

DISCLAIMER – THE FOLLOWING ARE DRAFT MINUTES FROM THE REINDERS AD HOC COMMITTEE AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE UPON APPROVAL FROM THE REINDERS AD HOC COMMITTEE

**VILLAGE OF ELM GROVE
AD HOC COMMITTEE – REINDERS DEVELOPMENT
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, November 29, 2016**

Present: Chairman Trustee Haas, Marlee Hansen, Rebekah Schaefer, Christina Berger, John Galanis, Martha Kendler, Joe Klein, and Stew Elliott
Absent: Pete Moegenburg, Jan Schoenecker
Also Present: Wayne Wiertzema, President of Wangard Partners, Tim Anderson, Development Manager of Wangard Partners, Village Manager David De Angelis, Village Clerk Mary S Stredni, Zoning/Planning Administrator Thomas Harrigan, and members of the public.

1. Bring the meeting to order

Chairman Trustee Haas brought the meeting to order at 6:05PM.

2. Public Comment Period

Chairman Haas provided a brief background on the Ad Hoc Committee and its formation. The Chairman then explained the procedures for the public comment session. The floor was then opened for public comment.

1. Betsy Haushalter- 13425 Lee Court

Deeply concerned about the urbanization of Elm Grove, specifically density and traffic. Elm Grove Road is such a narrow road, dangerous for many people. Height of the proposed buildings are too tall. Contamination is also an issue. Water could potentially leach into local wells. No set place for children to play in. Funding is an issue, maybe utilize Village funding for beautification, but that is it.

2. John Wermuth- 915 Katherine Drive

Fifty eight (58) years on Katherine. Has faith the Board of Trustees, Plan Commission, and Building Board will approach the proposal with continued scrutiny as they have with any proposal. Size is too large. Agree with what was previously said.

3. Mary Inden- 14745 Watertown Plank Road-

(Read aloud from a letter dated 9/20/16 Elm Grove Business Association) The Elm Grove Business Association Executive Board expresses strong support for the concept of the redevelopment of the Reinders property on Watertown Plank Road. A vibrant and economically viable downtown business district is important to the health of the community. The existing tax base would be improved by \$40,000,000 of property value.

4. Matilda Mc Clusky- 12800 Watertown Plank Road

Traffic concerns. Already high traffic existing on Watertown Plank Road. The redevelopment would produce a hardship for exiting the driveway.

5. Carol Hoke- 13000 Dunwoody Drive

Moved to Elm Grove because of the unique bedroom community with easy access to shopping centers in both directions. The residents would like to see the Village remain the way it is. Concerned about the potential vacancy of the apartment units if they are not able to fill them. Concerned about what will happen in the future if the apartments are not rentable. Not against a development, just not this level of density on this small of a parcel.

6. Kathleen White- 1620 Greenway Terrace

Believes apartments are a current trend that may not last. People who live in apartments are not concerned with the community. Quality of the apartments is low. Against apartments.

7. Christopher Mason- 830 Fox Creek Court

Family moved to the Village of elm grove in 1956, Mr. Mason was six years old. In the most recent presidential election (November 8, 2016), there were four thousand two hundred (4,200) registered voters in the Village. The number of absentee ballots cast was one thousand seven hundred (1,700). At the first Reinders/Wangard open house on October 3, 2016, thirty (30) questionnaires were completed by people in attendance. At the second Reinders/Wangard open house on November 14, 2016, one hundred and seventy (170) questionnaires were completed by people in attendance. For the open house held on November 14, 2016, a meeting announcement post card was mailed on Thursday, November 10, 2016. This is not enough time for notice, and not all residents received the announcement in time. Is concerned about some comments that have been made such as referring to the Village as, "archaic Elm Grove", and "Elm Grave". These attitudes are extremely disturbing and personally offensive.

8. Sharon and Tom Smallwood- 950 Katherine Drive (Letter read by Margo Koleski)

Density and size of the buildings are too large. Final plan discussions should take place when the optimum number of residents are home in the Village. The beauty and smallness of the Village is at stake.

9. Rick Fronberry- 1025 Lower Ridgeway

In the letter which President Palmer sent to the Village Board Members in April of 2016, that establishes the purpose of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee, nowhere is there charge to make a recommendation to the Village Board. Giving the public three (3) minutes of testimony is not a reflection of meaningful public interaction. Many of the issues of this committee are addressed

in the comprehensive plan developed in 2007.

10. Janis Crego- 13240 Oakhurst Drive

Development is too large, two stories would be better, too much traffic. Already apartment building going up on 111th and North Avenue. Why are we not voting on this? Many people are unaware this meeting was going on.

11. Tadeo Balderrama- 920 Katherine Drive

Village is a tremendous place to live. Height, density, contamination, access to Elm Grove Road are the four (4) major concerns. Volume seems out of place for Elm Grove. Contamination is a concern. Disturbance to the soil when digging out the underground parking will affect water wells of residents near the proposed redevelopment. Water contamination is a concern for little children who are drinking the water. Increased traffic on Elm Grove Road is a concern. Parcel size is a concern, the proposed redevelopment appears to be only six point three (6.3) acres. Mirror and agree with all the previous comments.

12. Jeanne Edwards- 1025 Woodland Avenue (Letter read by Tadeo Balderrama)

The Wangard project will completely alter the look and feel of the downtown area and I do not support it. Two hundred and fifty four (254) more people living in Elm Grove is going to create a traffic issue. I enjoy living in a quieter Village without so much activity downtown. The proposed development will change that atmosphere. Have you forgotten we were voted best suburb in America the way the Village is now?

13. Tim Stemper- 1720 Highland Drive

Who is financing the apartments? The Village? Will there be rent subsidies?

14. Jim Koleski - 940 Katherine Drive

Left Milwaukee in 1994 for career reasons, chose Elm Grove when moving back to the area. This was due to the tranquility of the Village, and low traffic. The Village Board does take comments directly from citizens at every Village Board meetings. The physical size and density is too excessive. The longest proposed building would be nearly the length of Lambeau Field. Almost Sixty (60) feet tall. The concept of planting trees two and one half (2.5) inches in diameter to shield the houses on Elm Grove Road is not adequate. There would be increased pressure on the Village Police and Fire Departments and other Village services. Contaminates are a major concern. What is going to happen when the soil begins to be excavated? There was unprofessionalism when the traffic counts were gathered last summer on Elm Grove Road. The hose located on the traffic counter was connected incorrectly, and zero (0) car counts were observed.

15. Dennis Kaun- 1780 Wedgewood Drive East

The culture of the Village will be changing if the apartments are brought into Elm Grove. Against the proposed project.

16. Susan McClusky- 580 Rosedale Drive

It is a joy to see kids riding bikes in the Village. How is that going to look when all the traffic increases? Traffic is a major concern. We need to think of children, moved back to Elm Grove from Boston, Massachusetts because of the pace of life and feel of the Village. Against the redevelopment proposal.

17. Mike Elton- 13400 Juneau Boulevard (Letter read by Adam Berger)

The idea of adding apartments of this size and density takes away from the quaintness of Elm Grove. Will not support this plan in its current form and everyone in the area will not support it either.

18. Paul Ryan- 14500 Hillside (Letter read by Adam Berger)

Has been following the updates and correspondences regarding the Reinders/Wangard development and shares the sentiments of the letter published earlier today (November 29, 2016) by Adam Berger at 925 Catherine Drive.

19. Christina Martinez-Gonzalez- 13700 Juneau Boulevard- (Letter read by Adam Berger)

Opposes development as currently proposed. One hundred and seventy (170) cars times two (2) will increase traffic and pollution to neighborhood. Cardiovascular and respiratory disease could increase due to the increased traffic. There is also a risk that well water could be contaminated.

20. Adam Berger- 925 Katherine Drive

Moved to the Village in 1998, has grown fond of the Village. The Village is feeling pressure from all 4 sides. The proposed math of the Wangard/Reinders redevelopment is not fit for the Village. Height and density are unacceptable. Want to be clear that he is not anti-development. Wants something to occur on the site, but is opposed to the proposed redevelopment.

The failure to collect data, failure to collect information and provide it to the public is unacceptable. Hope the developer is listening to all of the commentary that has been provided from residents this evening. The proposed development would add five (5) percent to the Village population. The proposed project fails to meet the statutory requirements in the Village Code of Ordinances regarding enhanced density. At a maximum, a two (2) story development in EG may be acceptable. The site is a hazardous waste site. It is the responsibility of the property owner to clean up the site. Please read additional comments and other residents comments on

the Village website, Community Projects, Reinders/Wangard Redevelopment.

21. Pamela Mueller- 1145 Lone Tree Road

The buildings are too high and too dense. Downtown has limited space for commerce. The land is valuable, and should be developed in a thoughtful way. We can do better than what has been proposed. The land should be developed in a way that the majority of citizens would appreciate.

22. John Anderson- 14730 Crestwood Court

Has lived in the Village over thirty (30) years. Everyone appreciates the quality of life, it is a community based area. Main concern is the footprint. Will this change the community? We don't have a chance to "re-do" the development in this kind of situation. Need to ask what "fits the community".

23. Michael Noel- 865 Morningside Lane

Moved to the Village in 1986. Moved here due to the quaintness. Concerned about the traffic, increase in number of people. Biggest concern is the impact on the feel of the community, traffic, and living so close to the development that it would have a negative effect on the value of the home.

24. Brent Barg- 13830 Wrayburn Road

Lived in Elm Grove for a majority of his live. Echo's a lot of what has previously been said about height and density. Why do we want to be another "me too", like Wauwatosa, like Brookfield?

25. Britt Mason- 2115 Underwood Parkway

There is an investment model behind this project. Reinders has a non-performing asset sitting idle. What this all boils down to is, how much are we willing to allow the owners of the property to profit from the land? Alternative to developing the property may not be as valuable to the owners or the developer. Would like to see this issue be taken to a referendum vote.

26. Tom Herzog- 1550 Church Street

Neil Palmer said he wanted "value" for the land. The essence of Elm Grove is quality, not value. The thought is that the development will reduce taxes, untrue. Tax Incremental Finance, can last up to twenty seven (27) years. This information was not provided during the finance presentation delivered to the Ad Hoc Committee. The development would place more kids in schools that do not get additional funding. No one gains from the water main extension, except the developer. Businesses in the Downtown are told they "need this" development to occur. Density is way too much. The developer wants to vacate Elm Grove Road in order to have his density calculation equate in his favor.

Not against apartments, but am against too many apartments in too small of a space. Take a look at the Watermark condos. All units have sold. Against the apartments because they are too tall, too massive.

If zoning is changed to Rm-1 and the density allowed, it should be limited to three (3) stories, not a parking garage and an additional three (3) stories on top. Quality of the development should be exceptionally high. Should provide community space on the development site. Should limit all ingress and egress. Traffic study should be created by independent consultant, not someone hired by the developer.

No Tax Incremental Finance for the project. If it is worthy, it should stand on its own.

27. Marc Mc Sorley- 1505 Sunset Drive

There has been no interaction with the public except for tonight. That is not fair to citizens. Density, this development does not qualify for any additional bonus around eighteen (18) units per acre. This proposed development needs to go to referendum.

28. Patty Rierson- 13245 Oakhurst Drive

Bought home in Elm Grove to live near Tonawanda grade school. Is an interior designer by trade, and belongs to the American Society of Interior Designers (ASID). When working on projects, always looked to the height, width, and length. This is attributed to safety concerns. The height. This development is too large. The developer is just trying to make a statement such as, "mine is bigger than yours".

29. Tom and Chelsea Magnor- 1640 Longwood (Read by Tadeo Balderrama)

Concerned the schools do not have the capacity to handle the increase in population. Traffic is a concern for the safety of pedestrian foot traffic. Construction of these apartments will change the aesthetics of the Village. The development of this property should be able to stand alone without Tax Incremental Financing.

30. Tina Prade- 14245 Juneau Boulevard (Read by Tadeo Balderrama)

Proposed development would change Elm Grove. The Development that occurred in Wauwatosa changed the walkability of the Village. Renter vs. Owner ratio are elements that need to be considered.

31. Michael Rohr- 13000 Wrayburn Road

If this project advances, the citizens should really consider whether their voices are being heard. Do not miss the messages and comments that are being said at this meeting.

32. Dave Rierson- 13245 Oakhurst Drive

Who decides if this project goes ahead? The Committee or the property owners?

33. Lisa Becker- 1155 Church Street

Agree with what has already been said. Tax Incremental Finance is absolutely a no. The project has too many units. Reinders should clean up the contaminated site.

34. 1610 Legion Drive- Ted Eull

Trust that the Plan Commission and Village Trustees will have the citizen's best interest in mind. What is planning to be proposed is an extraordinary development, which is asking to leverage a Planned Development Overlay [Zoning District]. The proposal has unreasonable density which will adversely impact neighboring properties and is not harmonious with the surroundings. The developer's profit is not the citizen's benefit. A referendum is appropriate.

35. Tim Klein- 13125 Dunwoody Drive

Has lived in Elm Grove for a longtime. One of the unique things of Elm Grove, and what makes it great, is the majority of the homes are owner occupied. Believes Elm Grove should not do apartments because people do not tend to stay in apartments. The citizens in the Village have a sense of ownership.

36. Kristina Sayas- 12535 Stephen Place

Was raised in Evenston Illinois, can attest to the permanent nature of developments once they are built. An "I love Elm Grove" sign hangs in the kitchen. Loves participating in the Junior Guild. The Village makes me think of small town America. Does the perfect small town America still exist? The functioning small towns of yester year have all but disappeared.

END OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Hearing no other comments, the Chairman closed the meeting by stating that there has not yet been a formal application submitted to the Village for the development. The Ad Hoc Committee will reconvene next week Wednesday, December 7th to formulate recommendations for the Village Board of Trustees.

3. **Adjourn**

Meeting was adjourned at 7:39PM

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas Harrigan
Zoning and Planning Administrator/
Assistant to the Village Manager

DRAFT