

David De Angelis

From: David De Angelis
Sent: Monday, October 3, 2016 3:59 PM
To: David De Angelis; George Haas; John Domaszek; John Domaszek (jdomaszek@gmail.com); Katy Cornell; Neil Palmer; Patrick Kressin; Patty Kujawa; Thomas Michalski
Cc: Thomas Harrigan; Mary S. Stredni; Monica L. Hughes
Subject: FW: Citizens for the Essence of Elm Grove - 9/28/16 Ad Hoc Committee meeting notes
Attachments: EG-Planned Development Overlay District.pdf; ATT00001.htm

Good Afternoon,

Please see the below email and attachment that I have been asked to forward to the committee.

Dave

From: Marlee Jansen [mailto:marleejansen@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, October 3, 2016 9:35 AM
To: David De Angelis <ddeangelis@elmgrovi.org>
Subject: Fwd: Citizens for the Essence of Elm Grove - 9/28/16 Ad Hoc Committee meeting notes

Dear Dave:

A citizen sent this email regarding the Reinders development to me, and I wondered if you might be able to share it with the rest of the ad hoc committee. Also, I wanted to let you know that my last name is Jansen, not Hansen - sorry I did not see this to correct it earlier!

Thank you,

Marlee

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Ted J. Eull <tjeull@yahoo.com>
To: Tadeo Alejandro Diaz Balderrama <c.e.elmgrove@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 29, 2016 10:06 AM
Subject: Re: Citizens for the Essence of Elm Grove - 9/28/16 Ad Hoc Committee meeting notes

Tadeo,

Thanks for the detailed notes - you're doing an incredible job of keeping up with this project and I'm sure a bunch of people appreciate it as much as I do.

One thing I'm going to raise to the Ad Hoc and Planning Committees is the calculation of ERD (effective residential density) specified in the code for PDOs. Did the developer share this calculation, or enough data to complete it as far as you know? The ERD is not simply number of units but a more detailed calculation for mixed use that takes into account the interior size of units and the amount of commercial space. You can see an example calculation here: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1es1H041I5FabrIIPXQXA4BvaUiwR9YvTNHvw38ylshg/edit?usp=sharing>

In the spreadsheet I used some numbers from their plan but I don't have the real TNR number, and the ARU is just based on a bullet in your notes about 1,500 sq ft size for apartments. But if the units in the mixed use bldg are smaller that would bring this down (or townhomes could bring it up).

I'm also attaching the PDO ordinance which I think we should share out for interested people to read. It's worth noting that all allowance for a PDO, and especially for Enhanced Density, is discretionary on the part of the village. The owner/developer has no "right" to develop a PDO or put enhanced density, but must convince our board that:

- [1] ...the project will provide **better utilization of the land and better preservation of natural resources** than would otherwise be realized if the site were developed either in conformity with the density requirements of the underlying district or as a PDO District without an enhanced density;
- [2] ...the project makes adequate provision such that an increase in residential density will not have an **unreasonable adverse effect** on neighboring properties, existing and/or proposed public rights-of-way and/or municipal and other public services as a result of the type, intensity and frequency of the use(s) associated with the proposed project;
- [3] ...**the structures proposed for the project are harmonious with existing surrounding structures and land uses.**

The "scale" issue that people are feeling speaks directly to #3 and it is completely correct, appropriate and indeed REQUIRED for the trustees to consider when deciding if the enhanced density is allowed. They can and should reject the plan, if the scale is not harmonious with surroundings.

Furthermore, when evaluating the PDO, the plan committee and the board are required to evaluate several criteria, including:

- [1] The development will not be contrary to the **general welfare and economic prosperity of the community.**

If their best judgment is that 175 rental units is not in the village's best economic interest, they can (and should) reject or require revision. There is no right or entitlement (zero, none whatsoever) for the property owner to have a PDO, or put a specific density. For perspective, if the village simply re-zoned the undeveloped part to Multifamily, then the allowable density would be 8 units per acre.

Not sure if folks on the ad hoc committee have read the PDO ordinance, but I think it's very helpful in understanding the role of the village in this process, and that this is an extraordinary and mutually-developed plan, not a simple development under regular zoning.

I also want to point out that comparing to much smaller watermark (also all Condo) is non-applicable and we should tell them to stop doing it unless they plan to put in premium condos only and reduce their property size to 2 acres. There is no requirement that the village allow same or similar densities in different PDOs, on different properties with totally different scale and composition. In fact it would be foolish in our part.

Personally, with great amenities (path, road realignment, mixed use) I would love to see the property developed. It's also clear that many EG residents don't think that 175 apartments is in our economic/general welfare best interests. So I'll be pushing for a plan with ERD much closer to 15 and a mix much more weighted to condos. I think some apartments could play a part in the development, but it could be 50 (which is still a lot) with a more significant development of townhomes and high-end condos - which helps lend stability and keep the rental values up.

Thanks again for your notes and sorry for MY long winded email :)

Best Regards,
Ted

From: Tadeo Alejandro Diaz Balderrama <c.e.elmgrove@gmail.com>

To:

Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2016 10:37 PM

Subject: Citizens for the Essence of Elm Grove - 9/28/16 Ad Hoc Committee meeting notes

Good evening everyone,

Some of you were present at tonight's meeting and can relay that there was no forum for public discussion about the most recently proposed plans. It was a meeting for the stakeholders (committee members) to ask the developer questions. However, there will be a meeting open to the public on October 5th from 4:30-7:30pm at the Women's Club where people from the community can go directly to each expert to ask questions. Also, the next Ad-Hoc committee meeting will take place on 10/12/16.

I Trustee Haas if there would be forums for the community to voice their collective concerns and he felt that the planning commission meeting and the village board meeting (when the topic comes up) would be a good place to discuss these.

My notes were as follows:

- The development needs an ingress/egress on Elm Grove road
- They think they added 1 acre of land to the current development calculations by including the front property.
- There is a large parking structure under the buildings that will be partially below ground. The roof of this structure between the building would be a "green roof"
- There is no plans to move soil in or out of the site
- The height change from 4 to 3 floors shaved 15 feet in height to a height of 46ft from the level of Elm Grove Road and 54ft from the property level.
- They would not remove trees but would actually add some trees to EG road
- They are still working on the architectural details and warned that the aesthetics of the buildings are not final
- One of the committee members mentioned the development felt "huge" in it's current state.
- The mixed use building would have the first floor as commercial with 12,000 sq ft available, the two stories above would be residential (this would be the last building to be built)
- The number of units in each building is roughly:
 - A - 50
 - B - 70
 - C - 30
- 6 townhouses
- This totals 152 units in the large buildings, rest of the units would be in the mixed use building
- No studios are built into the current plans
- The units are large 1-2 bedrooms and 2 bedrooms with den. Their largest would be 1800 sq ft, average unit is 1500 sq ft.
- Goal is to rent it at \$1.8 dollars/square feet

-There would be a lot of opportunity for customization of the units to preserve long term residents.

-The developer used the quote "There won't be anything else like this in Waukesha County"

-Developer also admitted that in many cases you can buy a home for less than these units rent for but they feel they cater to the high end customer (executives, millennials, retirees) who will move out of their homes and make room for more people to move to Elm Grove.

-The issue of what the developer would do if occupancy becomes an issue came up
Developer is shooting for 95% occupancy, their lowest in their properties is 88%
If they run into issues with occupancy they provide incentives like free rent, free parking, etc

They feel they provide other incentives to live there (gave examples like the fastest Wi-Fi available, an Amazon room, bicycles , etc)

One of the committee members mentioned to the developer that issue of occupancy will come up and be an active issue for many people

-The developer stated that they have a long term commitment with the project, quoted their ownership commitments with other projects going for 10 years.

-A committee member brought up two issues they felt were important - Density and traffic.

A traffic study is being updated and finalized (by the developer from what I understand)

From the developer - "this is going to be a great improvement in traffic on watertown plank road"

One committee member stated that traffic has to be addressed for development to take place

-Multiple committee members identified the bike path as a big plus, there was some discussion about where the bike path crosses and the developer said this was still fluent

-The question of the fire department using the EG road ingress on the north end of the street came up, the fire chief stated that they would use the water town plank road entrance due to weight limits.

-The developer stated that they rely on experts to design (architects, landscape architects, engineers, etc)

They are aiming to separate foot, bike and truck traffic within the property

-A committee member identified the mixed use and the bike path as big improvement but identified the lack of play space for children of families that move to the development

-The question of who will own and maintain the bike path came up

The developer stated that it would make sense to make it a permanent easement on the property and who is responsible for it is still negotiable

-The question of who will be responsible for the re-alignment of Elm Grove road came up - this is part of the global development proposal and the TIF would help pay for infrastructure improvement

-The current right of away on each side of EG road is 50 ft (this is the amount of property owned by the Village on either side of the road)

-They would have on site management full time, full time maintenance and a leasing agent as well.

-The question of whether adjacent wells was brought up by a committee member came up

The developer mentioned they would only go down 4-6 feet down existing grade and would dig ~30ft for structure support

Initially the answer was "I suppose we could monitor ground water"

One of the committee members proposed the village should be working to protect the water quality of its residents while negotiations are taking place.

The developer then went on to say that they are "...100% committed to monitoring wells"

-Since the renderings are not final one of the committee members asked for an example of one of the developer properties that would mirror this development. The developer gave their headquarters at 1200 N Mayfair road for an example of the type and standard of development they would have. He also mentioned the landscaping in that site is the standard.

-A committee member raised safety concerns about the detention basins - they didn't have specific depth numbers but stated they would mostly be dry and would work as filters when it rains

-The timeline of this project would be 2 years for full completion. EG road change would have to happen the first year to allow an entry point to the site.

The sequence of which buildings would go up first has not been determined

-The TID schedule sent out was put together by Ehlers (EG financial advisors)

This would require committee review

Dave DeAngelis mentioned that no information has been requested of the village despite the date noted on the document and it illustrated how fluid the process was. The document was merely provided to outline the process, the dates will fluctuate. The proposal is still conceptual.

-Given the meeting on 10/5/16 by the developer and to allow the committee members to attend there will be no Ad hoc committee meeting until 10/12/16

Mark Reinders had a chance to speak as well

He thanked the committee member for their time commitment

They are in regular communications with Wangard

Wangard doesn't make decisions without Reinders input

Reinders held out on including the front buildings but Wangard worked to educate them on the importance of including the building to adequately develop the site

The Reinders felt that if it was that important they would agree

The Elm Building was not included due to its sentimental value but he mentioned he is committed to improving the building but that will depend on tenant mix. He does plan for some retail use (mentioned something about people wanting a pizza place in that area with outside seating potentially facing RJ's)

He wants to cater to whomever is coming in

Reinders signs off on any critical decisions that have to be made.

Finally, I gave Wangard, Trustee Haas, Mary Claire Lanser (public relations person) and Dave DeAngelis a copy of our letter. I also gave my personal notes on the DNR meeting that gave the facts about water standards, monitoring and regulations to Mr. Wangard since the question came up and the meeting was so informative (one of the other people presenting had mentioned that the minutes are available but the presentation is not)

I also asked Dave DeAngelis for the phase 2 assessment of the site by the DNR for contamination so that I can send it out to everyone. He is going to look for it and I will also contact the DNR so that it is available for review by everyone (it is public record).

Sorry for the long email late at night but I hope it is helpful to those that could not attend.

Tadeo Diaz Balderrama