accomplished and all of the developments will have interconnected access. The second stage of Devonshire will include the remaining lots, lots 64 through 120, and the construction of Cooper Road.

Under public improvements, public water will be extended into the development from 93<sup>rd</sup> Street throughout the development and connect to municipal water in 97<sup>th</sup> Street to the east. Municipal sanitary sewer will be extended from the existing sewer located at the intersection of 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 93<sup>rd</sup> Street throughout the development and to the sanitary sewer in the Meadowdale Estates



Addition #1 at 97<sup>th</sup> Street and through an easement in Lots 19 and 20 and Outlot 1. Storm sewer will be provided throughout the development and retention facilities will be located within Outlots 1 and 3.

Under roadway improvements, as mentioned previously Cooper Road is proposed to be widened within an 80 foot wide right of way with a five foot wide sidewalk constructed on the east side. I'm not going to go into the 93<sup>rd</sup> Street discussion. I think I will save that for when the transportation engineer does his presentation.

A couple of other things that I'd like to mention. The first thing is construction access. A 93<sup>rd</sup> Street construction access for installation of public improvements and house construction will be through Lot 89 to 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue will not be used as a construction access. Construction equipment will be allowed at 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue in order to construct the underground utilities and the roadway at that location, but that main connection through Lot 89 will provide access for the development to the property until Cooper Road is built. All grading required for 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue behind the curb will be done within the dedicated road right of way, and no grading will occur on adjacent properties east and west of proposed 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Under zoning map amendment the properties are currently zoned R-4. A portion of the R-4 area also has an AGO, which is a general agricultural overlay district, and an ALHO, agricultural landholding overlay district, and UHO district, and a portion is also zoned C-1. A zoning map amendment is proposed to rezone the field delineated wetlands into the C-1 classification. Again, that's the Lowland Resource Conservancy District. Non wetland areas within the outlots will be put into the PR-1, Park and Recreation District. The residential area will be placed into the R-4, Urban Single Family Residential District.

As with the previous development, a fiscal impact analysis shall be completed by the Village staff for the proposed Devonshire Development as it relates to the amount of Village tax dollars collected from the development. The staff has worked with the developer and they have agreed to donate eight acres of parkland and provide a \$200,000 park-related improvement donation. They have also agreed to collect and pay the necessary impact fees for this particular development through a cost sharing agreement and impact fee requirements of the Village.

That is an overview of the two different developments, Stonebridge and Devonshire. With that, I'd like to introduce Wayne Higgins, and he is the transportation consultant that was hired cooperatively by Devonshire with the support by the Village and with Stonebridge to evaluate 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. Primarily we're looking adjacent to these two developments, but he has looked beyond just these limits in order to do his complete analysis.

Wayne Higgins:

As said, I'm Wayne Higgins. I'm President of Traffic Engineering Services in Elm Grove. I was asked to look at the traffic impacts and we have a little slide show from the traffic impact study to go through showing you how we develop the traffic impact analysis, what specific things were included in this particular development scenario with multiple development, not just the two that are on the public hearing. And also we try in our work to look at the safety and term LOS gets thrown out there, and if I use it accidentally it means level of service which is a measure of how free flowing the traffic is and how safely much like grades in school that F is failure and A is

doing a tremendous job. Like you drive at two o'clock on the Interstate it isn't that good, but on Highway 31 it might be.

Let's look at the first slide here. This is, again, something that you've already seen. It's the Village Green Neighborhood Plan, which takes into account that we not only are looking at developments east and west of extended Cooper Road, but we've taken into account all of the developments to the south all the way to 165. Next slide please. This location is falling within the 93<sup>rd</sup> Street access which is our east/west connection from 31 to 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue and points further to the east. Cooper Road as it is now only draws traffic to 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. This is a very important element, because as this is connected to 165<sup>th</sup> character changes will occur. We have tried to include those in our recommendations, but we do not have a true projection from the global map except for the next slide.

This aerial is just an example to show you that substantial development exists to the north of the site. As we get into the development staging and the neighborhood plan, keep going forward, you've seen the staging plan already. One thing I want to point out is by having phase 2 in the second position Cooper Road is not at the front end of construction giving us the time we need to do the job right. That's very important.

Here we've taken a picture of the Wisconsin DOT 24 hour traffic volumes. If your eyes are as good as mine I can read nothing that's on there, so I'm going to turn to my exhibit just to help me give you some numbers. This was recounted in 2005, and the numbers that are shown on there in kind of the bronze color are 2005 numbers. The numbers that are black such as here at 93<sup>rd</sup> and Cooper are 2002, three years earlier.

We have a significant item to look at and that is 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue, either side of 93<sup>rd</sup>, is running over 8,000 vehicles a day in 2005. I want you to keep that in mind because when we get to the exhibit that shows projections of traffic for Cooper Road and 93<sup>rd</sup> that is a good handle for you to put into your mind about how things are operating out there today on 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue with four lanes. It is a significant input for this decision.

We have 2,500 cars but that was in 2002, not 2005, on 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. Just before we get to 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue there is a 2005 number of 3,100 vehicles, so quite obviously this 2,500 is elevated to an excess of 3,000. We look at the history, this shows us that history on 93<sup>rd</sup> Street what we have on either side Cooper Road values are only shown at the top. And it's important to note that up near 85<sup>th</sup> Street Cooper Road in 2005 is operating at 3,400 vehicles a day.

This shows the long range plan which starts giving us better perspective in terms of the traffic that we will be dealing with as Cooper Road is extended. We have 10,000 vehicles a day on Cooper Road immediately north of 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. We have 7,000 and 6,000 vehicles either side of Cooper Road in your long range plan. The omission is there is no number assigned to Cooper Road between the two. But the easy logic is if I've got 10,000 here and a difference of 1,000 here, 9,000 are going to be in this section. So you need to design a roadway and intersection that will handle not too far disbursed type balance volume and that's a positive statement for a roundabout. So that's one of the big picture items that we want to work with.

As we go through the traffic impact study it's very important for us to do detail, and I don't intend to take you through the detail. I only want you to see the picture of where things came from as we started through this. In 2016 we have taken a straight line projection and come up with what

the traffic volumes will be in the peak hours at these two intersections, 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Cooper Road on 93<sup>rd</sup> Street.

The next slide has a graphic in the corner here that I'm not going to go into but I want you to know it's there. Each of the developments that we looked at between 165<sup>th</sup> and 93<sup>rd</sup> Street is listed here and it's 24 hour traffic as distributed back to 93<sup>rd</sup> Street and Cooper Road, so we can start getting a picture of what this impact is leading us towards that future operation.

In each of the developments we take the number of units by type of unit that it's going to be and we add in the statistical projection from the Institute of Transportation engineers for how many vehicles are going to be 24 hours a day and then break them down to the a.m. and the p.m. peak hour how many entering and how many exists, and those are carried through for our analysis by each individual . . . . This is the new development that's just related to Devonshire. There is a sheet for each development all carried forward to give us the understanding of operations from 55<sup>th</sup> to 48<sup>th</sup> on 93<sup>rd</sup> Street.

The new development trips are all combined, and we then have an exhibit that gives us 2016 traffic. The 2016 traffic is where we do our big analysis. The analysis is about a third of the book. It's one of those things you don't want to read. It's not even good bedtime reading. The significant things are as you put in the number of traffic . . . and the traffic volumes how is it going to operate and under what kind of conditions do we want to evaluate. We wanted to evaluate Cooper Road and 93<sup>rd</sup> Street as a four-way stop. It is a three-way stop today, what it will be like with a four-way stop. What would it be like when we start having 8,000, 9,000 and 10,000 cars a day on it? What are we going to do then? So we want to prepare for that. Well, we're going to need a traffic signal, or we're going to need a roundabout because the delays that are resulting from a four-way stop will have large backups in the peak hours. And that will cause neighborhood disruption as well as the customer or the people who are driving the vehicles from point A to point B and we don't need those.

We looked at a lot of different typical cross-sections. You heard one cross-section which is this top one which is consistently a four lane, and it's similar to what 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue is. I think 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue has 12 foot instead of 11 foot lanes. That's the big difference. And the difference between 11 foot and a 12 foot lane has to do with trucks. If you've got trucks on the road you need that extra food in the lane width just to be able to accommodate them. In the 11 foot lane it helps to somewhat make the lanes a little smaller and keep the speed of the vehicles down. Unfortunately, this type of cross-section leaves the motorist who wants to make a left turn in the through lane of traffic. And it tends to reduce high potential for rear end accidents.

Below this is a cross-section of a three lane roadway. In the three lane roadway we've shown parking on the outside, 11 foot through lanes and 8 foot parking areas. This is another contemplated section. The 14 feet in the middle is what's called TWTL, two way left turn lane is the acronym that is taken from that.

The next slide shows us the addition of a bike lane. We were trying to look at alternatives, and through planning staff we've identified where the sidewalks are going to be, how the network is going to work through the neighborhood for sidewalks and bike paths and things, and so this we kind of said it's good to include but we won't consider it.

The last one on the bottom is, again, the discussion of widths of right of way. I want to cover with this. In the 80 foot right of way we can easily put this two-way left turn lane and parking on

each side. In the next picture here it shows us without the parking with a 12 foot lane with the two-way left turn lane, and the significant thing is this can work within a 33 foot or a 66 foot total right of way and you can build it in and it could work. So you can use existing right of way, and where you have development you can expand that development out to wherever width you see you need for utilities and other purposes. But it will work on 66, desirably 80 foot.

On the bottom we have a typical section alternative that would take us with a median in the middle. In an area where there is no access for driveways you can have a grass median in this type of thing but you can only do it for limited distances because there is nowhere for a stopped car with a flat tire to park. So you've got to have enough distance so that they can move forward to a break in the road. And that's a design element but this can add some green to it and develop a change in character. Another thing you can do is you can even change the color of the pavement and do some things like that. Many of the three lanes it's been done with concrete pavement down the middle and asphalt on the outside to be able to get this better delineation.

Here is a good picture of what is going on 93<sup>rd</sup> Street today. The south edge of the existing pavement is the center line of the 66 foot right of way. The south edge is the center line of the right of way. So when we start talking about bringing a new section in here we will stay with that same center line as the section line is for expanding a roadway left and right of the section line which centers then on the right of way, which means on the north side where you really don't have any opportunity to look at too much because there's not a development, you don't have any impact to the residents. The back of curb on this section is within a half a foot of the existing north edge of the pavement as it is today.

It brings us into the issue of what is this pavement like. Well, we all know it's in pretty poor condition, so the reconstruction is going to have to take on a pretty substantial component, and we're working at trying to put together some costs and ideas and what it's going to be which we'll share with staff as we development it more.

Over here I have taken the plan superimposed on images of the homes and we dimensioned the distance back to each home to see how the various different widths of right of way, being 33, 40 or 50 foot offset from center, so we have 66, 80 and 100. We have shown a roundabout and the impact of the right of way here and here. There's a tree right at the corner here that is lost. The tree that's at this corner would only need some trimming. It is not impacting it significantly. It is just barely on the drip line that we would look at so it's not a loss of any tree on the northeast corner. Northwest there's one that's right out at the right of way point and it's gone. And we look at this same thing with the aerial. We can start seeing the homes and with the shift to the south on the big picture this really is a developer donated land situation to make an improvement to the center line of a right of way.

I want to talk a little bit about the detail of the intersections. As we look at the 48<sup>th</sup>, we looked at the intersection and, again, I point out the important thing is to get the left turner out of through traffic. This two-way left turn lane becomes a dedicated left turn lane either side of intersections so that the person making a turn gets out of through traffic. A person making a right turn into a development should have a deceleration area so that they have a taper to be able to smoothly move out of the way and not have to come to a near stop to make the turn. As you exit the subdivision, we have conflicts with residential driveways, and we have no absolute need to make a right turn out and have an acceleration taper. We have no heavy vehicles. It's residential so we're not dealing with having to have that right turn taper out. It's desirable but not necessary.

So to help compromise and provide the residents with the least impact we've shown a radius on each corner much like most intersections are done throughout Pleasant Prairie and other communities.

The roundabout is done a little different because the mountable area is used at the beginning of each approach to be sure that the existing driveways maintain their access. We have a driveway for the property here that comes out into this current T intersection which would come 90 degrees out to the east into Cooper Road as it's extended. There's two driveways in this area that are being changed, this one because the whole crux of the site is changing; this one because the driveway is being taken to the inside of the cul-de-sac.

That pretty well covers our projections. We recommend a three lane on Cooper Road as well all the way through. The platting as it has been set up allows driveway accesses onto Cooper Road south of 93<sup>rd</sup> Street just the same as it is to the north of 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. Having the people turning left into their driveways out of the through moving traffic is a great safety benefit, and these types of cross-sections will adequately handle 10,000 to 13,000 vehicles a day above what we project as the traffic increases. I will be here and can address questions.

Thomas Terwall:

Thank you. Jean?

Jean Werbie:

We have one last part of our presentation, and that is a video that was given to us by the Wisconsin DOT. Many folks have not seen a roundabout video. It's eight to nine minutes, but it kind of gives you a really good idea. This is actually in Kansas City, but this is what the DOT sends out to local communities for them to start to educate their Plan Commissions, Boards and populations as to how roundabouts work. Some of the roundabouts are very big, but, again, what's being shown here is just a single lane roundabout but it identifies it.

(Video Shown)

Jean Werbie:

With that, that concludes our part of the presentation for Stonebridge, Devonshire and the transportation impacts on 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. What I'd like to do is continue the public hearing on both the Stonebridge and Devonshire items.

Thomas Terwall:

This is a matter for public hearing. Anybody wishing to speak please step to the microphone and begin by giving us your name and address. Anybody wishing to speak? Yes, ma'am. Somebody needs to break the ice and it might as well be you. They'll all get up now.

Elizabeth Falcon:

I'm Elizabeth Falcon. I'm at 6021 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. I was of the impression at this hearing that we border the Stonebridge. There's one plot of land between us and then we have a small, narrow 22

acre plot. I was of the impression from the letter that we got that you were going to discuss that development also. At least that's the impression I got from that map.

Jean Werbie:

At one of our next Plan Commission meetings we are doing an amendment to the High Pointe neighborhood, so that's one of the next Plan Commission meetings. That's not on the agenda tonight.

Elizabeth Falcon:

Alright, thank you.

Jean Werbie:

There's a second phase to Stonebridge that goes west. That's Stonebridge West but we're not talking about that yet.

Elizabeth Falcon:

I've seen both of them there and I just assumed. Thank you.

Thomas Terwall:

Anybody else? Yes, sir.

Mike Renner:

My name is Mike Renner. I live at 3211 122<sup>nd</sup> Street. Just a comment about the enforcement of the trees to put the HOA to put fines in place. I just wanted to make a comment that really I think if the Village wants those trees maintained then the Village needs to take responsibility for that to make the homeowner associations do that when they typically are turned over to the residents when two-thirds or three-quarters of the homes are in place. I don't know how enforceable that's going to be. Homeowners associations in our situation we collect monies to maintain the properties, insurance and stuff, but to enforce rules it's really not the place to do it. So you may want to change how you do that in the future or inspect before it's turned over to the homeowners to make sure they're in compliance with all their own rules.

Thomas Terwall:

Thanks. I wrote down the same comment that the Village needs to have some clout I think beyond just the homeowners association.

Jean Werbie:

And the way that we have been writing changes into the homeowner's association documents with the consent of the developer is that the Village has the right but not the obligation to enforce provisions within their covenants. So we can go in and we can do the enforcement should the homeowners association fail to do so. But in the first instance it probably will be the

homeowners association that brings something to our attention. So hopefully what we will be doing is we'll proceed joint ahead with the homeowners association. It won't be just the Village, but it will be the association with the Village pursuing these.

Thomas Terwall:

With respect to the trees we need to have some clout. I take a look at the one across the street here and we just can't let that happen again I don't think. Anybody else wishing to speak?

Walter Safran:

Hello. I'm Walter Safran at 4733 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. Our house is directly on the southeast corner of 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 93<sup>rd</sup> Street and the northwest corner of Devonshire. I think Mr. Higgins did an excellent job in presenting the 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. My only concern is expanding the width of 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. Across the front of our yard we have six large oak trees that are 50 to 75 years old. They are right on the edge of a 33 foot road right of way which means that if the road is expanded even to the 80 feet that we're talking about, a three lane road, there's probably going to be a good possibility of losing those trees. Those trees are the main value of the house with mature trees across the front of the yard.

Also, increasing the width of the road I'm going to lose a maple tree that's been planted 20 years ago, and also lose an evergreen tree that was planted in 1964 that's 50 years old more or less and 50 feet tall. So I would certainly want this Board and Commission to see whatever they can do to save the trees. When you get into oak trees that are 50 years old you just don't replace them. It does a lot for the environment and it makes a pleasant Pleasant Prairie.

Thomas Terwall:

Thank you. Mike, did I understand before that 93<sup>rd</sup> Street is currently at the extreme south boundary or it is the north boundary?

Mike Pollocoff:

The center line of 93<sup>rd</sup> Street is the south line of the pavement on 93<sup>rd</sup> Street.

Thomas Terwall:

So if there's going to be any widening of that road it would be on the north side of the road anyhow?

Mike Pollocoff:

No, south side.

Thomas Terwall:

The south side?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right. So the people on the south side have the benefit of the entire road being completely on the other side of the right of way. And it's an old County Road. It is what it is. So when that road gets reconstructed it needs to be recentered.

John Braig:

In other words the property owners on the south side of the road have a larger front yard or an apparently larger front yard than they really actually have?

Mike Pollocoff:

Right.

John Braig:

Isn't there some indication that the utility is going to make some major renovations to their system in that area which would affect those trees anyhow?

Mike Pollocoff:

I believe so. I think the electric company there's fiber optics that are running through that area. It's a big corridor for the private utilities in that area. There's already the beginnings of some work taking place in that area.

Thomas Terwall:

The oak trees that he's talking about then are in the right of way?

Mike Pollocoff:

I'd have to look. I believe they are. If there's an additional right of way required that would have to be—we would have to acquire that right of way as part of a road project. But as the engineer indicated in his proposal, there still is a possibility of doing an improvement within the existing 66 foot wide right of way. If there's trees within that existing right of way that would be cleared with the road improvements. Now, going through an urban profile helps mitigate that because you're tightening up what you're doing. If you had ditches you'd be spreading that out even farther. But that wouldn't be the case here.

Thomas Terwall:

Thanks. Anybody else wishing to speak? Anybody else? Anybody else? Hearing none, I'm going to open it up to comments and questions. Yes, John?

John Braig:



Following up on that intersection, when this was before the Commission earlier there was a discussion about relocation of the driveway on the southeast corner of 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. Is that still a consideration or does this roadway plan permit that driveway to remain as it is?

Mike Pollocoff:

I believe this roadway plan will permit that driveway to stay there. It doesn't?

Jean Werbie:

No.

Wayne Higgins:

On our plan we have dashed in that driveway as going out to 48<sup>th</sup> so that the loop driveway would be off of 93<sup>rd</sup> Street and onto 48<sup>th</sup>. If it stayed within the taper it's not a good practice to do that, but it could operate that way. I would encourage that the connection be made to 48<sup>th</sup> just so they have the safest possible access. But our recommendation is to take it to 48<sup>th</sup> for that second driveway to the parcel. We're still in the same spot, right?

Jean Werbie:

No, I think you were just talking about the Miller driveway at the southwest corner, and Mr. Safran was just up here so let's just clarify.

Wayne Higgins:

I'm speaking of this driveway.

Jean Werbie:

Right, that's Miller and Mr. Safran is southeast.

Wayne Higgins:

This one is staying as it is.

John Braig:

And while you're at the microphone, your recommendation was to make Cooper Road a three lane roadway. You did not indicate how far. Would that go all the way north to Highway 50, and if so is there additional right of way required?

Wayne Higgins:

I'll take your question is several steps. First of all, the 10,000 vehicles a day is going to force you to rebuilt the roadway. It will not operate in the current two lanes.

John Braig:

All the way to 50?

Wayne Higgins:

And it will go all the way to Highway 50. Second of all, the number of driveways that exist for access puts you into the same condition as I defined before. You need to get the left turners out of the way of the through traffic for the highest level of safety. So, yes, a three lane all the way to Highway 50 is a plan that you should be looking towards implementation of.

John Braig:

Additional right of way?

Wayne Higgins:

You can build it in 66 feet with an urban section.

John Braig:

Thank you.

Wayne Higgins:

That is the beauty of this. I've done some long-range planning for Sussex where we have the same thing, 66 feet, and we are staying with that 66 feet to build it.

John Braig:

Good.

Mike Serpe:

When you're talking the three lane, are you talking two left turns, one from each way in that third lane?

Wayne Higgins:

The lane is 14 feet wide. Barring no snow and good visibility you could actually get two cars close together meeting each other. But the intent is that they wouldn't be passing each other, that you only pull into it for a short distance, stop, or proceed to make your left hand turn. When you start getting high volume left turns it might cause two or three cars to be waiting to make a turn like you do on commercial. Then you start making these 16 or even 18 feet wide so that you do have the ability for two vehicles to be along side of each other in the turn lane. It's not justified for the single family access we're dealing with.

Thomas Terwall:

Thank you.

John Braig:

And then I have a question of the developer of Stonebridge. In Article III of your covenants which is on page 2, buildings are restricted to two stores or 35 feet plus attic in height. Am I reading it correctly that the building can be 35 feet plus an additional footage for the attic, or is it intended that the total be 35 feet.

Russ Swanson:

My name is Russ Swanson, and I'm Vice President or Project Development for Westminster Swanson Land Partners. We're the developers of the Stonebridge Farm project. In answer to your question I believe that that is--unfortunately I don't have the covenants here with me. I was looking at them on my computer about an hour ago, but I believe that 35 feet is maximum height of the foundation to the ridge of the roof. I may be wrong, but I believe that's the case. That's usually typically what it is in most municipalities is 35 feet.

John Braig:

That's what I expected, but the wording here seems to indicate that the attic could be added to the 35 feet. So thank you for the clarification.

Wayne Koessl:

Mr. Chairman, through the Chair to Mr. Pollocoff. Mike, T is a County highway. Has this been shared with the County?

Mike Pollocoff:

Not anymore. They gave it to us.

Wayne Koessl:

That will make it easier then. Okay.

Walter Safran:

Walt Safran at 4733 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. Just to clarify, turning of the driveways and the right hand turns with the deceleration lanes that's only if the road is widened, is that correct, and at a certain time when the population of the three or four or five different subdivisions warrant the additional traffic?

Mike Pollocoff:

I think the Village is looking at doing this project in a series of phases. The absorption rates of the developments is driving that as there's more—as Mastercraft development builds out or as Stonebridge builds out. When Cooper Road goes in, we're going to want to have the roundabout fill out. What we're going to do is, as I indicated before, this is an old County road that as the engineers have discovered isn't in alignment. It's obviously got structural problems. We're going to be—in our direction to the developers in accordance with the Village ordinances we won't pay for and can't pay for any additional improvements to 93<sup>rd</sup> Street. Although this road in sections, not all at once, is going to qualify for some various levels of grants for congestion mitigation, local road improvement and some other grants. So our plan is as we're going to be submitting for improvements to bring 93<sup>rd</sup> Street up to spec between 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue and where our last grant project ended which is roughly where Creekside ends and come up in alignment there. It's not going to happen in one year and it will probably be over a series of years, but ideally I think we're looking at—just what we know about the phasing right now, because the Devonshire it's in Q to go first, so we're going to apply for that grant first to get that road put together and build in phases, then the Stonebridge one and then closing the gap.

So we're going to be able to take advantage of having the developer pay for—the developer could be exposed to 100 percent of the cost, but since there is some grant money available and the road is in need of work we're going to be able to secure some grants. So we're going to do this in phases so that possibly at the end of five or six years we've got 93<sup>rd</sup> Street in good condition between 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Creekside.

We had some running issues with sanitary sewer between Cooper Road and the Creekside development. That's actually almost like a ridge line there. Everything kind of falls away on either side of the road, so we're going to be looking at as those developments go in taking the sewer from the homes going north or going south. One of the reasons we've held up on doing anything on there is because we don't want to put a road in there and rip it up for the sewer because the sewer would be incredibly deep. It would be 25 or 30 feet deep. Putting that in the road would disappear. So we're trying to find another way to solve that because that's an incredible expense for the homeowners in that stretch. And if we can find another way to do it that's not as expensive that's what we want to do.

So it could be your section including Cooper Road to Meadowdale would be the first run or maybe even Cooper Road to 39<sup>th</sup> to get that up to speed and ready to go. Of course, that section does have sewer, it does have water. There is going to be private utility work mostly with the telcoms working in this area. That's a major fiber corridor that they're looking to do some work in, to get all that stuff done and then come back with a road improvement plan. We don't have that alignment.

We were able to do 85<sup>th</sup> Street between Cooper Road and 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue in a 66 foot wide right of way, so visualize how wide that is. As the engineer indicated you can do quite a bit within a 66 foot wide right of way and we'll probably be attempting to do the same thing here. And if there's more right of way I think it would be secured by the private utilities that might be looking to do things, or if the design as that rolls out, because we don't know because this is still conceptual, we may be looking at some sloping easements for making things match up so we don't have any sharp drops at the right of way.

Walter Safran:

I think to answer the question you are looking at sooner than later?

Mike Pollocoff:

In your case, yeah, it would be sooner. And sooner would probably be 2009 or 2010.

Walter Safran:

We also talking about that intersection being a controlled four-way stop sign intersection, 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 93<sup>rd</sup>.

Mike Pollocoff:

We did talk about that. But one of the things the traffic study indicated is just given the number of trips that are running on 93<sup>rd</sup> Street and the number of trips going north and south on 48<sup>th</sup>, it just isn't warranted.

Walter Safran:

So you're looking at a two-way stop on the north and south-

Mike Pollocoff:

48<sup>th</sup>.

Walter Safran:

And keeping 93<sup>rd</sup> straight.

Mike Pollocoff:

And I think the traffic calming that's going to occur at the Cooper Road roundabout should slow that traffic down sufficiently on 93<sup>rd</sup>.

Mike Serpe:

You're not in favor of a four-way stop there are you? I'll give you my reasons why I think you may consider not doing it is because of the acceleration of the cars, the noise that they create when leaving a stop sign is probably more annoying than a steady.

Walter Safran:

That was my major concern with 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue being a construction entrance also, but that question has been answered already. They're going to move it down to the extra lot. I'm okay. Thank you very much.

John Braig:

Question to the staff. Assuming that this conceptual plan passes, is the developer well aware of the fact of the dilemma the Commission has in approving a project in recognition of the funds that are required on the part of the Village to provide for additional police and fire services, snowplow and all those other costs?

Mike Pollocoff:

We made both developers aware of that. Mastercraft since they're at that stage where they need to start committing to that level of participation they have. And they've been very good about it. They're making a significant donation of \$200,000 to the parks plus the other impact fees which we have and then the other ones which have been modified by statute. We haven't gotten that far with Stonebridge but they haven't told us to go away either.

John Braig:

Thank you.

Thomas Terwall:

Anything further?

Mike Serpe:

This came to us a while back and the neighbors got involved and they did so very eloquently I might add, and I think we came to terms as far as compromise and how this is going to develop and lay out. I give staff and the neighborhood all the credit in the word for doing so. With that I move approval of the conceptual plan, Item B.

Larry Zarletti:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

**IT'S BEEN MOVED BY MIKE SERPE AND SECONDED BY LARRY ZARLETTI TO SEND A FAVORABLE RECOMMENDATION TO THE VILLAGE BOARD TO APPROVE THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR THE SWANSON DEVELOPMENT SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.**

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered. Since the public hearing has already been held with regard to the second one I'll also entertain a motion for Item C.

Wayne Koessl:

I'd move Item C subject to the conditions outlined by staff.

Thomas Terwall:

Is there a second.

Jim Bandura:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

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

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered. And finally, Item D then, a motion to approve the zoning map amendment?

Mike Serpe:

So moved.

Wayne Koessl:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

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

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered. Thank you.

**E. Consider the request of Gregory Paielli of the JLP Family Limited Partnership, property owner, for a Certified Survey Map to subdivide the property located at 909 92nd Street to divide the property into two (2) single-family lots.**

Peggy Herrick:

The petitioner is requesting to subdivide Tax Parcel Number 93-4-123-184-1036. He's proposing to subdivide this property into two properties. This property is located at 909 92<sup>nd</sup> Street.

In 1996, the then-property owners combined Tax Parcel Numbers 93-4-123-184-1035 which is Lot 4, Block 4, Carol Beach Estates Subdivision Unit #6 and 93-4-123-184-1040 which is Lot 5, Block 4, Carol Beach Estates Subdivision Unit #6 into one 120' x 135' parcel. On October 22, 1996, a Parcel Combination Affidavit was recorded at the Kenosha County Register of Deeds Office as Document Number 1039481, which legally combined Lots 4 and 5 into the current Tax Parcel Number 93-4-123-184-1036.

With this preliminary CSM application, the current property owner is seeking Village approval to re-divide this property back into the original platted lot configuration of Lot 4 and Lot 5 as originally platted.

The property is zoned R-6, Urban Single-Family Residential District which requires lots to have a minimum of lot area of 6,000 square feet and a minimum lot width of 60 feet on an improved public road. The minimum street, rear and side setbacks for a house in the R-6 District are 30 feet, 25 feet and 8 feet respectively. Pursuant to the Village Land Division and Development Control Ordinance, all lots are to have a minimum lot depth of 125 feet.

Both Lots 1 & 2 are proposed to be 8,100 square feet in area, are proposed to have 60 feet of frontage on 92nd Street and have 135 feet of lot depth. Both proposed lots meet and exceed the minimum requirements of the R-6 District regulations.

Currently, the property is improved with a 976 square foot single-family ranch dwelling constructed in 1953 and a 440 square foot detached garage and associated driveway. The proposed land division of the property results in the new lot line dissecting the existing dwelling. The Zoning Ordinance does not allow for the creation of nonconformities with a land division, i.e. a new lot line creating zero setbacks for the existing dwelling or in this case a lot line going through the middle of an existing dwelling. Therefore, as noted on Sheet One of the CSM, the existing single-family dwelling and attached deck as well as the detached garage and associated foundations shall be razed prior to recording the CSM.

According to the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission interpolated Wetland Maps, as revised in 1995, there are no wetlands located on this property. The existing dwelling on this property was constructed in 1953, which is prior to the existence of zoning regulations in Kenosha County. Pursuant to the SEWRPC wetland map, it can be concluded that due to the



straight wetland boundary lines around the perimeter of this property, that this property was filled at some previous point in time in order to construct the improvements that currently exist on this property.

The subject property is not located within the limits of the 100-year floodplain, is not located within a shoreland jurisdiction and does not contain any wetlands.

Additionally, the petitioner shall be granted a period of 180 days from the date of Village Board approval of the CSM to completely remove and raze the existing dwelling, deck and detached garage, including all foundations. The preliminary CSM depicting the structures on the property shall not be recorded. Once the structures and foundations on the properties are removed, the petitioner shall have the CSM revised to reflect that there are no longer any structures on the properties and all notes on the CSM referring to the structures shall be deleted from the CSM. Then the petitioner shall record the revised CSM depicting no structures with the Kenosha County Register of Deeds.

Municipal Water & Sanitary Sewer, both municipal water and municipal sanitary sewer are available in 92nd Street. However, there are no existing sanitary sewer or water laterals stubbed to the property line from the mains. When a new single-family dwelling is constructed on either Lot 1 or Lot 2, the dwellings will be required to connect to both municipal water and municipal sanitary sewer. A licensed utility contractor or a licensed Master Plumber will need to install the laterals at the owner's expense.

According to Village records, there are no outstanding taxes or assessments on this property. There would be a \$1,600 per residential unit sewer connection fee for any new connections to the sanitary sewer system. Any new construction would require a \$1,490 per unit impact fee. Additionally, this property is listed on the municipal water force connection list, meaning that the previous owners were past due to hook up to municipal water. The one year period to connect to water expired on October 1, 1998 and the previous owners never connected. Eventually, when there are enough parcels that are in violation of not connecting, the Village will bid-out the municipal water connections and the work will be completed by an outside contractor. The Village expenses to the contractor for this work will be charged to the individual parcels as a special assessment. However, as indicated before the intention is for this home and this building to be razed and new homes to be constructed so the water connection would then occur to the new homes on each property.

Pursuant to Mr. Rich Hooper at WE Energies, the existing Utility Easement along the rear of the properties shall be increased from 4 feet to 10 feet in width.

Storm water, the Village Engineering and Street Departments have reviewed the proposed CSM and concluded that there are no storm water drainage issues at this time.

The land division conforms with the Village's Land Division and Development Control Ordinance, Village Zoning Ordinance and all other relevant Ordinances or requirements of the Village except as previous noted, meaning that the buildings will need to be razed prior to recording the CSM. With that, the Village staff recommends approval subject to the conditions as outlined in the staff memorandum.

Thomas Terwall:

Question. If the house was built in 1953 and the lots weren't combined until 1996, does that mean that the house was built across the middle of two lots in the first place?

Mike Pollocoff:

Same owner.

Peggy Herrick:

Again, in 1953 there was no zoning in effect.

Larry Zarletti:

That was a very good year, though.

Thomas Terwall:

Any comments or questions?

John Braig:

Move approval.

Mike Serpe:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

**IT'S BEEN MOVED BY JOHN BRAIG AND SECONDED BY MIKE SERPE TO APPROVE THE CSM SUBJECT TO THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF MEMORANDUM. ALL IN FAVOR SIGNIFY BY SAYING AYE.**

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? So ordered. Before we close the meeting, I'm going to call on Wayne Koessl because he has an announcement he wants to make for the benefit of the Plan Commission.

Wayne Koessl:

For those of you who remember Lou Dixon who used to appear before us quite a bit, he passed away February 16<sup>th</sup> in Las Vegas and there will be a memorial service for him March 5<sup>th</sup> in Hales Corners. When I get the details I'll give them to you.

Thomas Terwall:

Please do.

Mike Serpe:

He was one of the drivers on the whole Lakeview Corporate Park.

Wayne Koessl:

He and I were the first two employees in that little gray house that is now in the park.

John Braig:

He's not old enough to die.

## **6. ADJOURN**

Thomas Terwall:

Motion to adjourn is in order.

Mike Serpe:

So moved.

John Braig:

Second.

Thomas Terwall:

All in favor signify by saying aye.

Voices:

Aye.

Thomas Terwall:

Opposed? We stand adjourned.

**Meeting Adjourned at 7:10 p.m.**