

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
Wednesday, December 9, 2016**

Present: Chairman Trustee Haas, Marlee Hansen, Rebekah Schaefer, Christina Berger, John Galanis, Martha Kendler, Joe Klein, Jan Schoenecker, and Stew Elliott
Absent: Pete Moegenburg,
Also Present: Wayne Wiertzema, President of Wangard Partners, Tim Anderson, Development Manager of Wangard Partners, Mary Clair Lanser, President of Lanser Public Affairs, Village Manager David De Angelis, Hector de la Mora, Village Attorney, 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 6:03PM.

2. Discussion and possible recommendation to the Board of Trustees and the Plan Commission

Discussion was held on how a recommendation should be composed and reviewed before being submitted to the Board of Trustees and the other standing committees. It was noted that in the minutes from the first Ad Hoc Committee meeting, held on May 18, 2018, “consensus is not a goal of the Ad hoc Committee. Rather, thoughts that bring rise to valuable considerations and can be shared with potential developers should be encouraged.”

Chairman Haas began the discussion by referencing the working document titled, *Topics to be Considered*.

1. Land Use

Chairman Haas asked if the proposed land use is appropriate for the site. The Committee was in agreement that the proposed use as a mixed-use, residential Planned Development Overlay is more preferable than the current use and zoning as M-1 Limited Manufacturing.

2. Building Sizes, heights, and elevations

Chairman Haas opened the floor for committee members to comment on the proposed building sizes, heights, and elevations.

Hansen commented that the proposed building size is too large, especially the “middle building” [Building B]. Community members commented on the building size during the public comment session, and all comments reflected the building as being too big.

Elliott highlighted most of the objections in size have been directed more toward building height than mass of the building.

Galanis recommended there not be a third floor. If the third floor is removed, the development would not be as dense. This will also help with traffic.

Kendler commented on building height. The building height should be reasonable and complimentary to the culture of the community. Particularly if the retirees will be living in the building, mobility of residents in the building was never a talking point.

Berger noted the building height in comparison to the surrounding areas is excessive as currently proposed. From a size perspective, building 'B' is out of scope and magnitude. It also appears to be excessively long from a footprint perspective.

Schoenecker commented that a point of concern is the proposed density. As residents and members of the Ad Hoc Committee, it is not the Ad Hoc Committee's responsibility to make these decisions.

Chairman Hass clarified it is the charge of the Committee to provide a recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees.

Elliott shared that the third story makes it too out of scale for the property. The footprint does not appear to be too out of character for any other purpose.

Klein commented that if the number of units within the proposed redevelopment stays the same, and building 'b' is reduced down to two stories, building 'b' would take on a massive footprint that would not be acceptable. If that is to be a proposed compromise, it should not be allowed.

Schaefer opined the density is too high. Schafer is pro-development but great care should be taken as the proposed re-development is located in the downtown area. Townhouses are not an issue. Two stories is much more acceptable from a neighborhood perspective.

Haas stated concern about the height, especially the building proposed on Watertown Plank Road. Haas would like to see one of the three buildings shaved down. The fact there is a peaked roof adds to the height. Foot print is not as much of a concern. Building on Watertown plank should be two stories.

Galanis motioned the proposed apartment buildings be limited to two (2) floors.

Kendler seconded

Aye: 6

Nay: 3

Motion carried

Footprint:

Kendler commented the total amount of buildings is fine, but perhaps break up the size of building 'b' and add a second town house.

Hansen does not agree a vote on the footprint can be made without knowing all the variables.

Committee decided to provide no recommendation on footprint alone.

Elevations-

De Angelis provided clarification as to what the Committee should be considering when commenting on building elevation: do the buildings appear to be differing in appearance? Is the look and feel appropriate for this development? Is the proposed building mass appropriate? Do the buildings 'flow', or are they disproportionate?

Haas is in favor of the homogenized appearance. The buildings are somewhat similar. However, the proposed buildings do not look that different than some of the apartments going up around the area.

The Committee discussed whether the Village Building Board is the more appropriate body for reviewing building elevations, exterior, and aesthetic value.

The Ad Hoc Committee agreed not to provide a recommendation in regard to building elevation.

3. Proposed Residential Unit Density

The proposed residential unit density is just over 21 units per acre.

The Committee vote on whether the density, as proposed, is too high at 21 units per acre is as follows:

Aye: 8

Nay: 1

Hass noted the general public sentiment is that the development has too much density.

De Angelis explained the property is currently zoned as M-1, limited manufacturing district. The Comprehensive Plan has the property listed as mixed use residential. There are a number of ways to accomplish this. The property could be straight residential as an Rm-1 Multi-family residential district, with 8 units per acre. Or, go up to 12 units per acre as a Conditional Use within the Rm-1 zoning district. The Planned Development Overlay (PDO) district allows for the ability to approve enhanced density. Units per acres within the mixed compatible use PDO district can be less than but not more than a maximum total of 22 residential units per acre.

Klein commented that density is a difficult topic, due to traffic concerns and the potential strain on public services.

Kendler stated concern over traffic, and infrastructure support provided by the Village (EMS, Police, FIRE, and the school district).

Hansen highlighted that the Village Ordinance requires the proposed redevelopment be in the best

interest of the community in order to receive the enhanced density bonus.

Haas suggested a bonus range not be provided, but rather asked the committee members to state say concerns over traffic and other services provided within the community.

Kendler commented that 8-12 units per acre would be more acceptable. Traffic, and preservation of the community's culture, are the main concerns when considering density.

The committee came to a consensus that the density as proposed is far too high. The major concerns are increased traffic, impact on the community's culture (look and feel of the Village), and impact on the surrounding neighborhoods.

4. Impacts of development on Village services for police, fire, and EMS

Committee defers this topic to the appropriate departments and agencies.

5. Should the Village evaluate providing Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) for those allowable project components which provide benefit to the Village? Potential project components eligible for TIF funding:

- Municipal Water
- Hazardous Soil Remediation
- Soil Stabilization (geo-piles)
- Re-route Elm Grove Road
- Streetscaping
- Underground Parking

Consensus of the committee is that in some circumstances, such as instances where there is public benefit, TIF funding would be appropriate.

Galanis commented that TIF funding would be OK for everything except underground parking,

Schoenecker commented that there would be a problem with providing TIF funding for soil remediation. There are still hazardous waste liability issues. The Reinders have never been good 'house keepers'. Not in favor of TIF funding for soil remediation, or soil stabilization (geo-piles).

Haas commented that TIF funding for site remediation would be OK. It would be in the public's interest to have the sight remediated. It is not uncommon for communities to provide funding for remediation on industrial sights. However, that is not to say 100% of the site remediation costs should be funded.

Klein noted that typically cities will have taken over land that has been deemed brownfield, or is highly contaminated. The city would TIF to clean the site, and make it more desirable for a developer to consider developing. Caution should be taken to assure TIF funding is not simply going to the Reinders because they have an unclean site.

Committee Consensus on the utilization of TIF funding for specific eligible costs of the redevelopment are as follows:

TIF funding should not be utilized for:

- Hazardous soil remediation
- Soil Stabilization (geo-piles)
- Underground Parking

[Kendler exited the meeting at 7:09PM]

TIF funding could potentially be utilized for:

- Municipal water
- Re-routing Elm Grove Road
- Public Streetscaping.

Note* TIF funding could be considered for financial support soil stabilization (Geo-piles) so long it is not enriching the economic benefit of the buyer or the seller.

5. Site Development and Design

Re-routing of Elm Grove Road at Watertown Plank Road: There is concern regarding the proposed re-routing of Elm Grove at Watertown Plank Road, specifically whether there would be adequate protection/shielding for homes located on Elm Grove Rd.

Traffic Impact of new development: Berger found the traffic study conducted by traffic Engineering Services wholly inadequate, as it was based on 2011 data. Efforts to monitor the traffic was done inaccurately. The Village traffic counter placed in the field became inoperable, a new traffic counter was rented and installed incorrectly in the field.

Mr. Wiertzema noted that the data used in the Traffic Engineering traffic analysis was from 2013. Since the last meeting, the traffic counts were reassessed, and the traffic counts were actually lower than the original counts.

Berger stated the traffic analysis is worthy of a fresh study.

Berger read from a comment letter provided by Kendler who had left the meeting. Kendler's traffic concerns are, "excessive traffic and the lack of havin a traffic study that includes all projects the trustees and Village leaders are aware of and that may impact traffic in the development area."

[Hansen existed the meeting at 7:17PM]

De Angelis commented that the village engineers will provide a traffic analysis study based on the previous traffic study that has been provided. the determination will be made if the assumptions in the original study are valid. National traffic standards will be used in the comparison.

Consensus of the committee is that the traffic impact of the proposed new development is an issue that needs to be addressed by a more comprehensive traffic study.

View shed of proposed project from surrounding properties:

Committee members commented that the overall mass and height has an effect on what this will look like and feel like in the Village's downtown. The landscaping should include some rather larger caliper trees.

Berger stated the view shed issue is of large concern to people who live across from the proposed development. Additionally, the lighting plan for the proposed development will need to be reviewed extensively by the Plan Commissions.

Greenspace: The committee is in agreement that the green space component is OK.

Public space and pathway- the committee is in agreement that the proposed public space and pathway is a positive thing.

Parking: The committee would like to see the number of parking spaces for residential units increased to two parking spaces per unit.

Sound reflection by buildings: The committee agrees this is a non-issue.

7. Benefits/Detriments to Village

Benefits- The proposed redevelopment would eliminate an eye sore, enhance the downtown, increase tax base, and enhance the Village's walkability.

Detriments- Public safety is a concern for people/children on the pathway and attempting to cross Elm Grove Road to Watertown Plank Road.

3. **Other items which may come before the Committee**

Berger stated that anything constructed on the site needs to be keeping in character with the Village.

Galanis commented the one bedroom units should be designed larger. Currently designed at 750 square feet for one bedroom.

Berger commented that an outstanding concern is that it may be too late to enter the apartment game. Wauwatosa now has 2,300 rental units. New construction going on nearby in Brookfield. Are we going to be able to compete and have the property filled successfully? Concerns about the vacation of elm Grove road and use it in the density calculation.

De Angelis recommend the committee meet again, to formally approve the minutes. Office staff will send out dates to schedule the next meeting.

4. **Adjourn**

Schoenecker motions, and Schaefer seconded to adjourn. Motion carried 7-0
Meeting was adjourned at 7:41PM

Respectfully Submitted,

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

DRAFT