

Thomas Harrigan

From: Mary S. Stredni
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 4:47 PM
To: Thomas Harrigan
Subject: FW: Ad Hoc Committee 11 Points
Attachments: image1.jpeg; ATT00001.txt; EGStat335-30Exceprt.pdf; ATT00002.txt

-----Original Message-----

From: Adam Berger [mailto:adam.berger@doeringfleet.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 4:40 PM
To: David De Angelis <ddeangelis@elmgrovewi.org>; neil@neilpalmerllc.com; Mary S. Stredni <mstredni@elmgrovewi.org>
Cc: Tadeo Balderrama <Tadeo.Balderrama@gmail.com>
Subject: Ad Hoc Committee 11 Points

Dear Dave/Neil/Mary:

I continue to have real concerns about the yet-to-be-proposed plan by Wangard. Their President, Wayne, was clear last night that the 172/174 unit proposal was their "go to market" proposal. Wangard was clear that they believe they will be able to achieve the density as compared to other COMMERCIAL properties, certainly not residential. It's wholly unacceptable. I acknowledge there are steps and processes in place to review this at the Board and Committee level, but it seems that the way the Ad Hoc Committee has been run, spoon-fed an agenda, and the way correspondence has been aggregated that the Village is either curating the content available or giving the concept of full transparency an inadequate effort to say the least. Worst of all, the Ad Hoc meetings have been closed to the public. It leaves the impression of manipulation which is hopefully unintended but clearly transpiring.

The AdHoc committee is supposed to be your ears to the ground, experts in one way and community representatives and voice in another. The problem is they have been cutoff and unable to voice (because you dictate the agenda) the public feedback or solicit open feedback that would provoke ideas, concerns, and discussion. To date, you have spoon fed them presentations by Wangard, a faulty traffic study, and DNR information where we are to believe the DNR will ensure we are all safe and sound.

The process is faulty and gives rise to serious negative energy in town, pits neighbors against each other, and all because of a lack of forum!

Last night's open house proved many things to me:

- 1) There are some very upset EG residents who don't have their voices heard
- 2) Wangard is not listening. Their modifications were trivial and related to secondary issues of concern to residents, not size/density/height.
- 3) Wangard believes they can push this through, reliant on bad traffic study data, non-Chalant attitudes about environmental contamination, and ignoring the singular issue in surveys collected thus far - size!
- 4) The Ad Hoc committee is not done and should not be for some time. They must have an open forum to hear the community if they are to represent it in messaging to the developer.

5) Having all developer-led meetings and presentations instead of community hearings and open discussions is failing. We need the committee to lead meetings. They were selected as experts so let them deliberate and evaluate without prescribed structure.

6) All correspondence is not being posted to the website. This is a major problem.

7) There were a majority of Trustees in attendance without a meeting notice. This is in violation of Village regulations. My prior email was to you and other Trustees still has not been responded to.

8) Meeting minutes are very slow to be posted across committees. The ad hoc committee's minutes are not an accurate and full reflection of the meetings and the committee has not been asked to review and approve minutes!

9) The Village has not been open and honest and helpful to residents seeking to oppose the development. This must change or our Board must change in April.

10) We all need to hear how the Trustees will vote on this proposed development, safeguard the community, and listen to and act as a representative for the resident and business constituency. This must be done openly and without "politics," curation, or deception. Trustees are documented sparring with residents already. The first meeting was filled with this. Listening is the hardest skill and the ramifications of failing to listen are too much for our Village.

11) Will the Village enforce EG Stat 335-30 F(3)a as attached? There is a terrible concern in this statute that allows for increased density of this structure exceeds the nicest residential properties OR (and this is the problem) nicest commercial sites.

We need leadership. We need transparency. We need the residents to be heard. We are an incredibly intelligent and savvy community and believe our EG Village is more of a hidden secret in its quaint and quiet aura. This development as proposed is diametrically opposed to the Essence of Elm Grove. Our letter to the Trustees, as published in the paper, as emailed to over 100, and the key tenets from the gathering of 50 plus residents have not been heard.

We must tell this developer we expect and demand them to listen or leave. The residents of this Village deserve respect and the ability to be eyes wide open. It's quite simple. Listen or leave, Wangard. Listen or leave, public officials. I was open going into this process but the developer has made few changes of consequence. They added the front property to continue to prop up density with a greater land mass as a denominator. They realigned EG Road and added a bike path. They have only dropped density 4%. I'm looking for it to drop 33% or so and others still believe that is too much. This is driven by my simple math - 1/3 less = one story less. This is the thesis for the feedback I have heard from EG residents all along. We want less - less height, less mass, less unit count. EG does not benefit from the cash cow this property becomes but it and its residents suffer all the consequences, near term and long-term.

I anticipate this message WILL be included in the Correspondence page immediately as well as any and all replies. Please do share it with Trustees, Building Board Members, and Ad Hoc Com I only hope you have the fortitude to respond openly and timely.

This negative energy will likely erupt if not rectified as I have described, potentially dividing our community, and leaving us with something few want. Please correct this quickly.

We currently have a Village President whose professional job it is to "overcoming these barriers to public acceptance for careful audience targeting, message research and testing, and creating the right mix of new and traditional media for delivery...Neil Palmer and associates have a successful track record of gaining public acceptance of facilities and managing controversial issues. We can create and implement public affairs strategies to help your business or organization minimize controversy, overcome resistance and gain approval." I ask - did our Village President coach Wangard to hire a PR firm in Lanser Public Relations? Does Neil benefit in a quid-pro-quo? He is certainly pushing for

this development, dictating the 7 AD Hoc talking points, and seemingly coaching the developer although he did State in the initial meeting he has been taking to Wangard for a long time about this proposal. The lattermost point is not confirmed. This is a feather in his cap "in his backyard" except it isn't actually his backyard.

THIS Emerald Woods property was allowed by the Village of Elm Grove. This is an abomination. Please see the photo and my attachment noting specific areas of the statute cited above. This is not what downtown Elm Grove will accept and I will stand with my fellow residents to oppose it until it is palatable to our community - verbally, legally, and environmentally.