

January 19, 2021

Mr. Thomas Harrigan
Zoning and Planning Administrator
Village of Elm Grove
13600 Juneau Boulevard
Elm Grove, WI 53122-0906

Re: 13105 Watertown Plank Road
SSND Redevelopment Plan Review

Dear Mr. Harrigan:

We have reviewed the redevelopment plan documents submitted to the Village for the multi-family redevelopment proposed to be constructed on the School Sisters of Notre Dame (SSND) campus at 13105 Watertown Plank Road. The documents were received on January 4, 2021. A site visit was conducted on January 12, 2021 with you, Richard Paul, Jr and I in attendance. Dave De Angelis joined us for a meeting at Village Hall following the site visit. The findings and recommendations are as follows:

1. General:

- a. Wetlands: Mapping from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Water Surface Data Viewer website shows wetland indicators exist on the property. The applicant will need to conduct a wetland investigation to determine if wetlands exist. Wetlands cannot be impacted unless approved by DNR and US Army Corps of Engineers.
- b. Floodplain: The effective FEMA floodplain map shows the property is located outside of a regulatory floodplain.
- c. Previous Development: During our site visit it was noted there are several buildings on the site that appeared to be constructed at different times. Periodic air photos viewed on Waukesha County's GIS taken since 1941 confirm the assumption of phased development of the campus. The photos would also suggest some demolition has also occurred. We do not have records of previous demolition on the site. However, during our site visit we also observed a dump site located in the trees in the southwest part of the existing lot. Therefore, we recommend a Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) be conducted by the applicant. During our meeting after the site visit we discussed that a Phase 1 ESA was in progress. A copy of the final report will need to be provided to the Village.
- d. Permits and Approvals: A copy of all permits and approvals obtained from regulatory agencies having jurisdiction over the improvements need to be provided to the Village.
- e. We recommend the Village enter into a development agreement with the applicant. The approved developer agreement should run with the land for each parcel.
- f. It is known that historical/cultural artifacts have been found in an area near the project site. In addition, a note on the development plan indicates burial graves exist in the northwest corner of CSM Lot 4 where future development is proposed. Because of the previous historical finds in the vicinity of the project area and because of the existing burial grounds, we recommend the applicant conduct an archaeological investigation of the site.

Mr. Thomas Harrigan

Re: 13105 Watertown Plank Road – SSND Redevelopment Plan Review

January 19, 2021

Page 2

- g. We recommend the applicant contact the State Historical Society to determine what restrictions may apply to this development because the complex is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.
 - h. The petition to amend the Comprehensive Plan was not included in our review.
 - i. The petition to rezone the land and create a planned development overlay was not included in our review.
 - j. The site includes multiple existing easements that appear to conflict with proposed development. The applicant will need to indicate how these conflicts will be resolved.
 - k. A Plat of Survey needs to be provided for review.
 - l. An existing conditions plan needs to be provided. The plan needs to be prepared at a scale that will avoid notes and callouts from overlapping with featured information and also allow proper review of details for existing at grade and underground facilities.
 - m. Utility plans need to be submitted for review. We recommend a separate plan be prepared for the sanitary sewer, water distribution and storm sewer systems. We also recommend the plans be prepared at a scale that will avoid notes and callouts from overlapping with featured information and also allow proper review of utility details.
 - n. The redevelopment plan drawings show the conceptual future single-family home lot layout for Lot 1 of the CSM. The redevelopment plans need to also show the conceptual future single-family home lot layout for Lot 4 of the CSM.
 - o. Building Height:
 - i. Section 335-21.E.1 for the requested RM-1 zoning on CSM Lot 2 allows principal structure height to be as much as 36 feet above the surrounding grade (up to 41 feet if the building is actually set back at least 10 feet more than the minimum).
 - ii. Section 335-21.E.1 for the requested RM-1 zoning also allows principal structure height to be as much as 46 feet above the surrounding grade for building faces with exposed foundations (up to 51 feet if the building is actually set back at least 10 feet more than the minimum).
 - iii. Several of the building heights shown on the proposed building elevation drawings exceed the requirements of Section 335-21.E.1 of the Village Code.
 - iv. The tallest proposed building height measured to the peak of the roof shown on the proposed building elevation drawings is 53'-6".
 - v. The architectural drawings show the existing Notre Dame Hall has a height of 91'-1" above grade.
 - p. Construction access:
 - i. Construction access is shown to be provided to the site from Watertown Plank Road. A note needs to be added to multiple drawings indicating the location of the approved construction access along Watertown Plank Road.
 - ii. A note needs to be added to multiple drawings indicating that Green Meadow Place cannot be used as a construction entrance. We recommend signs and barricades be placed at the end of Green Meadow Place to block construction traffic.
2. Conceptual CSM:
- a. The CSM included with the redevelopment plan was reviewed for compliance with Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter A-E 7, Wisconsin Statute Chapter 236 and the Village of Elm Grove Chapter 305 Land Division Regulations:

Mr. Thomas Harrigan

Re: 13105 Watertown Plank Road – SSND Redevelopment Plan Review

January 19, 2021

Page 3

- i. Only the face of the CSM was provided and reviewed. All pages of the CSM will need to be submitted for further review.
 - ii. Per Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapter A-E 7.05(4): Describe all monuments used for determining the location of the parcel and show by bearing and distance their relationship to the surveyed parcel and indicate whether such monuments were found or placed.
 - iii. Per Wisconsin Statute Chapter 236.34 (1m)(c): Each sheet shall be labeled.
 - iv. Per Wisconsin Statute Chapter 236.20(2): The Legend for monuments shall indicate the type, diameter, length and weight of the monuments.
 - v. Per Wisconsin Statute Chapter 236.20 (2)(f): Show the exact width of all easements (existing and proposed).
 - vi. Per Wisconsin Statute Chapter 236.20 (2)(i): North needs to be referenced to a magnetic, true or other identifiable direction.
 - vii. Per Wisconsin Statute Chapter 236.20 (2)(k): When a street is on a circular curve, the main chords of the right-of-way lines shall be drawn as dotted or dashed lines in their proper places.
 - viii. Village of Elm Grove Chapter 305 Land Division Regulations 305-10 (3): The names and address of the owner and subdivider shall be shown.
 - ix. Village of Elm Grove Chapter 305 Land Division Regulations 305-10 (8): Zoning on and adjacent to the land division needs to be shown.
 - x. A tie to one of the section lines needs to be shown.
 - b. Future Development:
 - i. We understand CSM Lot 1 and CSM Lot 4 are proposed to be sold as undeveloped property. These lots will then be able to be further divided and developed into single family homes by a subsequent owner/developer.
 - ii. The future single-family lots are not shown on the CSM because a CSM can only create up to four lots. Creating 5 or more parcels that are 1.5 acres or less, or 5 or more of 1.5 acres or less by successive divisions within 5 years will require a subdivision plat to be filed rather than a CSM.
 - iii. Village approval of the currently planned development on CSM Lot 2 is predicated on the future development plan for CSM Lot 1 and CSM Lot 4. In addition, the SSND redevelopment plan for CSM Lot 2 includes elements that assume impacts from future development such as the recommendations from the traffic impact analysis, sanitary sewer service and storm water management facilities. The type and density of future development on CSM Lots 1 and 4 must be reasonably identified before the SSND redevelopment plan is approved so that the infrastructure serving the development of CSM Lots 1, 2 and 4 is properly designed and constructed. Furthermore, it will be critical for the future developer of CSM Lot 1 and CSM Lot 4 to understand the limitations assumed and approved by the Village during this current development phase and adhere to the approved future development plan so that existing and new infrastructure shared by the three lots does not need to be reapproved, redesigned and reconstructed.
 - iv. We recommend the applicant consider replacing the CSM with a Subdivision Plat showing the single-family lot layouts on CSM Lot 1 and CSM Lot 4 to minimize concerns with future development plans.
3. Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA): A TIA was prepared for this development by Ayres Associates and dated September 23, 2020. Two updates have been prepared to the TIA. Supplement Number 2 of the TIA was received on January 12, 2021.

Mr. Thomas Harrigan

Re: 13105 Watertown Plank Road – SSND Redevelopment Plan Review

January 19, 2021

Page 4

- a. Ayres Associates conducted traffic counts at the study intersections in May 2018 and March 2019.
 - b. Background traffic counts conducted by Ayres Associates were projected forward to year 2028 assuming an annual growth rate of 0.5%. Projected additional traffic volumes from the full buildout of the proposed and future developments were added to the projected background traffic counts and then analyzed.
 - c. Supplement No 2 was prepared to analyze traffic impacts from the current version of the development plan, which is less dense than originally planned.
 - d. Supplement No 2 assumes all traffic generated by the multi-family portion of the proposed development will have one access to Watertown Plank Road.
 - e. Supplement No 2 indicates the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) collected by WisDOT along Watertown Plank Road east of Crescent Drive has decreased from 11,200 vehicles per day (vpd) in 2009 to 9,100 vpd in 2018.
 - f. Supplement No 2 analyzed the operation of 8 intersections along Watertown Plank Road from Elm Grove Road to 124th Street including the proposed SSND west driveway during peak hour traffic volumes at full build-out conditions in 2028. Results of the analysis are as follows:
 - i. According to the *Highway Capacity Manual, 6th Edition* intersections operating with a level of service (LOS) A, B, C or D are acceptable and intersections operating at LOS E or F are not acceptable.
 - ii. The additional traffic generated by the proposed SSND development was shown to adversely impact the LOS for some movements at the intersections of 124th Street, Longwood Avenue, Blue Ridge Boulevard/Stephen Place and Elm Grove Road. None of the adverse impacts resulted in the operation of an intersection to change from the acceptable LOS A, B, C or D to an unacceptable LOS E or F.
 - iii. Intersections modeled to operate with a LOS of “C” or better in 2028: Crescent Drive, West Driveway of SSND development and Elm Grove Road.
 - iv. Intersections modeled to operate with a LOS of “D” or better in 2028: 124th Street, Longwood Avenue, Stephen Place/Blue Ridge Lane and Juneau Boulevard.
 - v. Legion Drive is shown to operate with a LOS “E” or worse in 2028 with or without traffic generated by the SSND development. However, the TIA supplement shows the Legion Drive intersection can operate with a LOS D or better if the recommended modifications to existing traffic signal timing is implemented.
 - g. The intersection of the SSND west driveway is not expected to satisfy any of the 9 traffic signal warrants in 2028.
4. Sanitary Sewer Service Plan:
- a. The sanitary sewer as-built drawings for Watertown Plank Road indicates a sanitary lateral connection was made from the existing 8-inch diameter sewer in Watertown Plank Road to the campus power house. It is unknown if the sanitary lateral serves only the power house or if it serves other existing buildings.
 - b. A 10-inch diameter sanitary sewer crosses the open field in the southern part of the property. The sanitary sewer is located within a recorded easement according to the redevelopment submittal plan drawings. The redevelopment drawings also show a sanitary sewer of unknown size extends northerly from one of the manholes within the easement. It is assumed the northerly sewer pipe out of the existing manhole in the

Mr. Thomas Harrigan

Re: 13105 Watertown Plank Road – SSND Redevelopment Plan Review

January 19, 2021

Page 5

easement provides sanitary sewer service to existing development on the SSND campus. It is also assumed all future development on CSM Lots 1, 2 and 4 will be served by the existing 10-inch diameter sewer.

- c. A proposed sanitary sewer service plan needs to be provided for review. The plan will need to show the location of the existing 10-inch diameter sewer and its easement relative to the proposed future development lot layout on CSM Lot 4.
 - d. New connections to the existing public sanitary sewer will need to be watertight.
 - e. Existing lateral connections not being used in the future will need to be abandoned per Section 232-8 of the Village Code. The existing sanitary lateral will need to be severed from the main and a watertight seal placed at the main connection. The abandonment will need to be inspected and tested to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.
5. Sanitary Sewage Flow Allocation:
- a. the MMSD Cost Recovery Manual provides guidance on minimum occupancy factors to be used when developing projected sanitary sewage flows for different dwelling types and the number of bedrooms for each. We calculated projected sewage flows generated by the proposed development using the MMSD 2020 Facilities Plan Sewershed Flow Allocation Worksheet. The population growth resulting from each of the proposed dwelling units broken down by bedroom counts multiplied by the minimum occupancy factors were used in the worksheet.
 - b. The SSND site is located within the EG3007 Sewershed. According to previous correspondence with MMSD staff in 2019, the 2020 Facilities Plan shows the allowable growth in the EG3007 Sewershed to be 323,000 gallons of sewage per day (gpd).
 - c. Other developments we are aware of that have utilized some of the available growth within the EG3007 Sewershed since the 2020 Facilities Plan was finalized includes the Heritage Assisted Living facility at 800 Wall Street and Elm Grove Heights apartments at 13040 Bluemound Road. We ask the Village to let us know if any other new developments should be included in this list. According to our calculations, these two facilities have utilized approximately 89,341 of the 323,000 gpd available growth flow leaving approximately 233,659 gpd available for the SSND and other future developments.
 - d. The proposed SSND development plan calls for 240 apartment units and 26 single family home dwellings. The architectural plan drawings show at least 38 one-bedroom units, 134 two-bedroom units and 30 3-bedroom units (Total = 202 Units). The bedroom count for the remaining 38 units is unknown. The redevelopment review request letter from Mandel Group dated December 1, 2020 provides anticipated occupancy factors for the apartment and single-family dwelling units on page 8. However, our calculations will use the occupancy factors in the MMSD Cost Recovery Manual as noted above. According to our calculations, the anticipated sewage flow generated by the proposed development will be 209,816 gpd.
 - e. The existing SSND campus includes approximately 168 one-bedroom dwelling units. The sewage flow generated by the existing development is calculated to be approximately 55,104 gpd. Therefore, the net increase in sewage flow created by the proposed development is 154,712 gpd, which is less than the calculated remaining allowable growth for the EG3007 Sewershed.
 - f. If the SSND redevelopment plan as currently proposed is approved, then approximately 78,947 gallons of sewage per day is continues to be available for future growth within the EG3007 Sewershed.

Mr. Thomas Harrigan

Re: 13105 Watertown Plank Road – SSND Redevelopment Plan Review

January 19, 2021

Page 6

6. Downstream Sanitary Sewer Capacity:

- a. The existing local sanitary sewer running between anticipated future development service connection point and the 42-inch diameter interceptor sewer consists of three segments of 10-inch diameter pipe having a slope of at least 0.27% with a minimum capacity of 0.74 MGD (1.14 cfs).
- b. The service area of the existing 10-inch diameter sewer includes 41 single family homes in addition to the SSND redevelopment plan. The calculated peak flow from the existing and proposed development is 0.346 MGD and will fill the existing local sewer to about half full. Therefore, the downstream local sewer has enough capacity to serve the proposed development.
- c. I am not able to properly evaluate the remaining available capacity in the 42-inch diameter interceptor sewer downstream of the 10-inch sewers without existing conditions flow data. MMSD may have flow data from its monitoring station at the downstream end of Elm Grove's interceptor sewer. We have requested the data and will continue our capacity analysis of the interceptor sewer after appropriate flow data is obtained.

7. Water Service:

- a. The existing development is served by an existing well. The existing well could not be located on the information provided and needs to be called out on the drawings or made more prominent.
- b. The applicant has requested public water service to serve the proposed and future development. Therefore, the existing well needs to be abandoned. The well will need to be abandoned in accordance with Village Code Chapter 283 and WDNR Administrative Code NR812.
- c. Fire flows and pressures needed to serve the proposed development need to be provided by the applicant for review.
- d. An internal water distribution system and plan with fire hydrant locations needs to be developed and provided for review.
- e. Public water supply is currently available from the City of Brookfield. The Village is currently evaluating the feasibility of alternative water service from the City of Wauwatosa.
- f. Existing public water service from the City of Brookfield:
 - i. An existing 16-Inch diameter public water main is currently extended to the intersection of Elm Grove Road and Wall Street.
 - ii. Another existing 12-inch diameter public water main is currently extended to approximately 200 feet east of Underwood Creek on Wall Street.
 - iii. If the existing service from the City of Brookfield is used to serve the proposed development, then we recommend public water mains be extended north along Elm Grove Road and east along Watertown Plank Road through the downtown area to the north side of CSM Lot 2. A conceptual water main extension plan following this route and a preliminary cost estimate were prepared in March 2020 and updated in October 2020. The updated preliminary estimate for this extension was \$2.3M.
 - iv. In addition, if the existing service from the City of Brookfield is used to serve the proposed development, then we also recommend a public water main loop be extended easterly along Wall Street and northeasterly across the railroad tracks to the south side of CSM Lot 4 for improved flow, pressure and system

Mr. Thomas Harrigan

Re: 13105 Watertown Plank Road – SSND Redevelopment Plan Review

January 19, 2021

Page 7

redundancy. A conceptual water main extension plan following this route and a preliminary cost estimate were prepared in June 2015. The estimate was updated in October 2020. The updated preliminary estimate for these extensions was \$0.36M.

- g. Possible alternate public water service from City of Wauwatosa:
 - i. An existing 12-inch diameter water main at the intersection of 123rd Street and Watertown Plank Road in the City of Wauwatosa may be available for use as a supply connection point for development in the Village of Elm Grove. The connection point is currently being evaluated by the City of Wauwatosa and may be moved to a location farther east that might have better supply characteristics.
 - ii. If public water service is provided from the City of Wauwatosa, then a public water main will at least need to be extended from 123rd Street along Watertown Plank Road into the Village of Elm Grove to the north side of CSM Lot 2. A conceptual water main extension plan following the route from 123rd Street and a preliminary cost estimate were prepared in October 2020. The preliminary estimate for this extension was \$1.7M.
 - iii. Depending on the location of the connection point in Wauwatosa that has not been finalized yet, a booster station may be needed that is not included in the October 2020 cost estimate.
8. Site Plan (Sheet C100):
 - a. Label lot numbers shown on the proposed CSM.
 - b. Plan notes on the drawing reference additional site plan drawings that were not included in the submittal. These drawings will need to be submitted for review.
 - c. We recommend a second permanent paved access be provided to the development on Lot 2 to improve access to the site by emergency vehicles.
 - d. The Site Plan needs to be reviewed by the Fire Chief to confirm that emergency vehicles can properly access the site when called.
 - e. Parking:
 - i. Notes on the Site Plan indicate 495 parking spaces (76 surface spaces and 419 underground spaces) are provided for the development. According to our counts there are only 457 parking spaces (65 surface spaces and 392 underground spaces). The discrepancy needs to be resolved.
 - ii. Another note indicates the number of parking stalls provided per 1,000 SF of building area is 3.58. An asterisk indicates the single-family homes to the east on Lot 1 are excluded from the building data and parking data. The note needs to be revised to confirm that the single-family homes to the south on Lot 4 are also excluded since that is another development type and will not occur until a later date.
 - iii. Section 335-32.J of the Village Code requires multi-family dwelling developments to provide 2 parking spaces per dwelling unit. If the number of apartments being proposed is 240 units, then 480 parking spaces are required on CSM Lot 2. The redevelopment plan does not meet this requirement.
 - f. Reserved Accessible Parking Stalls:
 - i. Section 208 of the Americans with Disabilities Act requires each parking facility at a site provide the minimum number of accessible spaces.
 - ii. The Site Plan does not show any of the surface spaces to be reserved for disabled persons. Three parking spaces reserved for disabled persons needs to

Mr. Thomas Harrigan

Re: 13105 Watertown Plank Road – SSND Redevelopment Plan Review

January 19, 2021

Page 8

- be added to the surface parking areas according to Table 208.2 of the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- iii. The underground parking plan shows a total of 12 spaces to be reserved for disabled persons broken down as follows:
 1. Building 1: Four accessible parking spaces are provided. Table 208.2 requires at least 6 accessible parking spaces are required for this parking facility. One of those spaces needs to be van accessible.
 2. Building 2: Six accessible parking spaces are provided. The number provided meets the minimum required by Table 208.2 for this parking facility. However, one of those spaces needs to be van accessible.
 3. Building 3: Two accessible parking spaces are provided. Table 208.2 requires at least 3 accessible parking spaces are required for this parking facility. One of those spaces needs to be van accessible.
 - iv. The development team should consider whether additional parking spaces exceeding the minimum requirements should be reserved for disabled persons.
 - g. Underground parking plan: (See additional comments below).
 - h. Other Underground Utilities: Show proposed gas, electric and other utilities that will serve the new buildings.
 - i. The Site Plan does not appear to show a monument sign for the development. If a monument sign is being proposed, then the location of the sign will need to be shown and details of the sign will need to be provided for review.
 - j. Impervious area calculations:
 - i. The computations provided on the drawing only include impervious surfacing located within areas to be disturbed. The calculations need to be revised to follow Village Ordinances, which restrict total impervious area coverage for the entire parcel.
 - ii. Impervious surfacing coverage calculations need to be broken down for each lot created by the CSM.
 - iii. Additional computations need to be provided to show building footprint coverages for each lot created by the CSM under existing and proposed conditions.
 - iv. The applicant is requesting Lot 1 to be rezoned from I-1 to RS-3. Village Code limitations on building footprint and impervious area for RS-3 zoning is as follows:
 1. Section 335-19.G: maximum building footprint coverage to 20% of the lot area.
 2. Section 335-19.H: maximum impervious surfacing coverage to 30% of the lot area.
 - v. The applicant is requesting Lot 2 to be rezoned from I-1 to RM-1. Village Code limitations on building footprint and impervious area for RM-1 zoning is as follows:
 1. Section 335-21.G: maximum building footprint coverage to 30% of the lot area.
 2. Section 335-21.H: maximum impervious surfacing coverage to 65% of the lot area.
 - vi. The applicant is requesting Lot 4 to be rezoned from I-1 to RS-4. Village Code limitations on building footprint and impervious area for RS-4 zoning is as follows:
 1. Section 335-20.G: maximum building footprint coverage to 25% of the lot area.
 2. Section 335-20.H: maximum impervious surfacing coverage to 40% of the lot area.

Mr. Thomas Harrigan

Re: 13105 Watertown Plank Road – SSND Redevelopment Plan Review

January 19, 2021

Page 9

- vii. For future development on Lot 1 and Lot 4, building footprint and total impervious area coverage should assume the maximum allowable so that stormwater management facilities are sized for the worst-case scenario.

9. Erosion Control Plan (Sheet C110):

- a. The area of disturbance is greater than one acre. Therefore, the development may require a construction site stormwater discharge permit (NOI) from the appropriate agency having jurisdiction over the site.
- b. The tracking pad shown at the west end of Green Meadow Place needs to be deleted since it cannot be used as a construction access.
- c. The erosion control notes need to be revised to indicate who will be responsible to conduct periodic erosion control inspections and create written inspection reports. Copies of the reports need to be provided to the Village.
- d. The type of inlet protection needs to be called out on the erosion control plan.
- e. A temporary sediment trap located on the south end of the project site needs to be designed to protect the southeast basin from siltation during construction. We suggest a basin be located near the railroad right-of-way line and outside the tree drip line where the existing topography directs runoff into the southeast basin. Temporary diversion berms/swales will need to be extended northerly and westerly during construction to temporarily direct runoff to the temporary sediment trap. The westerly diversion berm and swale is similar to the swale that is proposed to connect Infiltration Basin No 1 to the southeast basin. The swale extending north from the temporary sediment basin should extend north of Green Meadow Place to effectively keep construction site runoff from leaving the site at Green Meadow Place.
- f. The proposed infiltration basin is being used as a temporary sediment trap during construction. Additional details or notes on the plan must be provided to encourage that this basin not be fully constructed or excavated to plan grades until after the tributary area is fully stabilized.
- g. We suggest diversion berms and swales be added to the erosion control plan to direct construction site runoff to sediment traps/ponds. We suggest the design engineer consider berms/swales at the following locations:
 - i. To Dry Basins No 1 and No 2 which could follow the sidewalk system. Berms/swales should extend east and west to direct runoff to these facilities.
 - ii. Along the rear lot line of the homes on the north side of Green Meadow Place to direct runoff either to Dry Basin No 2 or toward the sediment basin on the south end of the project recommended in previous comments.
- h. Additional language within the construction sequence should be added to require the sediment traps, basins, diversion berms and swales to be constructed and stabilized prior to mass grading of the site.

10. Details (Sheet C111 and Sheet C112):

- a. The swale detail needs to be revised to call out the side slopes and minimum depth. If this information is not typical for all swales, then those details need to be called out for each swale on the grading plan.
- b. A detail for temporary diversion berm/swales needs to be added to the drawing. In addition, notes need to be added to require the stabilization of these facilities after their construction and before mass grading begins.

Mr. Thomas Harrigan

Re: 13105 Watertown Plank Road – SSND Redevelopment Plan Review

January 19, 2021

Page 10

11. Grading Plan (Sheet C300):

- a. Existing topography of the property generally slopes toward the southwest. The proposed contours appear to show surface water runoff from the site will generally follow the same pattern.
- b. It is difficult to review the 100-scale grading plan. Spot grade labels and contour elevation labels overlapping other details make this plan difficult to review. The grading plan needs to be revised to include one overall sheet with multiple subsequent grading plan drawings added to show portions of the site at a larger scale.
- c. The Grading Plan needs to be revised to show details of the accessible routes and ramps for pedestrians. The details and spot grades need to demonstrate that the routes and ramps meet ADAAG Standards.
- d. Additional grading details including spot grades on impervious surfacing need to be provided. The grading plan must set first floor elevations and/or proposed yard grades for the future the single-family lots.
- e. We recommend the proposed contours show grading of the swales to confirm that the swales proposed on the site will fit within the available corridor space.
- f. We strongly encourage defined side yard drainage swales be designed between each of the single-family lots.
- g. Given the size of CSM Lot 2 and the nature of the development, significant consideration should be given to a phased construction approach to minimize the size of disturbed areas at a given time.
- h. Building Grades on CSM Lot 2:
 - i. The existing first floor elevation of Notre Dame Hall appears to be approximately 766.8. The correct elevation needs to be added to the drawings.
 - ii. The existing first floor elevation of Maria Hall appears to be approximately 762.5. The correct elevation needs to be added to the drawings.
 - iii. The proposed first floor elevation of Building 1 varies from 758.00 at the south end to 760.00 at the north end.
 - iv. The proposed first floor elevation of Building 2 varies from 759.00 at the south end to 766.33 at the north end.
 - v. The proposed first floor elevation of Building 3 is 757.00.
 - vi. The first-floor elevations as currently proposed appear to be reasonable for this lot.

12. Setbacks Exhibit:

- a. The property is currently zoned as an I-1 district. The property is proposed to be split into four lots and petitioned for CSM Lots 1, 2 and 4 to be rezoned to separate underlying districts with a Planned Development Overlay (PDO) as follows:
 - i. CSM Lot 1 is petitioned to be rezoned from I-1 to RS-3.
 - ii. CSM Lot 2 is petitioned to be rezoned from I-1 to RM-1.
 - iii. The plan does not request a zoning change for Lot 3, which will remain as I-1.
 - iv. CSM Lot 4 is petitioned to be rezoned from I-1 to RS-4.
- b. We did not review the underlying rezoning petition.
- c. We did not review the PDO petition. However, Section 335-30 of the Village Code may provide some flexibility on certain zoning requirements. Approved variations to the zoning requirements will impact our review and Village approval of those elements. Therefore, in accordance with Section 335-30.G of the Village Code, the petition will need to include details of each proposed deviation from current zoning ordinance requirements including, but not limited to, building footprint coverages, total impervious area coverages, building

Mr. Thomas Harrigan

Re: 13105 Watertown Plank Road – SSND Redevelopment Plan Review

January 19, 2021

Page 11

height, lot size and building setback requirements. Flexibility for approval of each of the requested deviations is at the discretion of the Village.

- d. Village Code requirements for setbacks for properties zoned RS-3, RS-4 and RM-1 are as follows:
 - i. Minimum building setback along street frontages: 50 feet.
 - ii. Minimum building setback along side yards: 20 feet.
 - iii. Minimum building setback along rear yards: 25 feet.
 - e. Setbacks shown for the existing and proposed development on CSM Lot 2 do not meet the requirements for the requested RM-1 zoning.
 - f. Building envelopes for each future lot proposed on CSM Lot 1 and CSM Lot 4 need to be shown with setbacks labeled.
 - g. Dimensions and lot sizes for each future lot proposed on CSM Lot 1 and CSM Lot 4 need to be shown and labeled.
 - i. Future lot sizes within CSM Lot 1 are currently shown to be less than the 20,000 SF minimum required by Village Code.
13. Supplemental Site Exhibit:
- a. We recommend the exhibit be converted into and renamed “Demolition Plan”.
 - b. We recommend the exhibit be revised to show and label all proposed site demolition including, but not limited to buildings, structures, surfacing, underground tunnels and underground utilities.
14. LED Sight Lighting Plan:
- a. We recommend underground/overhead wiring be shown on the lighting plan.
15. Connected Underground Parking Plan:
- a. The underground parking plan shows 392 spaces in three interconnected underground parking facilities.
 - b. The plan shows two locations where vehicles are allowed to enter the underground structure. Both locations are at the south end of Buildings 1 and 2. Vehicles that enter the underground structure will approach the structure at a 90-degree angle to a connecting corridor that is 29-feet wide between the parking facilities.
 - c. The plan needs to be revised to show dimensions of parking spaces, driving aisles and entrances. The development team will need to verify and demonstrate that resident and emergency vehicles have enough room to negotiate movements within the underground parking facilities.
 - d. The plan shows a storm sewer protruding through the corridor connecting Building 1 and Building 3. A note on the plan indicates clearance under the storm sewer to be 7 feet, which seems low. We recommend the clearance be increased. We also recommend appropriate signage indicating overhead clearance limitations be posted at the entrances of and within the underground facilities.
 - e. The plan needs to be revised to include a provision for dewatering the structure at the low point of the interconnected facilities, which is located under the protruding storm sewer.
 - f. The fire chief needs to review the underground parking plan after dimensions are provided to verify emergency vehicles can properly respond to emergency calls.
16. Preliminary Storm Water Management Plan:
- a. Hydrology calculations will need to be provided before we can review or confirm the model inputs, routing, peak flows, elevations, volumes and assumptions described within

Mr. Thomas Harrigan

Re: 13105 Watertown Plank Road – SSND Redevelopment Plan Review

January 19, 2021

Page 12

the storm water narrative. Based upon the information supplied it appears that the storm water facility design for the site is adequately sized and located.

- b. The 2-year release rate as shown in table 6 of the report does not satisfy MMSD's peak flow reduction requirement.
 - c. Water quality calculations will need to be provided before we can review or confirm the TSS reductions as stated in the report.
 - d. A more detailed description for the water quality calculations needs to be provided. The revised description needs to specifically address how the water quality goals for the site were established such as the TSS reduction requirement of 43.76%.
 - e. The report indicates the current TSS reduction of 54%, while satisfying the 43.76% TSS reduction goal as established through coordination with DNR, does not achieve the 60% TSS reduction goal the Village will soon adopt. The report goes on to say that additional design will be done to achieve the 60% TSS reduction goal.
 - f. A hydraulic analysis was done for several storm sewer segments. However, hydraulic capacity calculations need to be provided for each segment for review. In addition, the plans provided do not adequately show or label existing and proposed storm sewer systems. We recommend that a separate storm sewer system map be provided.
 - g. Hydraulic capacity computations need to be provided for each swale.
 - h. Storm water facility cross sections, outfall structure details, emergency spill way details, and liner details need to be provided for each facility for review.
 - i. Structural drawings of the underground storage systems need to be provided for review. Final copies of these drawings need to be stamped and sealed by a professional structural engineer licensed in the State of Wisconsin.
 - j. According to the narrative, an assumed infiltration rate of 8-inches per hour was used to evaluate the effectiveness of the infiltration ponds. The report indicates that double ring infiltrometer tests will be performed. Results of the tests need to be provided for review. The infiltration rates used in the plan need to be based upon test results and DNR guidance.
 - k. Additional information needs to be provided to allow a comparison of the existing flows, volumes, and peak elevations to and within the existing southeast basin versus the proposed flows, volumes and peak elevations. The comparison is needed to verify the proposed development does not impact the existing southeast basin being co-owned and used by other existing development.
 - l. Geotechnical reports need to be provided.
 - m. The development plan includes more than ½ Acre of additional impervious area. Therefore, in accordance with Section 13.302(3)(c).1 of MMSD Chapter 13 rules, Green Infrastructure runoff management measures are not required. However, infiltration is proposed as part of the storm water management plan for this development even though it is not required by MMSD rules.
 - n. A maintenance agreement needs to be provided for review. The agreement needs to be included as a deed restriction for each parcel.
17. Landscape – Existing Trees (Sheet L-1):
- a. No comments at this time.
18. Landscape – Trees to Remove (Sheet L-2):
- a. No comments at this time.
19. Landscape – Trees to Remain (Sheet L-3):

Mr. Thomas Harrigan

Re: 13105 Watertown Plank Road – SSND Redevelopment Plan Review

January 19, 2021

Page 13

- a. We recommend the approved tree preservation plan be included as a deed restriction for each new parcel.
20. Landscape Plan (Sheet L-4):
- a. We recommend keeping plantings out of the vision triangles at the intersections of driveway entrances onto public streets.
 - b. We recommend the keeping plantings out of the vision triangles at the internal intersection of the access drives.
 - c. Vision triangles need to be labeled on the plan.
 - d. The compacted aggregate trail needs to be included in the impervious area computations shown on the Site Plan.
21. Landscape Planting Schedules (Sheet L-5):
- a. No comments at this time.

We recommend the items listed above be addressed to the Village's satisfaction prior to approval. Please contact our office with any questions regarding this matter. Thank you for allowing us to be of service to the Village of Elm Grove.

Respectfully,

RUEKERT & MIELKE, INC.



Anthony D. Petersen, P.E. (WI, IA)
Senior Project Manager
apetersen@ruekert-mielke.com

ADP:adp

cc: David De Angelis, Village of Elm Grove
Richard Paul, Jr., Village of Elm Grove
Chris Ruetten, PLS, Ruekert & Mielke, Inc.
Christopher M. Genellie, P.E., Ruekert & Mielke, Inc.
File