

DRAFT

Village of Bristol Plan Commission Meeting and Public Hearing
Bristol Municipal Building 19801 83rd Street, Bristol, WI 53104
Tuesday, March 25, 2025
7:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Boldt at 7:00 p.m.. Present at the meeting were Commissioner Leker, Commissioner Sharp, Commissioner Bolton, Commissioner Atwood, Commissioner Klemko, Commissioner Riegert, Village Planner Dominic Marlow, Village Administrator Kerkman, Plan Commission Secretary Renee Brickner, Applicant Jim Purinton and 3 constituents.
2. Approval of Minutes:
A motion was made by Commissioner Atwood and seconded by Commissioner Klemko to approve the minutes from the January 28, 2025 Plan Commission Meeting. The motion was carried with 5 ayes with 2 abstaining (Sharp/Riegert).
3. Chairperson's Comments:
Chairman Boldt stated that there is one agenda item for Public Hearing and that is a CSM. He indicated that if anyone wanted to speak at the Public Hearing you would need to sign in. He stated that due to the fact that we know most of the people in the audience he does not believe we have to do that. He stated that he will suspend the Citizens Comments as there are no citizens to comment.
4. Citizen's Comments: None
5. Unfinished Business: None
6. Public Hearing:
 - a. The Public Hearing was opened at 7:02 p.m. at the request of Bristol Land LLC, c/o of Jim Purinton, Janko Group 2610 Lake Cook Rd. Ste. 100, Riverwoods, IL 60015 Owner/Applicant) for a Certified Survey Map on approximately 8.5 acres on tax parcel 37-4-121-234-0105 located on part of SE 1/4 SECTION 23 Town 1 Range 21, Lot 5, and approximately 9 acres on Tax Parcel 37-4-121-234-0106 located on part SE 1/4 SECTION 24 Town 1 Range 21, Lot 6 Village of Bristol, Kenosha County Wisconsin. For informational purposes, these properties are located on the north side of Hwy Q (104th Street) west of Hwy U (136th Avenue).

Jim Purinton while looking at a diagram of the property stated on the left is what is currently there, Lot 5 and Lot 6. He stated that they are talking about merging those two lots into what they call Lot 5A and indicated the CSM has a different number. He stated that instead of two

buildings, it is one building indicating the reason they are doing that is because the 2 buildings on the left are about 100,000 square feet. He stated that the tenants are attracted to 100,000 rather than 50,000 indicating they will pay the rent for the smaller building as some have issues with the smaller building.

Chairman Boldt asked if it was going to be Lot 5 or Lot 11?

Jim Purinton stated they are calling it Lot 5A indicating it is whatever the CSM says.

Chairman Boldt stated that the CSM indicates it is Lot 11.

Jim Purinton stated that they use 5A and he believes his surveyor told him that in Wisconsin they do not use the A. He indicated that is really it, the CSM is just merging these two lots.

Dominic Marlow stated that this CSM would qualify for not being a Plan Commission review item, when combining two lots or removing a lot line it could just go through Kenosha County. He indicated that this is a review of the proposed lot combination and PUD General Development Plan amendment. He stated that the PUD is a discussion item of the current Lot 5 and Lot 6 which will be Lot 11 as referred to on the proposed CSM. He indicated that has been reviewed by Strand and they are recommending approval of the Certified Survey Map.

There were no citizen comments.

b. The Public Hearing was closed at 7:07 p.m..

7. New Business:

a. Discuss and consider for approval of the request of Bristol Land LLC, c/o Jim Purinton, Janko Group 2610 Lake Cook Rd. Ste. 100, Riverwoods, IL 60015 (Owner/Applicant) for a Certified Survey Map on approximately 8.5 acres on tax parcel 37-4-121-234-0105 located on part of SE 1/4 SECTION 23 Town 1 Range 21, Lot 5, and approximately 9 acres on Tax Parcel 37-4-121-234-0106 located on part SE 1/4 SECTION 24 Town 1 Range 21, Lot 6 Village of Bristol, Kenosha County Wisconsin. For informational purposes, these properties are located on the north side of Hwy Q (104th Street) west side of Hwy U (136th Avenue).

Commissioner Sharp asked if it makes any difference on the application form and the diagram on page 3 the lot is still labelled Lot 5 instead of 5A.

Dominic Marlow indicated that this was a project narrative so we can note that we want to change the error in the project narrative. He indicated that it is a difference of how they want their site plan.

Chairman Boldt stated that he had something to make a note of on the applicant's surveyor indicating that Clement is no longer the Highway Commissioner, and it is on the Certified Survey Map.

A motion was made by Commissioner Klemko and seconded by Commissioner Leker that the Plan Commission recommend to the Village Board the CONDITIONAL APPROVAL of the Certified Survey Map on approximately 8.5 acres on tax parcel 37-4-121-234-0105 located on part of SE 1/4 SECTION 23 Town 1 Range 21, Lot 5, and approximately 9 acres on Tax Parcel 37-4-121-234-0106 located on part SE 1/4 SECTION 24 Town 1 Range 21, Lot 6 in the Village of Bristol based on the review of submitted

materials, the memo from STRAND dated March 18, 2025 and Memo from GRAEF dated March 20, 2025, and subject to the following conditions:

1. Any and all technical deficiencies shall be corrected;
2. All applicable Village of Bristol application and review fees shall be paid by the applicant;
3. The applicant shall address any other issues which are raised by any approving or objecting authority, which the Village Plan Commission and/or Village Board deem necessary for the applicant to address in the application materials, and which have been made, or may be made, by the Village Administrator, Village Attorney, Village Engineer, and Village Planner; and
4. The applicant shall address the items listed in the memo from Strand dated March 18, 2025.

The motion carried unanimously.

- b. Discuss and consider for approval the request of Bristol Land LLC, c/o Jim Purinton, Janko Group 2610 Lake Cook Rd. Ste. 100, Riverwoods, IL 60015 (Owner/Applicant) for a Site Plan Review on approximately 8.5 acres on tax parcel 37-4-121-234-0105 located on part of SE 1/4 SECTION 23 Town 1 Range 21, Lot 5, and approximately 9 acres on Tax Parcel 37-4-121-234-0106 located on part SE 1/4 SECTION 24 Town 1 Range 21, Lot 6 Village of Bristol, Kenosha County Wisconsin. For informational purposes, these properties are located on the north side of Hwy Q (104th Street) and on the west side of Hwy U (136th Avenue).

Jim Purinton stated that he made his first presentation to this Plan Commission for Bristol Business Park almost 7 years ago and indicated that Bristol Business Park today includes 225 acres, nine developable lots rather 8 now with the recent change, 40 plus acres of open space and a half mile of internal roadways. He stated they have completed 8.2 million of the adjacent County Highway improvements and laid almost 3 miles of water mains to connect to and expand the Village of Pleasant Prairie's Municipal Water System. He stated that Bristol Business Park also contains 1 mile of sidewalks along the private road and 1.25 miles of paved bike trails along the County Highways, and 1.8 miles of walkable trails within the open space parcels. He indicated that today there is a total of 5 buildings totaling 2.3 million square feet having a value of over \$300,000,000 have been developed on Lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8. He indicated that Uline occupies Lot 1, a building of approximately 1.1 million square feet of distribution centers as you are well aware that they are the largest users and tenants in all of Kenosha County. He indicated that Forefront Engineering occupies Lot 2 which is a subsidiary of a Swedish based manufacturing company that makes high speed doors for industrial and refrigerated buildings. He stated they consolidated 3 locations, one from Sussex and one from Mundelein Illinois, and occupy 180,000 square feet. He indicated Zebra Technologies occupies Lot 3 which is a company that invented the bar code and does a lot of scanners. He stated they relocated their Texas

facility into this 396,000 square foot building. He indicated that Ermco occupies Lot 4 which is a manufacturer of electrical transformers and occupies the 157,000 square foot building. He indicated that Ely Lilly is part of the 3 billion expansions in southeastern Wisconsin have purchased the Lot 8 last fall which is 325,000 square foot building, as well as the vacant Lots 7 and 9 parcels. He indicated they will be used for warehousing and support their adjacent manufacturing facility just east of Lot 8 and 9 which they are expanding in size. He showed a view from the northwest of the intersection of Q and U which shows Lot 5A or 11 as the vacant lot in front which they wanted to combine for economical rent for the smaller tenants. He stated that their Lot 5A building is a 238,000 square foot warehouse for light assembly buildings which is similar to Lot 4 and Lot 7. He indicated that the property is designed to have offices facing the highway with truck docks in the rear and can be leased to a single tenant or be divided to accommodate up to 4 small tenants. He stated the property is extensively landscaped with berms that are already constructed along Hwy Q and U and an existing stormwater swale that takes water from south to north. He stated the buildings will have required foundation plannings with parking lot islands and sidewalks leading to the office entrance. He indicated that development 5A exceeds the Village requirement for open space. He stated the building is accessed from 101st Street to the left via 2 separate driveways, the western driveway for trucks and the eastern one for vehicles which are aligned and match up with Lot 4 truck and car driveways to the north. He indicated the building will have parking for 312 vehicles which will accommodate large offices and/or manufacturing users. There will be 20 truck docks constructed with room for an additional 45 docks as needed. He indicated that buildings will be constructed and generally designed with drive in doors so you can drive a small truck right into the building on the north side or the south side with knock out panels for flexibility that in two areas where drive in doors can be built. The truck apron is 185 for truck maneuvering between the docks and the edge of the pavement which is what is typically. He stated that market standards have been met for this size building a 32 ft internal clear height which allows high stacking with 50 by 50 internal column bays, with deeper bays for the truck docks for easier loading and unloading. He stated they have the state-of-the-art fire protection which includes the SFR with 4000 amp to provide higher electrical services. He indicated that this building is unique in that there are 3 telecom services that can be drawn from which are above standard services which they are glad to have. He commented on the middle building which has two entries and an exterior wall that has been spiffed up indicating they respected the fact that this building was highly visible from the road and wanted to make it more interesting which does meet the wall depth challenges. He indicated that the southeast corner will be closest to the intersection of Hwy U and Q and very well may be the most prominent of the entire park and they have asked the architect to spend more time on this to bring a special visual interest while meeting the setback along the common highways. He commented on page 6 of the staff report in which there is a request for sidewalk connections to 3/4 of the building in which he indicated that they were okay with adding two sidewalks, one at the north corner of the building and one at the south corner of the building to allow pedestrians access to our bicycling system. He indicated that they disagree that there should be a sidewalk added from the parking area to the bike lane at the southeast corner of the building and discussed the four reasons they do not want the sidewalk there. He referred to a comment on page 10 as to the number of parking spaces in a row before the landscaped island on which they

have 17 spaces, and the ordinance calls for 15 spaces and requested that the 17 spaces be allowed. He indicated that they agree to revise their final drawings per staff comments referenced on page 8 regarding the landscaping on the east bufferyard to conform which will include all Strand comments in the final engineering drawings and the CSM. In conclusion he stated that they are grateful to the Planning Commission, Village Board and Village staff for partnering with them over the past 8 plus years on the overall development of the Bristol Business Park. He stated that it has been a pleasure to work with the Village, indicating that they were always told what was wanted and the rules were there, and they abided by the rules, and everything was good indicating it was a great experience for them.

Commissioner Sharp asked if there were any tenants lined up for the new buildings.

Jim Purinton stated that there are some prospects starting to emerge. He stated that thinking about a marketing building and this building is newer but comparable to the Haribo building north of the cemetery.

Dominic Marlow stated that all the major discussion points were made by Mr. Purinton. He stated that the GRAEF memo covers 3 items for review, one of which includes a Certified Survey Map of the two tax parcels. He indicated the second is a PUD General Development Plan Amendment reflecting the lot combination which is for discussion only indicating that he will discuss why that is so important. He indicated that lastly there will be a Site Plan Review in which he will go into detail about. He gave an overview of the review of the Site Plan and the building referred to as building Lot 5A or Lot 11. He indicated that this development follows several years of approvals starting with the approval of the PUD overlay on the property which was on October 2018 Plan Commission and November 2018 before the Village Board where the rezoning of the parcel was approved with the PUD Overlay as a 7 lots plat and one out lot. He indicated that by May or June of 2020 the building had evolved slightly to reorganize what is called a modern out lot to a fixed lot plat with 3 out lots and the original preliminary plat. He stated those changes were due to making one of those lots an out lot and redefining the l-shaped lot for a private driveway as an out lot. He stated that since then there have been various site plan approvals on the adjacent property and on the subject property Lot 5A that we are discussing now. He indicated that it is a review of all the different submittals that relate to the subject property. He stated that as for the site plan review, every site plan has to conform to the dimensional requirements of the BP district or otherwise specified by the PUD Overlay. He indicated that in terms of the dimensional standards all standards are met. He added that he would just like to note that the open space standard is not met on the lot itself but with the additional amount of the prorated open space across the PUD overall which has allowed for moderate use of the PUD for open space exceeds the open space requirement by law. He stated that in terms of the design of the building, this same building design has been reviewed extensively on each of neighboring existing buildings and all areas conform. He indicated that in terms of relationships with the highways we have talked about all the primary entrances being on the north side of 101st Street, 2 separate driveways one wider for trucks and a narrower driveway to the north for normal vehicle use. He stated that in revisiting the requested sidewalks he indicated that he went to the property and saw the grading of it and agrees with the applicant's arguments that a connection on the southeast corner being non-essential to the development. He stated that any reasonable person could evacuate whether it be employees or visitors and there are not any trips that they are concerned about from people who do not know the layout. He indicated for those reasons;

he would be amenable to eliminating those connections. He indicated when the approval process is reached, we can talk about the wording for that issue. He indicated that there is no negative impact to surrounding uses by the proposed site plan. The natural resources on the property were reviewed in which most of the identified wetlands and woodlands on the plat are outside the extents of the subject property. He stated that 1.46 wetlands are to be filled, and all woodlands were proposed to be removed and mitigated. He indicated that of the required landscape bufferyards, there is a deficit of 9 understory trees and 5 canopy trees in the east bufferyard. He stated in the proposed south bufferyard includes 16 fewer understory trees than required but the proposed number of shrubs exceeds the requirement by 22 resulting in no deficit. He indicated that there will be foundation plantings including plants surrounding each of the public facing facades with no fences are proposed. He indicated that the parking spaces conform stating that the Plan Commission shall determine whether to allow 17 parking spaces. He indicated that the loading area is in the rear which is consistent with the Village Zoning Code along with the lighting plan. He indicated that the parking and loading is similar to that of the other buildings. He indicated that the Village does not have descriptive parking requirements, and the applicant has proposed what they feel is adequate quantity of parking stalls to accommodate likely users and percentage of office space likely for each building. He stated that the loading requirements call for one loading dock per 10,000 square feet of the building. He indicated that they are agreeable with the proposed number of required loading docks stating the building is expandable to 65 docks if necessary. He referred to a paragraph that details the plan subdivision requirements indicating that because this is a lot combination and includes lot line adjustments approval shall be received from Kenosha County as a minor lot combination. He stated that recommendation is for approval with the conditions listed in the memo provided.

Chairman Boldt indicated that we took care of the access to the path on Hwy Q.

Dominic Marlow stated that one pathway comes from the north and the pathway on Hwy U and Q would be excluded.

Chairman Boldt indicated that the applicant is absolutely right, the one on Hwy Q is going to be a tough one.

Commissioner Atwood stated that we do want people to be safe.

Chairman Boldt stated that the other item we have is the 17 parking spaces versus 15.

Dominic Marlow stated that the plan commission has discretion on this item.

Chairman Boldt asked what the reason is for 15 in the Village Ordinance, stating it is not a real thing we just have to have a number in the ordinance so that is what you do.

Dominic Marlow indicated that yes, he is correct.

A motion was made by Commissioner Leker and seconded by Commissioner Klemko for the Plan Commission to recommend to the Village Board the **CONDITIONAL APPROVAL** of the Site Plan Review on approximately 8.5 acres on tax parcel 37-4-121-234-0105 located on part of SE 1/4 SECTION 23 Town 1 Range 21, Lot 5, and approximately 9 acres on Tax Parcel 37-4-121-234-0106 located on part SE 1/4 SECTION 24 Town 1 Range 21, Lot 6 Village of Bristol, based on the review of submitted materials, the memo from STRAND dated March 18, 2025 and Memo from GRAEF dated March 20, 2025, and subject to the following conditions:

1. CSM is approved by the Village Board;
 2. PUD General Development Plan Amendment is approved by the Village Board;
 3. Applicant shall include additional required pathway connections to main entrances from the public way;
 4. Applicant shall submit a revised landscape plan with the required landscaping;
 5. Any and all technical deficiencies shall be corrected;
 6. All applicable Village of Bristol application and review fees shall be paid by the applicant;
 7. The applicant shall address any other issues which are raised by any approving or objecting authority, which the Village Plan Commission and/or Village Board deem necessary for the applicant to address in the application materials, and which have been made, or may be made, by the Village Administrator, Village Attorney, Village Engineer, and Village Planner; and
 8. The applicant shall address the items listed in the memo from Strand dated March 18, 2025.
8. Next Plan Commission Meeting is scheduled for April 22, 2025.
9. A motion was made at 7:45 p.m. by Commissioner Bolton and seconded by Commissioner Klemko to adjourn the meeting.

NOTICE TO PETITIONERS: You must be in attendance to have your request heard. If your request has been passed onto the Bristol Village Board, you must attend the **April 14, 2025 meeting at 7:00 p.m. at the Bristol Municipal Building**. Village Board members may be in attendance for informational & discussion purposes only by order of the Chairperson of the Plan Commission.

