

**PLAN COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, July 28th, 2021**

Meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by President Palmer

1. Roll Call.

Present: President Palmer, Mr. Michalski, Mr. Long, Mr. Cashin

Absent: Mr. Jodie, Mr. Reineke, Mr. Kujawa

Also: Thomas Harrigan - Zoning and Planning Administrator/Assistant to the Village Manager, David De Angelis – Village Manager and Hector de la Mora – Village Attorney.

2. Review and act on meeting minutes dated 6/30/21 and 7/8/21.

Mr. Long motioned to approve the 6/30/21 minutes as submitted. Mr. Cashin seconded, motion carried 4-0.

Mr. Cashin motioned to approve the 7/8/21 minutes as submitted. Mr. Long seconded, motion carried 4-0.

3. Public Comment Session - Related to the proposed School Sisters of Notre Dame Campus Redevelopment. More specifically, the Mandel Group request for approval of a Certified Survey Map, Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Rezoning, Conditional Use Permit and Redevelopment Plans.

President Palmer provided a brief overview of the School Sisters of Notre Dame Campus Redevelopment review process to date and what the protocol will be for the public comment process.

Philip Aiello, of the Mandel Group, presented a comprehensive redevelopment proposal summary to the Commission, which detailed the evolution of the project.

Following the presentation from Mr. Aiello, President Palmer opened the floor to public comment.

Public Comment Session

Anita Steindorf, 1035 Terrace Drive – Mrs. Steindorf stated the proposed development is too dense. There will be impacts to the police and fire departments. The projected population increase would be close to 10%.

Dan Schmidt, 12955 Meadow Drive –Mr. Schmidt stated that he lives in one of the homes which will be most affected by the development. Mr. Schmidt believes the proposed pocket neighborhood of 11 homes is unnecessary, and he was not aware the rent for the multi-family apartments will be as high as is suggested it will be.

Debbie Robinson, 1065 Longwood Ave – Ms. Robison asked what would be the cost to the home owners to connect to municipal water once the system is built out, if required, and what is the time frame. Concerns related to potential increased traffic in the Village. Stated the new single family lots

should be zoned as Rs-1, but would like to see what the lot configuration would be as Rs-2 zoning. Wonder what it would look like as Rs-2. Feels the redevelopment would be great for the community, but believes the scope of the project could be toned down. Everyone would benefit.

Michael Hamilton, 13130 Watertown Plank Road Unit 311 – Mr. Hamilton stated that he is currently a resident of the Watermark Condominiums, the closest neighbors to the development. Very familiar with the Mandel Group and has worked with them in the past. Thinks Mandel is one of the best developers in the City, would be very concerned if they were to walk away from this development. The proposed SSND development is very similar to the Watermark's construction. Most people who are interested in the Watermark are from the Village because they appreciate the quality of life that comes with it. The stores in the downtown need more customers. This kind of development will bring a high income group into the downtown area. The possibility of municipal water being brought into the Village with this development is very important to us. The Watermark has \$400,000 invested in well equipment. Very supportive of Lake Michigan water. In favor the development.

Matilda McClusky, 12800 Watertown Plank Road – Has concerns related to traffic. Would Mandel propose more units to the property that has yet to be discussed? What is the total cost that would be incurred to us as residents of Elm Grove?

Tom Castile, 1865 Hollyhock Lane – Mr. Castile moved to Elm Grove from Brookfield because of the charm of the neighborhood. Traffic on Hollyhock has already increased significantly. Need to have more sidewalks just to protect the safety of the people of Elm Grove. Shocked when looking at the TIF proposal. The TIF seems to only protect the Mandel Group. There are ways to bring in tax value other than this development proposal.

Pete Moegenburg, 985 Madera Circle – Mr. Moegenburg has spoken previously to the Plan Commission on behalf of the development, as it relates to the market realities for multi-family redevelopment within southeastern Wisconsin. He stands in support of the development for three simple reasons. 1. Market Demand 2. Community benefits 3. Reputation and quality of the project developer. 1. Market demand - EG has 85% of the total housing stock as owner occupied homes. This is disproportionality high compared to non-owner occupied homes. 2. Community benefits – There is tremendous buying power with the average income that will accompany this development, and it will greatly benefit the commercial sector. 3. There will be a development on this site. Will there be, or could there be a developer who could propose something as high of quality? Not certain. Addresses market demand, provides community benefit, and ancillary benefit to the community (i.e. Water).

Peggy Coakley, 1050 Madera Circle – Has lived in the Village since 4 years old. Something will happen on this property. Mrs. Coakley has known the Mandel Group as an employee of a residential moving company. I know that I have a mother in law and a mother who would be living in this development right now if it were already constructed. If we wanted to sell our home, we would be there, we want to stay in the Village. People are leaving since there is nowhere to go. I think this property is beautiful. The density is there, and the Village will have to allow for that. Probably will end up being a benefit to the Village. Municipal water is an easy “layup” for a problem that is on our doorstep. Village residents should not be afraid of change. This will help the Village. Speaking on an esoteric level, but it will help the development. Thanked the Plan Commission for their time and due diligence into the project review. The Village is on the doorstep of making this happen, if it does not happen it would be an unacceptable outcome for the Village.

Lisa Becker, 1155 Church Street - Agree with much of what has been said on both sides. Main issue is the scale of the apartment proposals. The Mandel Group would own 10% of the housing stock within the Village. The Village would be better off if the SSND property were sub-divided into multiple properties. More on the scale of the "The corners" of Brookfield at 243 units. What will the impacts be? Special consideration to housing and land use. Elm Grove Heights remains half empty. More fitting legacy to fit the School Sisters would be a gentler redevelopment plan. According to Village code PDO: "the development will not be contrary to the general welfare and prosperity of the community". This calls into question if this project can satisfy this requirement.

Mary Inden, 14745 Watertown Plank Rd - Bringing municipal water into the Village is a big deal. The well water from Brookfield is not wonderful. Mandel group is interested in preserving the historic buildings. The fact they are willing invest this kind of money in these buildings is fantastic. Seeing the size of the buildings, the new single-family homes will act as a buffer. Apartments are a plus to the Village. Do not want to move into the condo. Not positive, is the number of units. Encourage everyone to keep an open mind. If the Mandel Group can reduce the number or size, that would be beneficial.

Dale Streitenberger, 14375 Wisconsin Ave – Mr. Streitenberger believes this project is a great example of good planning and a good process. The main building is still the historical convent at 5 stories. The redevelopment creates a great amenity space for the residents that would utilize the park like setting at the center of the development. The initial development drawings compared to what we have today, the buildings are softer and resemble more of a single-family home. Look at the view we currently have compared to what will be. Applaud the partnering with Miller Marriott. The scale of the buildings will seem even smaller when they constructed. This proposal has a lot going for it.

Seeing no additional members of the public for comment, President Palmer closed the public comment session.

President Palmer stated that all information presented at this meeting will become part of the public record.

4. Other Business.

None.

5. Adjournment

Mr. Long motioned, and Mr. Cashin seconded to adjourn. Motion carried 4-0.

Meeting adjourned at 6:48 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

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