

Thomas Harrigan

From: alexdiaz1@gmail.com on behalf of Tadeo Alejandro Diaz Balderrama
<c.e.elmgrove@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2016 10:56 PM
Subject: Citizens for the Essence of Elm Grove - Ad hoc committee meeting notes

Good evening everyone,

Some of you were at the meeting and can communicate the sentiment that was felt there. This was a long meeting that changed the goal of the ad hoc committee from purely educative to now actually giving recommendations on particular aspects of the development. There was also say that this is the way the community would be able to voice their concern (I suspect through them). I will call Dave Deangelis tomorrow to see if I can get contact information for them so that anyone that wants to pass along their concerns can. Some of you came up to me asking me for their contact information and are now aware that we do not have it (email were requested at the initial meeting). I will send an email out when I find out what the best way to reach them is. Below are my notes from the meeting. I apologize in advanced for the lengthy email.

The next open house will take place on Monday November 14th from 4:30 - 7:00pm at the Women's club

The next ad hoc committee meeting will take place on Tuesday November 15th in the Court room (to allow for it to be televised)

Please let me know if anyone has any questions or concerns.

Tadeo

10/26/16 Ad hoc committee meeting notes:

- Haas stated the materials provided were similar to those from the previous meeting, opened to Wangard to speak about changes, height and traffic.
- Wangard, Wayne, Mary Claire Lanser and Tim Andersen (development director, architect, MBA) were present
- There have been subtle updates
 - Mixed use building has decreased in size, pulled away from bike path as a suggestion from the last meeting
 - It is now 10,341 sq feet from the previous 12,274sq ft.
 - Bike path was moved between adjacent residential property and commercial building.
- There was brief discussion about decreasing the height of the center building, Wangard is still studying the potential for changes
 - B-building (largest) - Looking to decrease 1st floor to decrease height and relief from the 3 story height
- There is new traffic information, although they mentioned the complete study is not done.
- There was mention that the committee had topics to be considered prepared by staff and Neil Palmer.
- Wayne went over the site overview slide
 - Want right of way clearance of 20ft from the road
 - Road portion going through the property would be re-dedicated to the Village
 - Green space will be retained
 - Bike path is to east of existing tree line, won't disturb the tree line
- Rich and Rob Reinders will be partners, Mark Reinders will have a role in commercial property management and Wangard will manage the rental property

Parking -1.5 indoor spaces per unit, 2.2 overall spaces per unit

-Unit count went from 176 to 174 (2 units less in A building)

-If B building was changed it would decrease building count further

-Building height

A, B and C buildings are 3 stories - 45 ft above EG road, 14ft of which is roof making the eaves 31ft.

Mixed use building is three stories (first commercial, second two apartments)

Basement is partially recessed

-Question from board - how do the building compare to other residential developments in terms of sq footage. -

Sq footage is still being worked out for current development

-Question - about the make up of apartments in the mixed used building - would be a mix of 1 and 2 bedrooms, majority 1 bedrooms of around 700-800 sq feet in size. Parking for the commercial building would be completely underground, separate from the main parking garage.

-Question about rent - smaller units will have higher cost per sq foot but on average across the development rent will be ~\$1.8/sq foot making a 700sq foot apartment ~\$1260.

Reason for this is that major investment is in the bath and kitchens, so you have to adjust accordingly.

-Question about bringing water to the property, who will bear the cost?

Wayne answered that the village previously estimated it would cost ~\$450 to 500k to bring a pipe to the development. Wangard wants it to be paid by TIF. Size of the pipe would allow business district to tap into the line

-Question - what type of businesses would go into multi use? Who has say in it?

Village has to approve use and plan of operation (i.e. hours, parking, etc). It would mostly be service businesses and restaurants, potential for a pizza place, brew pub, coffee shop.

-Question - who is driving the decision?

It would be important to understand what is sustainable, community input would be important

-Question - Rear parking would be for retailers and customers. There is potential to use the parking lot for community events as well

-Question - What is the height of the commercial portion of the multi use

12 ft ceiling height anticipated. Question was asked if this would limit it's use - it was felt it wouldn't since lots of businesses have open ceiling concepts

Residential portion would have 9 foot ceiling height with top floor potential for having higher height

Traffic

-There is decreased access along watertown plank road

-1 signaled intersection now

-Question about incline of road - Grade is <5%

-Question about headlights into adjacent properties and into first floor of building A - a tree line would be formed

-Wangard - It would be easy to do a study and work with a landscape architect to prevent this. He mentioned that he is sensitive to lights because he has had personal issues in the past.

-The summary of the traffic report simplifies the impact, takes into account development and road reconfiguration.

-The 3rd bullet point of the traffic study summary (sent in the prior email) is key and most important as it outlines the weekly added traffic in each direction.

-Question - the traffic study "almost defies logic", study is still in the process of being finalized, traffic is expected to increase, perpendicular parking along watertown plank road would change to parallel parking and the road configuration at the intersection would change. The number on the report is the net increase to what exists today. An additional 620 trips daily is what is being estimated.

-There was discussion of where people would opt to drive towards, wangard mentioned that people will adjust and usually people will head towards traffic signal (to ease the concern of increased traffic along Juneau). Also, because of train people will want to go towards Bluemound.

-Question, has round about been considered - would take more space

- Question - traffic can back up from watertown plank a road all the way to Katherine on the west side. They felt that the 4 way intersection would be an improvement. People may continue to Bluemound to avoid train.
- Haas mentioned that they need more detail at peak times, wants to see more data of what is there now.
- Wangard mentioned that data does not take into account demographics of the residents (presumably less trips with more retirees)
- Wangard mentioned there is already a wait list of people that are interested in living there
- EG road at the intersection would be three lanes (one for turning left) facing south
- Parking on either side of EG road (by WTP road) would be eliminated to allow for the turning lane)
- Wayne Higgins is not done with the traffic study, the impact of the traffic signals is still to be confirmed.
- The village will have the traffic study independently reviewed.
- A committee member reminded everyone that Wayne Higgins is a long term resident and is invested in the community
- Mary Claire Lanser presented the findings of her door to door visits (unclear if it was just from the visits or from the surveys of the open house)
 - Rang 79 door bells, talked to 34 homeowners, tried to stay closer to Katherine
 - The listed the issues that she provided in the uploaded materials (benefits and dislikes)
 - People suggested she talk to the businesses. She spoke to 4 "very high profile business owners"
 - the summary is that it would be great for business. Some comments that was able to jot down: "time for changes and change in traffic", "development would increase value of adjacent businesses"
 - She is responsible for community outreach and made herself available for those who want to voice their comments.
- The committee moved to the village prepared talking points, not meant to be all inclusive
- Issue of Density came up
- A member brought up that it was not just the density but also the massive size.
- For this zone 8 units per acre is the currently allowed density, village does allow bonus density in some cases
- The EG building statute was recited and pretty much says that an exception may be made for a building of exceptionally high quality and may be recommended by the planned commission. The discretionary number may be increased to no more than 22 units per acre (current development asking for 17.9 units per acre when taking the surface area of the mill shops into account as well)
- Currently they have 9.72 acres for 174 units.
- The Mill place is in the calculation and they made a commitment there would be no residential development in those buildings.
- Without Mill place the total property size would be 8.36 acres (Mill place is 1.36 acres), making the density 20.8 units per acre.
- There was discussion about the inclusion of commercial property, etc.
- Dave reminded everyone that the ordinance sets forth a formula to calculate effective residential density in multi use development which takes into account the total non residential units (TRN), total number of residential units (TRU), the are in sq feet of all residential units (ARU) and the land size (Land size)
 - $$ERU = ([TRU+TNR]/ARU)/Land\ size$$
- This formula helps to account for commercial space. Since the sq footage of total living space has not been set the calculation was not performed there.
- The ordinance was created when the watermark was developed
- ERU would push the density to >20.8 unit per acre when taking the commercial space into account, but not by much.
- The committee mentioned that the village doesn't want to entertain the maximum
- The village keeps a chart with the density of each residential development in the village, the committee asked that it be provided for them
- The watermark is 36 total units, equating to a density of 18.
- A committee member mentioned that residents are not happy with the number of units and asked what number would be feasible

- Wangard compared the property to the Watermark stating that there is more green space, less impervious surface. There is a financial tipping point where the cost of the development vs the cost of developing is not feasible. He feel this development will add significant income tax base to pay for the improvements. He "we trimmed it back quite a bit".
- Question - how many units less would a saddle in the middle building shave off - 2-4 but would increase the cost because of the need for a second elevator bank.
- Question - is there a TIF figure being thrown around. The amount has not even been considered yet. The first hurdle is to determine if the development is appropriate for TIF
- Cost of the development would be offset by the TIF and affects the magnitude of what they ask for.
 - Member brought up that density and TIF are big issues
 - There may be a breaking point in unit number where TIF wouldn't make sense economically. If that unit number was 100 it would not work
- Wangard - part of project is community development.
 - He mentioned that at a certain point for the Reinders, continuing to operate a warehouse project makes more sense. They know the income that is generated from the current use. The project follows what the community asked for. Should also encourage commercial development across watertown plank road.
 - Without TIF and infrastructure development the project will not occur.
 - At the end of the day numbers have to make sense financially
- Committee member - Mentioned that if they used the watermark density cap it would cap the development at 86 units and at that cap the project would be a no go.
- Pure size of the building is an issue, neighbors will see a massive apartment complex
- Height wise it is the same as the watermark, a committee member brought up that the watermark would be around similarly sized buildings but this development would feel out of place with the neighboring community.
- There was mention that the Watermark developer lost money on the deal as well
- 3d models would be used when it is brought to the building board and planning commission
- Wangard went on to say that the office building coming down was a compromise. The retail rental in comparison will be lower to help keep this a healthy and viable downtown.
- Also mentioned his commitment to add additional trees.

At this time there was discussion of the purpose of the board

Haas did not feel that at this time the committee was in a position to make recommendations. He would want to get more information on other residential developments (density wise), a more precise calculation to compare to and the traffic data.

- One committee member voiced that they felt the committee was redundant and rather impotent
- Haas mentioned that their purpose is to give recommendations to other boards.
- He asked the members if they had enough information to come up with a group opinion to pass on. The committee felt they are close but want a full traffic study, want footprint as a comparison in EG, want ERU of other developments, want renderings without the tree line to see what the development would look like.
- One committee member went on to say that we all take care of our "castle" and this is the "village castles". There needs to be a commitment to this development by the village. He brought up the park as a jewel in the community and identified it as a great investment but identified that in order for a community to stay vital it needs to have people. The village should remain development friendly. He cited Wauwatosa in the 70-80's where their population dropped significantly until they started passing more TIF. There was discussion about the timing of the business improvement to which he answered that retail followed residential.
- The board came back to what it needs to come up with a recommendation.
- The board is interested in development and most people voiced their support but they are interested in the intensity of the development

There was mention of the lack of public comment forum, Haas responded that public comment will follow formal application.

- The time table is tentative and it is already one month behind

- The public will have their chance for public comment at time of the planning commission meeting and all other bodies that have to approve this development.
- There will also be open houses to voice opinion.
- The ad hoc committee is a preamble to a formal application

There was mention about the lack of information on the impact on schools.

-Dave shared that the superintendent discussed with them that they completed a study recently on redistricting. They feel they have the capacity for additional students currently.

-Wangard again mentioned that the demographics may look different and that the list of people on the wait list was mostly retiree's

A board member asked how many people are on the list - the answer is 5 on the waiting list and another 12 interested in renting.

-One member mentioned that he is inclined to assist a developer and other members mentioned they are in favor of providing TIF for part of the development which provide benefit to the village.

-They are requesting other views of the project

-Question about sound - if the buildings would amplify the sound of the train or improve it for the neighboring communities. There was mention of adding an additional sound engineer consultant but they would use materials to dampen the sound of the train in the building. One board member felt it would be improved.

-There was the comment that the pathway would be of benefit and that it would connect the park to the commercial sector.

-There will continue to be open houses

-Mary Claire will be also available for public comment.

-Ultimately Wangard wants to know there is support for the project because it is large investment to put this through the proper channels (mentioned sometimes having 6 figures involved prior to putting a shovel in the ground).

-The question of condos came up, he said that he can't say with certainty that the condo market doesn't exist but did mention that it is a more complex finance strategy (need to have multiple lenders). He did mention that is it not completely out of the picture for the future. One board member mentioned that condos for a comparable size to those around town could sell for 200-400k

-Wangard also mentioned fresh data that rated that in Milwaukee it was 12% less expensive to buy than to rent (30% in Chicago).

The next ad hoc committee meeting will take place on 11/15/16 (Tuesday), in the court room. The goal is to go through the rest of the information requested and go through the topics to be considered to provide a recommendation based on that. The point is to have it televised by having it in court room.