

## Thomas Harrigan

---

**From:** David De Angelis  
**Sent:** Monday, November 14, 2016 4:26 PM  
**To:** Thomas Harrigan  
**Subject:** FW: Wangard-Reinders Development

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

From: Robert Smith [mailto:rob217194@sbcglobal.net]  
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2016 10:25 AM  
To: Village President Neil Palmer <npalmer@elmgroveswi.org>; Village Trustee Thomas Michalski <tmichalski@elmgroveswi.org>; Village Trustee Katy Cornell <kcornell@elmgroveswi.org>; Village Trustee Patrick Kressin <pkressin@elmgroveswi.org>; Village Trustee John Domaszek <jdomaszek@elmgroveswi.org>; Village Trustee George Haas <ghaas@elmgroveswi.org>; Village Trustee Patty Kujawa <pkujawa@elmgroveswi.org>  
Cc: David De Angelis <ddeangelis@elmgroveswi.org>; Thomas Harrigan <tharrigan@elmgroveswi.org>  
Subject: Wangard-Reinders Development

Dear Mr. President, and Village Trustees,

I have attended three of the Ad-hoc committee meetings, which by the way were very poorly attended by the Ad-hoc committee members, and I question how the members were chosen. I also attended the Wangard presentations and open house, and I wish to share my thoughts on the proposed development with you and all the other trustees and village residents..

I believe that we should keep the Village of Elm Grove like a village. Nothing against the owners and developers, these are business people wanting to maximize the profit from the development. But the residents have to live with what is approved FOREVER. The developers do not live in the Village, why should we have to live with what the developers want, it is more important to get a development that the resident owners, the people who live here every day get what we want, and you as our representatives are to represent the best interests of the residents and community, not the developers.

I also believe TIF financing should not be approved. If the developers think it is a good proposition it should not need financing from the residents of the village. Interest rates are at all time lows and I am sure that Wangard and Reinders have generally very good credit. I do not accept the premise that we should accept any development to expand the tax base.

I question the Wangard position that older demographics want to rent rather than buy. Rent of \$3,000 per month can buy a very nice home up to \$600,000 and owners can sell it if they want to move on. Paying rent is not a value proposition for most people. Saying that there is already a waiting list of prospective tenants that are seriously interested, without a floor plan, formal proposal or fixture list is nonsense. I caution you to be wary of marketing hype rather than fact. The recent articles in the MJS and local papers are other examples of marketing hype by self interested parties that we will all experience.

I believe the property is to be over built and that the density of the site is too high. I believe no more than two stories should be sufficient and that a minimum of 2 car spaces under cover per residential lot should be required and an additional 1 car space per lot should be provided for visitors. There is no serious public transport available in the village and personal vehicles will be the primary mode of transport for all prospective residents. I have lived in developments similar to the proposed development many times throughout my life and car spaces are at a premium in such

developments. There is never enough parking spaces and the shortage creates car rage just like on the highway. Also car spaces should not be shared with the mixed use development, they should have their own parking without direct access to the housing development parking. I am more confident than the developers that the development will increase the traffic in the village especially at peak times and this will bring its own other problems.

I would rather have Townhouses and Condominiums than Apartments, the occupants would take ownership of not only the Condo but the Village. Owners are far more interested in what is happening in the Village than renters. Nuisances in rented apartment blocks may not be offences but they do become annoying and my personal experiences with these type of accommodations tells me that owners are much more friendly to each other than renters. A high density housing complex, on a small parcel of land, in the heart of the village most certainly is not aligned with my values and I fear that the village we all treasure may be lost forever, for once this development gets built it is with us forever.

I would like to see the Village conduct a referendum on the development, afterall it is the owner residents of the village that have to live with the consequences of what is built.

I suggest the referendum have at least two questions that cover these points:

Question 1. Should the final proposal accepted by the Village Board proceed? YES/NO.

Question 2. If the Final proposal should proceed, should the Village provide TIF financing. YES/NO

I attended the Open House, and when I questioned the presenter on the aquafer being tested I was told that it wouldn't be required as the aquafer at the Reinders property was higher than the aquafer at surrounding properties. At previous Ad-hoc meetings we were informed that aquafer testing would be included, before, during and after construction. This site is going to have city water and therefore it is of little concern to the development that the aquafer may be contaminated.

During the same Open House I also asked about vibration on the buildings from the railroad, they had no answer. I got the impression that there is much more to be done by the developer. I have a concern that the vibration from the railroad could be transmitted through the development and transmitted at a different higher frequency than is currently the case. I believe vibration monitoring should be included; before, during and after construction of this development.

Fancy drawings that we are told may have no resemblance to the final product does not win me over. When can we expect to see the final renderings, floor plans and finishes?

I do want to see the site developed. But, the development must suit the current village, as decided by the resident owners, and the developers need to finance it for themselves.

Please pass to the Ad-hoc committee.

Sincerely,  
Robert Smith  
955 Katherine Drive