


Sisters of Notre Dame Campus, 13105 Watertown Plank Road.

Chairman Olson stated the goal for this discussion is provide additional feedback to the Mandel Group and Enberg Anderson related to the materials that were presented at the March 16th, 2021 Building Board meeting.

Mr. Koleski stated there was discussion related to the backside of Building One and Two. What is going to be done with the porches and how do they blend into the overall structure. Also, not being able to see the size of the proposed stone in comparison to the existing stone on Maria Hall is a challenge to understand visually. Is there an opportunity to scale the stone to demonstrate what will be done one site?

Mr. Koleski noted a rendering of nighttime conditions was discussed. Specifically, how will the development appear in the evening with the internal outdoor lighting illuminated?

Mr. Thedford noted that the landscaping plan has not been discussed at length. Greater focus will need to be given in order to determine how the landscaping plan engages with the site plan.



Proximity of building to street

When measured to the edge of the road (not property line):

Existing Buildings

Watermark: ~35'
 Notre Dame: ~23'
 Maria Hall: ~105'

Proposed New Buildings

Building 2 at closest point of screened porch: 37'
 Building 2 at furthest point (gable end): 108'
 Buildign 1: ~100'-110'









Sisters of Notre Dame Campus, 13105 Watertown Plank Road.


Chairman Olson stated the goal for this discussion is provide additional feedback to the Mandel Group and Enberg Anderson related to the materials that were presented at the March 16th, 2021 Building Board meeting.

Mr. Koleski stated there was discussion related to the backside of Building One and Two. What is going to be done with the porches and how do they blend into the overall structure. Also, not being able to see the size of the proposed stone in comparison to the existing stone on Maria Hall is a challenge to understand visually. Is there an opportunity to scale the stone to demonstrate what will be done one site?

Mr. Koleski noted a rendering of nighttime conditions was discussed. Specifically, how will the development appear in the evening with the internal outdoor lighting illuminated?

Mr. Thedford noted that the landscaping plan has not been discussed at length. Greater focus will need to be given in order to determine how the landscaping plan engages with the site plan.

6



7

Mr. Falsetti noted there are overhead utility lines on Watertown Plank Road, will these be buried as part of the development?

Chairman Olson commented there needs to be a discussion on how snow removal will operate, where will it go? This needs to be addressed from a functional standpoint.

Mr. Thedford stated a discussion needs to be had as it related to the memorialization of the School Sisters. Will this be taking place as elements of the landscaping plan?

Mr. Koleski stated that public comment should be taken at an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Harrigan noted that a public comment session is being planned for an upcoming Plan Commission meeting. All Building Board members will be encouraged to participate in this listening session and advanced notice will be provided once the date and time has been set.

Chairman Olson opined there have been improvements to the architectural plans, specifically where stone has been incorporated at the corner elements of the front building façade on Watertown Plank Road (Building One). Prior to this improvement, the white siding was very stark and dominant. From this perspective, it is a major improvement.

Mr. Thedford noted the scale of the lap siding is absolutely appropriate for a development of this size. Also, the proposed stone has a warm tone which compliments the existing stone on Maria Hall.

Chairman Olson questioned if the use of stone on the interior elevations of Building One and Two should be made at the base of the buildings, and if so, how high up does the stone rise?

Mr. Thedford cautioned, if the use of stone becomes too heavy, it will lose its special quality and use within the development. It should be approached as a material that ties all the elevations of the buildings together in a special way.

Mr. Falsetti noted the approach of Building Two, heading westbound on Watertown Plank Road deserves additional study.

Chairman Olson commented the new single family homes proposed on the single-family lots need to be unique and high quality.

Mr. Thedford stated the board needs to begin addressing the topic of screening and the solidarity of the landscaping as it bridges into the building as you approach from the east to the west.

Mr. Koleski opined that he feels it would be appropriate for the Building board to schedule special meetings as needed as a development proposal of this scale deserves individual review and investment of time.



100

101









Mr. Falsetti noted there are overhead utility lines on Watertown Plank Road, will these be buried as part of the development?

Chairman Olson commented there needs to be a discussion on how snow removal will operate, where will it go? This needs to be addressed from a functional standpoint.

Mr. Thedford stated a discussion needs to be had as it related to the memorialization of the School Sisters. Will this be taking place as elements of the landscaping plan?

Mr. Koleski stated that public comment should be taken at an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Harrigan noted that a public comment session is being planned for an upcoming Plan Commission meeting. All Building Board members will be encouraged to participate in this listening session and advanced notice will be provided once the date and time has been set.

Chairman Olson opined there have been improvements to the architectural plans, specifically where stone has been incorporated at the corner elements of the front building façade on Watertown Plank Road (Building One). Prior to this improvement, the white siding as very stark and dominant. From this perspective, it is a major improvement.

Mr. Thedford noted the scale of the lap siding is absolutely appropriate for a development of this size. Also, the proposed stone has a warm tone which compliments the existing stone on Maria Hall.

Chairman Olson questioned if the use of stone on the interior elevations of Building One and Two should be made at the base of the buildings, and if so, how high up does the stone rise?

Mr. Thedford cautioned, if the use of stone becomes too heavy, it will lose its special quality and use within the development. It should be approached as a material that ties all the elevations of the buildings together in a special way.

Mr. Falsetti noted the approach of Building Two, heading westbound on Watertown Plank Road deserves additional study.


Chairman Olson commented the new single family homes proposed on the single-family lots need to be unique and high quality.


Mr. Thedford stated the board needs to begin addressing the topic of screening and the solidarity of the landscaping as it bridges into the building as you approach from the east to the west.

Mr. Koleski opined that he feels it would be appropriate for the Building board to schedule special meetings as needed as a development proposal of this scale deserves individual review and investment of time.

Entry sequence from the East

The following images are of the entry sequence entering the village from the east on Watertown Plank road. They represent the current condition using Google street view images. They are followed by renderings approximating the same view.





Proximity of building to street

When measured to the edge of the road (not property line):

Existing Buildings

- Watermark: ~35'
- Notre Dame: ~23'
- Maria Hall: ~105'

Proposed New Buildings

- Building 2 at closest point of screened porch: 37'
- Building 2 at furthest point (gable end): 108'
- Buildign 1: ~100'-110'



Entry sequence image 1- existing



12960 Watertown Plank Rd
Elm Grove, Wisconsin

Google

Street View



Google

Image capture: Jul 2015 © 2021 Google United States Terms Report a problem

Entry sequence image 2- Existing



Overhead view





Mr. Thedford suggested the public comment session not be scheduled until all four elevations of the proposed new buildings can be reviewed and comment provided by the Board.

Mr. Thedford also stated it would be helpful to have new renderings of the proposed building from new vantage points.

Mr. Thedford noted, if there are any improvements proposed for Notre Dame and Maria Hall, it would be beneficial for the Board to begin reviewing those proposed modifications.

9. Other Business

None

10. Adjournment

Mr. Falsetti motioned to adjourn and Mr. Thedford seconded. Motion carried 7-0. Meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas Harrigan
Zoning and Planning Administrator/
Assistant to the Village Manager



Echelon apartments



Mequon- Spur 16



Entry sequence image 1- proposed



Entry sequence image 2- Proposed



Entry sequence image 3- Existing



Entry sequence image 3- Proposed





Updated Rendering- March 16, 2021



3-02-21 Previous Image



3-16-21 Updated Image



Building 1- Updated Interior facade



Building 1- Updated Interior Facade



Previous Rendering- March 02, 2021



Updated Rendering study- March 02, 2021



Updated Rendering- March 02, 2021



Previous Rendering- March 02, 2021



Updated Rendering- March 16, 2021



Previous Rendering- March 02, 2021



Updated Rendering- March 16, 2021



Previous Rendering- March 02, 2021



Updated Rendering- March 16, 2021



Previous Rendering- March 02, 2021



Updated Rendering- March 16, 2021



Previous Rendering- March 02, 2021



Updated Rendering- March 16, 2021