

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

7:00 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT – PLANNED DEVELOPMENT FOR A GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR VILLAGE SQUARE OF DELAFIELD TO BE LOCATED ON VACANT PROPERTY ON THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF HWY 83/16, CITY OF DELAFIELD

ROLL CALL

Present

Absent

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| Mayor Paul Craig | Marily Gardner |
| Phil Schuman | |
| Chrys Mursky | |
| Robert Transon | |
| Diri Curtis Costa | |
| Marilyn Czubkowski | |
| Matt Carlson, City Administrator (entered at a later time) | |

PUBLIC HEARING

Bruce Woods, Foth & Van Dyke, the City of Delafield’s independent engineer described what has changed from the previous development to what is being proposed now. The changes to plans for the Village Square are:

- The pond has been moved to west side of the property
- The food store has moved 106’ to the east. This also reduced parking and provides an additional buffer for the adjoining properties.
- Parking has been reduced from 833 spaces to 768 spaces or 65 fewer spaces.
- Total square footage (sf) without the residential segment has been reduced by 28,000 sf from 182,000 sf to 158,000 sf by eliminating all of the office space and reducing the retail space by 2,000 sf.
- The two small retail buildings along the north were moved closer together.
- The two story office buildings were eliminated.
- The bank was moved 16’ to the west.
- Two southern retail buildings were each reduced in size and the parking was eliminated on the south side of the building.

He stated that these design changes were effective in accommodating the new pond location, reducing square footage, and saving additional trees. This is in addition to planting 400 trees that should more than meet the requirements. The

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

travel lane along south portion of the shopping area is redesigned as required. A 30' buffer was created from adjoining properties. Senior housing has been added as suggested by City staff. Traffic projections have been reduced and a traffic generating comparison table was provided. There is a pump house and vault to the wells.

The following documents were not submitted as of February 26, 2003 Proposal:

- Updated landscape and screen plan
- Updated grading plan

Of general concern, the applicant meets most of the general concerns, except that there is not proposed timeframe for the project in the submittal. In Environmental issues, the preservation of existing trees is not adequately dealt with regards to the "Isolated Natural Resource Area" and what trees above 4" CBH will be removed and thus have to be replaced as per code. In regards to Visual Quality, if the building's architecture remains the same as previous proposals, the architecture is of a high quality and has a very unifying theme. There is no mention in the new proposal of the signage, and he supposed that nothing has changed from the original proposal. The outdoor lighting is not described in the latest submittal. He had to suppose that it is the same as in the previous submittal and the light levels generally were satisfactory around the perimeter of the property. There is no mention of any measure taken to mitigate the lighting on the neighbors. The buffering or screening of the property from the neighbors is being handled by placing a road at the southern property line, creating a 30' buffer for the adjoining properties. The other mention of buffering is the new placement of the stormwater pond that will provide additional buffer for the adjoining property. Without a landscape and screening plan, he could not say what else they would be using to screen the property for the neighbors. There is no stormwater plan provided with the submittal beyond the placement of the water retention area on the southwest side of the property. Beyond that there is no grading plan and they could not evaluate how well the stormwater plan would actually work. The traffic has changed very little, and his comments from the last meeting stand for this meeting also. They met the requirements put forth by the Wisconsin DOT. A comparison table is provided that shows that the reduced plan for the property will reduce the amounts of trips per day by 170. They felt that the developer needed to look at the intersection of Capitol Drive and Vettelson Road for improvement. The new entry road off of Highway 83 makes its connection around the east side of the site to Vettelson Road. It appears to be a through-road, it could become a road that would be used as a short-cut. Ways to make this road a nonviable approach were discussed. There is no specific management plan provided with the submittal. He had to suppose that it would continue to be the developer as owner

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

of the site who would be responsible for all maintenance and management of the site. In regards to the residential elderly housing that has been proposed, there is no explanation for this area of the development other than it will be a three story elderly housing. The applicant is proposing four three-story buildings which could be rental or condos in an area where the standard dwelling unit is single family, one and two-story homes. The massing of these buildings will tower over the neighbors in scale and in height. The residential nature of independent living elderly housing is compatible with the existing single-family homes. The commission will need to decide if the density proposed is too high for the site.

Mayor Craig stated that a tape would be given to Commission Gardner so that she could hear the comments of this public hearing.

M. Czubkowski provided the Commissioners with a number of e-mails that were sent in (21 letters and e-mails from citizens that live outside of the community and 7 that were presented to the Commission by City of Delafield residents). They will be on file in clerk's office and be part of the hearing packet.

Mayor Craig stated that any testimony that the attendees would like to give, other than at this hearing must be in written format. He did not discourage the attendees from making phone calls, but stated that phone calls were not official. To become an official transcript, it must be in written format.

There was no time limit for comments. Mayor Craig asked that the audience refrain from a gross number of duplicating comments and to keep it as brief as they possibly could.

Jim Stuart, 2410 Hirschman Lane, Hartland - He stated that the highway is so crowded now that you cannot make a left turn onto Oakwood. He thought that there was enough development here now and did not see a need for any more supermarkets, hardware stores or anything else. There is too much development already. He was against the development.

Al Zietlow, 3312 Bayview - Asked what small portion of the City will benefit from the development being that it is located so far in the northeast corner of the city. What affect will this development have on traffic levels on 83 and Vettelson Road? How much will the City have to put in tax dollars to upgrade Vettelson Road which is really the old Highway 16 built in the 1930's? It can't handle a lot more traffic. If you have driven it in the last month, you will wonder what kind of a washboard you are riding on. What are the infrastructure or operating costs to City really going to be in terms of responsible for? The total income is \$63,000. If this development holds true to the I94/83, it will cost \$53,000 to put a police officer up

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

there, training this person, and not saying anything about the emergency service personnel and vehicles needed to serve these residents. The reality of the Highway 83 development is a big question. What real affect will this have in terms of the final layout of the intersection? The State of Wisconsin needs money for higher priority roadways. Hwy. 83 may be an easy cut from the funding. The effect of this development on the downtown businesses was discussed. He asked if the City really needed another senior apartment condo complex. He asked if the existing ones were full and are they affordable. He asked if the City government talks out of both sides of its mouth. On one hand they are proposing thousands of dollars be spent on making downtown Delafield like it once was to draw business and in the other hand they are saying making room for new. He also asked what would happen if Hartland changes it's mind about providing water and sewer. He asked how the City would pay for this expense of connecting citizens to city sewer and water that doesn't really exist in this area. He asked if they really needed this kind of development in the City. Stated that the Commissioners should evaluate all of the comments by the public this evening.

Chris Ellerd, 714 River Meadow Hartland – This development, if allowed to proceed, may devastate the downtowns of Delafield and Hartland. Traffic problems will be created. The environmental impacts of this development, the noise, the wastewater run-off, stormwater pollution, air pollution will degrade the quality of life in the Lake Country community. He felt that this development would cause great damage to the downtowns of Delafield and Hartland. He questioned the need for this development. The senior citizen project is not needed; there are many vacancies in senior citizen housing in both communities. It was stated that the Plan Commission rejected this development back last fall when it was a full 100,000 sf smaller than it is today. He asked why this development should be approved this development as it is now actually bigger than before.

Jaci Bowman, 4449 Vettelson Drive, Hartland – She distributed her written concerns to the commissioners. She has 800+ feet of frontage on this property. The concerns on the paper entitled “Concerns on Development on Hwy. 16 & Hwy. 83” included being against multifamily housing as it would land lock their property for commercial use and devalue their property for commercial use. The multifamily housing would devalue their single family housing by taking away their privacy. She stated that the Plan Commission and Common Council has been opposed to multifamily housing in the City of Delafield in the past. She is also concerned about the run off of water. The increase of traffic on Vettelson is very concerning to her. The traffic has increased dramatically since the opening of the school. Her conclusion was that if the property is to be developed, the entire parcel should be developed as a neighborhood friendly commercial

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

development without multi-family housing. Taking into consideration the lives, privacy and property values of the families living on the adjoining properties, if it is necessary to develop the property at all.

The other document provided other ideas for this piece of property. She was against the development.

Don Rambadt, 3440 Nagawicka Road – The report regarding the grade bothers him. The Plan Commission has not insisted on an analysis of the ground water. The existing quality of the groundwater should be determined and the impact that this development has on it. This should be done along with the impact this has on the declining ground water in the area. The drainage going into the Nagawicka Kettle seems to him like a lack of planning. He was against the development.

Barb Rambadt, 3440 Nagawicka Road – Asked where Mr. Spheeris and his representatives were tonight. She thought that he would want to hear what was being said. By his absence, she thought that it made the public hearing much more difficult. She hoped that he would be a good neighbor. She asked about Vettelson Road – The DOT stated that this was the City’s jurisdiction and she hoped that whatever happens that traffic can be limited on this road. Was disappointed that the office buildings were eliminated since these did not have the traffic that the others did. She was against the development.

Sherry Myers, 4447 Vettelson Drive – She was concerned about the new road and thought that people would be using this as a short-cut. Her house is on this road and she felt that this road would definitely be used as a short-cut. In regards to moving the storm drainage pond – she didn’t know if this was a good thing or not – she is afraid that all this water would go by her and because there were not any plans addressing this there was nothing to say that it would not. They do not want the multi-family housing, they do not fit in with the neighborhood. The increased traffic on Vettelson is a great concern. She asked that if this comes to a vote, that no vote is made on this issue until this district has an elected official to represent them. She is against the development.

Dave Meyer, Wetland & Waterway Consulting, Big Bend – He was retained by Schober Schober & Mitchell Law Firm to provide an independent analysis of the environmental impacts of this development on the area. He distributed a letter written to Mr. Michael Schober dated 3/11/03 to the commissioners. In his position paper dated 7/22/02 he addressed four different categories of environmental impacts that would be associated with this project. He was going to review these four categories in light of the revised plan and how they are or are not addressed in the revised plan.

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

He addressed the "Isolated Natural Resource Area". An Isolated Natural Resource Area (INRA) has been located on this site. The original development plan called for 3.1 acres of this INRA be clear-cut (approximately 570 trees of 4" dbh or greater to be removed). The current plan claims that additional trees are going to be saved. Although the drawing submitted with the revised plan was to scale, he thought he would be able to compare it fairly accurately to the original plan that did have a scale with it. He determined only one area where additional trees would be saved in the INRA and that is on the far east end of the site adjacent to the pump house and vault. That appears to encompass 0.05 acre. The difference in the number of trees being saved was approximately 9 trees. This would result in 561 trees being destroyed rather than 570. 3.05 acres would be destroyed rather than 3.1. In his original position paper he identified this area as approximately 8.5 acres in size. Since that time SEWRPC has field staked the site and indicated that the INRA is approximately 7 acres in size. This is more critical now in that in order to maintain the INRA designation it must be a minimum of 5 acres. Now that it is identified as 7 acres in size, if the 3.05 acres is cut, it drops below the minimum of 5 acres (3.95 acres). Once the INRA is lost, it cannot be reclaimed. Any additional tree litigation or replanting done by the developer will not permit this INRA to regain the status. The federal and state regulatory agencies like the Wisconsin DNR and the Army Corp of Engineers do not have the ability to protect an INRA of this nature. There are no endangered species on this site and there are no wetlands on this site. Therefore, SEWRPC recommends that the local units of government (in this case the City of Delafield) preserve and protect INRAs.

The archaeological resources were addressed. They contracted with the Great Lakes Archaeological Research Center (GLARC) to do an analysis of potential sites. They identified 12 sites within 1 mile of the development site. No sites were located on the development area, however that is only because no reports have been submitted, that does not mean they are not there. Since his initial presentation last year, Dr. Robert Jesek, Director of the Archaeological Research Laboratory for the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, sent a letter to Matt Carlson dated 9/6/02. He urged the City to engage a qualified archaeologist to undertake an appropriate archaeological investigation. Dr. Jesek understands the fact that 12 sites exist within one mile of this site presents a very, very high probability that there are archaeologically significant spots within the 27.55 acres. This issue was not addressed in the revised plan at all.

The Impacts from Retention Basin Discharge were discussed. They identified four items in the initial position paper that were inadequate detail by the developer the first time around. The first was the identification of the final receiving water for

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

the discharge from that basin. The second is the overland flow path for the 100-year event, which was not identified. There was no identification of calculation of time it would take the 100 year event to drain from the peak storage elevation and lastly, the economic impacts to the residents as a result of the city of Delafield owning and maintaining the retention basin were not addressed. He could find nothing in the revised plan that addresses any of those issues. Each one of those four issues regarding retention basins still exist. It has not been dealt with in the revised plan.

Lastly, the groundwater and drinking water impacts were addressed. They identified the fact that there would be reduced infiltration on this 27 acre site and it could have an adverse effect on groundwater and resulting effects of that on the residential drinking water wells was not quantified or qualified the first time around and has not been this time around. There was also a lack of detail in the revised plan identifying regarding the construction retention basin, adequate protection of the groundwater from infiltration of any polluted water in that basin. No liner system is shown on the plan. These issues regarding groundwater impacts, which were raised the first time around, have not been addressed at all in any way, shape, or form in the revised plan. He was against the development.

Bob Borkowski, 4521 Vettelson Road – Traffic is a big issue that hasn't been addressed. He stated that the line of sight on the newly proposed road is a concern and that this route may be considered a short-cut. In regards to the senior housing or multi-unit housing – there will be people of all age ranges present and he was concerned about the safety of the people in this newly proposed development because of the road going through the middle of the housing. The process of this development bothers him. He discussed some of the other developments in the area. Highway 83 has not been addressed and is in the holding pattern. Improvements to the highway will inconvenience many of the residents and then the people will use Vettelson Road during construction. He asked about the phasing in of this development. Thought that this was not compatible with the B-6 zone requirements. Letters were submitted to the commissioners. He was against the development.

Bill Restock, 4527 Vettelson Road – He expressed disappointment that the developers were not present. Requested that the Plan Commission vote “no” on this development. Referred to the Foth & Van Dyke paper dated 3/12/03 that stated that there were several required submittals that were not included. He reviewed the Foth & Van Dyke letter in more detail. Foth & Van Dyke provided 8 reasons to vote “no” on this development. The minutes of the October 7, 2002 Common Council meeting show more reasons why the current proposal has not addressed specific items that the City asked the developer to address before the

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

plan could be considered for approval. A direct quote of the motion by L. Kuklinski was read. He stated that the conditions of the motion have not been met with this new proposal. The compatibility of the development with the surrounding residential neighborhood was discussed. He discussed the proposed water retention pond in relation to his property. He stated that the developer has not addressed the concerns of the neighbors. A request to the Plan Commission was made that they vote "no" was made. He was against the development.

Jeff Krickhahn, 4506 Vettelson Road– Quite a few people showed up, I see the majority from the First District there are a lot of concerns, a lot of very valid concerns and a lot of good points were brought up tonight and I really hope that they've been heard. I will respectfully request that any further discussion regarding this or any further recommendations regarding the Village Square or any development, proposed development, on the property would be tabled until the First District has proper representation. Thank you.

Alyce Schouten, 4518 Vettelson Road – Stated that nothing has changed except enlarging the development. The Developer is defying the City and the citizens. It is the wrong development at the wrong time for all of the wrong reasons. She was against the development.

Mary Rose Mansour, 226 W. Capitol – She asked why this keeps coming up. There have been several professionals who have stated why this development should not take place. She asked that these resources be utilized. The citizens will keep coming to all of these meetings to continue to prove and reproving their points. She wanted to know if the Plan Commission represented Delafield or "Developfield". She asked that the Plan Commission just say "no" and let that be okay. No one wants this. She was against the development.

Dave Lamerand, 536 Saxony Ct. – Village President of Hartland. He stated that the Village of Hartland had some very strong concerns about this development. He spoke regarding the independent report from Foth & Van Dyke indicating that this was too intense of a use of the land. He stated that in reviewing the new plans himself, it seemed that the intensity has increased on this parcel. Asked about the municipal services needed with the housing and was concerned about who the development really serviced – City of Delafield, or Village of Hartland, Town of Merton, Village of Nashotah? These are the communities that are most affected. Capitol Drive is not conducive to being a major access to this development. Vettelson Road will need upgrading and this road may be used to access the shopping center. Municipal service expense is a concern. He is against the development. M. Carlson asked if he was speaking as an individual or

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

on behalf of the Village of Hartland. D. Lamerand responded that he was speaking on behalf of the Village of Hartland as a whole.

Mike Gatzold, 4439 Vettelson Road – He is the second largest landowner along Vettelson Road. Has lived here for 25 years. Every house that is built is part of development. The subdivisions in this area are nice. In 1991 a master plan was done for the City. At this time the City mapped out the future of the City. He discussed the traffic on Highway 83 that is mainly due to the industrial development in the Village of Hartland. This land is going to develop into something. He hoped that this body would stick by the plan. There is a need for proper roads and proper sewers. This is all a part of it. He encouraged the Commissioners to follow the City's long-term plans. He stated that the plan as presented does not work very well. As this area develops, he hoped that the future of sewers for the rest of the area would be looked at. The homes in this area are zoned B1A and B6 – the zoning is business, not residential. He is for the development of this property.

Michael Rambausek, 545 W. Luebbe Lane, Glendale – He was asked by Schober, Schober & Mitchell to provide an independent plan and analysis regarding this development. He is a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners. He was disappointed with the submission. He reviewed what has occurred up to this point in time, namely on 9/25/02 the Plan Commission recommended denial of this proposal. He believes that this was a tough, but right decision. That decision was based on several factors; environmental concerns, economic concerns, traffic, land use compatibility, and insufficient information were all issues. This recommendation was forwarded to the Common Council on 10/7/02. Taking this recommendation into account, the Common Council deferred the application back to the developer with five different directives and asked him to come back with a revised plan of application. These directives were reviewed. The City of Delafield hands out requirements for proposals, in this case, a planned development, general development plan application. In section 17.39.78 it outlines the entire approval criteria for an application of this type, sections 17.75 – 17.84, 17.40 – 17.48, and 17.25 – 17.32 outlines the requirements for the planned development, general development plan. It is important that all of these elements are provided. All the information is needed before an accurate decision can be made. Only a small portion of this has been provided. In regards to the five directives that the Common Council gave the developer – the total square footage of the development has actually increased by 60,000 sf. The floor area ratio has increased by 5%. The total numbers of buildings on the site have increased from 9 to 11. Impervious surface of the project has decreased by 4,000 sf. The green space increased by 1,000 sf. The reduction in parking is a step in the right direction, but the impervious surface was not reduced by the same amount. Because of the

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

lack of information provided by the developer at this point, no phasing has been discussed regarding the project. This is an important issue that the City has to consider. The compatibility with adjacent land uses – the density of entire site is still way out of character with the surrounding area. He did not think that the multi-family housing was compatible with the residential housing in the surrounding area because of the density. Stormwater/water retention, environmental studies – they found some deficiencies, the plan has been changed, but no new plan was provided. This is very important information. He discussed the multi-family housing on Vettelson Road. The criteria needed for zoning of approval/denial of the land are land use compatibility. This includes traffic, environmental concerns, land use, density, lighting, screening of parking areas, storage, preservation of privacy, noise, existing character, natural topography, the intensity, must not diminish property values, street and highway improvements must be adequate, capacity analysis as well as economic analysis must be provided. In terms of the comprehensive plan, 17 goals and objectives are still not met. This (area) was not one of the high intensity areas in the comprehensive plan of the City of Delafield. He will receive a revised report in a couple of days regarding this new proposal. He stated that at this point, this plan is so deficient and so bad that he hopes that it is not a ploy on the developer's part to go back to the original plan. He was against the development.

Atty. Mike Schober, 16845 W. Cleveland Avenue, New Berlin – He stated that this could be approved if the City didn't care about a number of items. A review of the history of the development proposals for this property took place. He expressed concern about the lawsuit that has been started. Stated that the developer has refused to abide by the directives asked for by the Common Council and Plan Commission. No one has talked about the favorable impacts of this development. The pluses and minuses of this development should be weighed. The economic impact of this development has been determined by the developer to be "break even." The developer has refused to conduct an archeological study. There are issues with the trees. He believed that the governmental body owes consistency to its constituents. There may be some kind of development that would be less intense for this property. The standards that were set forth by the Plan Commission at the 10/7 meeting were a reduction in total footage, elimination or substantial reduction of the anchor store, change in build-out corresponding with the Hwy. 83 expansion. He asked why approve a development in 2003 when the road is being moved back to 2007 or 2010? Why look at the development now with lack of foresight if it cannot be built until 2010 if it going to be delayed until the roads are adequate? There was a requirement for compatibility with current land use and more studies of water, environmental studies, etc. He referred to the Foth & Van Dyke report. The Common Council on 10/7 gave specific directives (this was not given to Foth & Van Dyke). The developer has disregarded every

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

directive given by the Common Council. He reviewed the changes that the developer has made to the plans. He thought that office space would be more compatible with a residential area. In regards to the senior housing – he didn't think that the City staff would have configured the buildings as it is being proposed. The traffic projections have been reduced by about 1%. This is not a substantial reduction. The Foth & Van Dyke report was again referred to. The independent consultant found at least 10 reasons that this development was lacking. The side view of the complex was discussed. He thought that you would be looking from below at the lights even if they were downcast lights. The plan suffers from a huge number of deficiencies. He encouraged the commissioners not to give in to the pressure of the lawsuit. He was against the development.

Linda Randall, 4530 Vettelson – Her property is right across from the senior residential area that is being proposed. Her main concern is traffic and the safety of her children and pets. If there is more traffic, she asked how many more incidents would occur where the road would be closed for accident clean-up. Inaccessibility to parts of the road make it impossible for her to get to her home. She does not want her taxes raised for road improvement. She suggested getting the infrastructure in place before doing something to this extent. Asked that the developers fulfill the requirements requested. She requested that the Plan Commission not give in to the developers. She was against the development.

Barb Barry, 2027 Timber Oak Court – Wants to preserve the land. Fight for the open spaces. She takes pride in living in this area and is against the development.

Tom Mauer, 3230 Nagawicka Rd. – Thought it was embarrassing for the developer to not show up to this public hearing. He is about 1-1/2 miles down the road from this development and would not want this in his backyard. Spoke in regards to the senior housing needs and stated that less people are going into retirement homes. Grocery stores are plentiful in this area. Banks are also plentiful in this area. There are plenty of restaurants in the area. He would like to see this project shelved for quite some time (7-10 years). Wait until 83 improvements come through. He is against the development.

James LaFore, 1441 Genesee Street – To put this in perspective, his store is about 2,000 sf. This is about what the developer is proposing to eliminate. This is not a large amount to eliminate from the project. He thought that 10-20% of the cars would go through on Vettelson per day. Customers come into the stores in clusters, usually when the schools let out. This affects traffic. Are police going to monitor traffic to let the buses out during this busy time? How the school traffic would work has not been determined. He was disappointed that the developer did

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

not attend and that it seems like he thinks that the only way he can get this development through is by a lawsuit. He hoped that the City would not bend to the threats.

Jim Zahorik, 1948 Westshore Drive – He stated that in New Berlin they had a joint hearing before the City’s common council, the utility committee, and Ruekert-Mielke’s consultant Steve Schultz. New Berlin’s water situation was outlined which was expected to have a gap between supply and demand. In the year 2020 it is anticipated that New Berlin’s water supply will fall short by 3 million gallons per day according to the Ruekert-Mielke study commissioned by the City. New Berlin has the ability on the eastern side to buy water from the City of Milwaukee. Its source is Lake Michigan. Delafield is in the Mississippi watershed. We don’t have that luxury. In 1991 when the Master Plan was commissioned, no one knew at that time of the problems we have in 2003 with the water in Waukesha County. As the area has grown, the aquifer that serves much of the region is declining, leading to water quality problems with radium, radiation, iron, and salinity. As the aquifer volume diminishes, salinity increases, radium increases. Radium causes cancer. He reviewed the water at Hartland, Delafield, and Waukesha. He brought this up because what this developer is asking for are things covered in the zoning and covered under the Master Plan. Now that 12 years have evolved since the Master Plan was put together, he stated that we should consider saving water so that our children and grandchildren of the future can enjoy living here. When the developer comes to the Plan Commission the second time with increased density, it shows absence of consideration and compassion for the people who live here right now. The Plan Commission’s decision will either help or place in jeopardy the descendants. He reviewed that the Plan Commission said no because the people impacted by the developer pleaded them to say “no”. The lawsuit was discussed. He stated that if you are right, you are right. When people are asking to do the right thing it is not only a moral obligation but it is one that you have to live with. He was against the development.

Kean Kemnitz 3732 Nagawicka Road – He came tonight to have his first look at the development. He discussed the absence of the developer.

Bill Restock, 4527 Vettelson Road – Out of respect for the Plan Commission – must they (the citizens) be present next Wednesday to make their comments again? Have their voices been heard? Do they need to make themselves known again next week on this issue? Mayor Craig stated that this was a special public hearing this evening when normally the hearings are before the Plan Commission. He knew that this was going to be lengthy. He asked that in respect a lot of the comments not be repeated in the citizen’s comments. If there is something new

CITY OF DELAFIELD PLAN COMMISSION MINUTES

or you have a burning thought that you would like to make, he would not stop anyone. If you want to repeat your statement, he cannot stop you, it is your right to speak in front of that body, but he respectfully asked that they not repeat it.

Judy Henry, 1829 Nagawicka Road – Not only the traffic issues are a concern, but also the pedestrian issues. She asked if sidewalks were planned in the senior housing and if pedestrians would be crossing Highway 83.

Al Zietlow, 3312 Bayview – Asked for a list of the infrastructure things that the taxpayers of Delafield would potentially be responsible for if this development develops. What are the operational costs as to what this size of a development could mean as far as the overall tax picture in terms of services?

Jim Zahorik, 1948 Westshore Drive – Asked if another public hearing would have to be held for a zoning variance if multi-family would be part of the project. M. Czubkowski stated no.

Bob Borkowski, 4521 Vettelson Road – Thanked all of the Plan Commissioners for their time. He provided the commissioners with a copy of a letter written by Jim Behrend 12/5/90. On pages 3, 4, and 5 the highlighted areas were reviewed.

Mayor Craig asked three times if there were any other comments. There were none

CLOSE OF PUBLIC HEARING

MAYOR CRAIG MOVED TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. P. SCHUMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THERE WAS NO FURTHER DISCUSSION. ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MOTION CARRIED.

ADJOURN

The public hearing adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Minutes Prepared By:

Marilyn Czubkowski, CMC
City Clerk/Treasurer

Accurate Business Communications LLC