

**VILLAGE OF ELM GROVE
AD HOC COMMITTEE – REINDERS DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

Committee Members: Chairman Trustee Haas, Marlee Jansen, Rebekah Schaefer, Christina Berger, John Galanis, Martha Kendler, Joe Klein, Jan Schoenecker, Stew Elliott, and Pete Moegenburg

The following is a summary of recommendations provided by the Reinders Ad Hoc Committee on Wednesday, December 7, 2016 and as approved December 15, 2016.

1. Land Use

The Committee was in agreement that the proposed use as a mixed-use, residential Planned Development Overlay is more preferable than the current use and zoning as M-1 Limited Manufacturing.

2. Building Sizes, heights, and elevations

The Committee was in consensus for the proposed apartment buildings be limited to two (2) floors.

Building Footprints

Committee decided to provide no recommendation on building footprint alone.

Elevations

The Committee discussed whether the Village Board and its committees are the more appropriate bodies for reviewing building elevations, exterior, and aesthetic value.

The Ad Hoc Committee agreed not to provide a recommendation in regard to building elevation.

3. Proposed Residential Unit Density

The proposed residential unit density is just over 21 units per acre.

The Committee voted that the density, as proposed, is too high at 21 units per acre. The Committee did not feel comfortable recommending an acceptable density above 8 units per acre without more information.

The committee felt that the major concerns raised by the proposed density are increased traffic, impact on the community's culture (look and feel of the Village), and impact on the surrounding neighborhoods.

Chairman Haas noted the general public sentiment is that the development has too much density.

4. Impacts of development on Village services for police, fire, and EMS

Committee defers this topic to the appropriate departments and agencies.

5. Should the Village evaluate providing Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) for those allowable project components which provide benefit to the Village?

Potential project components eligible for TIF funding

Municipal Water
Hazardous Soil Remediation
Soil Stabilization (geo-piles)
Re-route Elm Grove Road
Streetscaping
Underground Parking

Consensus of the committee is that where there is public benefit, TIF funding would be appropriate.

The majority of the Committee felt as follows

TIF funding should not be utilized for:

Hazardous soil remediation
Soil Stabilization (geo-piles)
Underground Parking

TIF funding could potentially be utilized for

Municipal water
Re-routing Elm Grove Road
Public Streetscaping

Note* TIF funding could be considered for financial support in soil stabilization (Geo-piles) so long it does not unduly enrich the economic benefit of the developers.

6. Site Development and Design

Re-routing of Elm Grove Road at Watertown Plank Road

There was consensus that the re-routing of Elm Grove Road at Watertown Plank Road would be an improvement. However, there is concern regarding that proposed re-routing, specifically whether there would be adequate protection/shielding for homes located west of Elm Grove Rd.

Traffic Impact of new development

Consensus of the committee is that the traffic impact of the proposed new development is an issue that needs to be addressed by a more comprehensive traffic study.

View shed of proposed project from surrounding properties

Committee members commented that the overall mass and height of the development will have an effect on the look and feel of the Village's downtown. The mass and height of the buildings should be screened by landscaping that includes larger caliper trees.

Greenspace

The committee is in agreement that the green space component is acceptable.

Public space and pathway

The committee is in agreement that the proposed public space and pathway are positive elements.

Parking

The committee would like to see the number of parking spaces for residential units held to a minimum of two parking spaces per unit.

Sound reflection by buildings

The committee agrees this is a non-issue.

7. In Addition to the Above - Benefits/Detriments to Village

Benefits

The proposed redevelopment would eliminate an eye sore, enhance the downtown, increase tax base, and enhance the Village's walkability.

Detriments

Public safety is a concern for people/children on the pathway and attempting to cross Elm Grove Road to Watertown Plank Road and crossing Juneau Boulevard to get to the Village Park.

The general public sentiment is that the proposed development has too much density. The proposed density may increase traffic on Elm Grove Road and Watertown Plank Road, and have an impact on the surrounding neighborhoods.

There is concern regarding the re-alignment of Elm Grove Road, specifically whether there would be adequate protection/shielding (from car lights) for homes located west of Elm Grove Road.

*****Minutes from the November 29, 2016 and the December 7, 2016***
Ad Hoc Committee meetings are attached below.**

**VILLAGE OF ELM GROVE
AD HOC COMMITTEE – REINDERS DEVELOPMENT
MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, November 29, 2016**

Present: Chairman Trustee Haas, Marlee Jansen, Rebekah Schaefer, Christina Berger, John Galanis, Martha Kendler, Joe Klein, and Stew Elliott
Absent: Pete Moegenburg, Jan Schoenecker
Also Present: Wayne Wiertzema, President of Wangard Partners, Tim Anderson, Development Manager of Wangard Partners, Village Manager David De Angelis, Village Clerk Mary S Stredni, Zoning/Planning Administrator Thomas Harrigan, and members of the public.

1. Bring the meeting to order

Chairman Trustee Haas brought the meeting to order at 6:05PM.

2. Public Comment Period

Chairman Haas provided a brief background on the Ad Hoc Committee and its formation. The Chairman then explained the procedures for the public comment session. The floor was then opened for public comment.

1. Betsy Haushalter- 13425 Lee Court

Deeply concerned about the urbanization of Elm Grove, specifically density and traffic. Elm Grove Road is such a narrow road, dangerous for many people. Height of the proposed buildings are too tall. Contamination is also an issue. Water could potentially leach into local wells. No set place for children to play in. Funding is an issue, maybe utilize Village funding for beautification, but that is it.

2. John Wermuth- 915 Katherine Drive

Fifty eight (58) years on Katherine. Has faith the Board of Trustees, Plan Commission, and Building Board will approach the proposal with continued scrutiny as they have with any proposal. Size is too large. Agree with what was previously said.

3. Mary Inden- 14745 Watertown Plank Road-

(Read aloud from a letter dated 9/20/16 Elm Grove Business Association) The Elm Grove Business Association Executive Board expresses strong support for the concept of the redevelopment of the Reinders property on Watertown Plank Road. A vibrant and economically viable downtown business district is important to the health of the community. The existing tax

base would be improved by \$40,000,000 of property value.

4. Matilda Mc Clusky- 12800 Watertown Plank Road

Traffic concerns. Already high traffic existing on Watertown Plank Road. The redevelopment would produce a hardship for exiting the driveway.

5. Carol Hoke- 13000 Dunwoody Drive

Moved to Elm Grove because of the unique bedroom community with easy access to shopping centers in both directions. The residents would like to see the Village remain the way it is. Concerned about the potential vacancy of the apartment units if they are not able to fill them. Concerned about what will happen in the future if the apartments are not rentable. Not against a development, just not this level of density on this small of a parcel.

6. Kathleen White- 1620 Greenway Terrace

Believes apartments are a current trend that may not last. People who live in apartments are not concerned with the community. Quality of the apartments is low. Against apartments.

7. Christopher Mason- 830 Fox Creek Court

Family moved to the Village of elm grove in 1956, Mr. Mason was six years old. In the most recent presidential election (November 8, 2016), there were four thousand two hundred (4,200) registered voters in the Village. The number of absentee ballots cast was one thousand seven hundred (1,700). At the first Reinders/Wangard open house on October 3, 2016, thirty (30) questionnaires were completed by people in attendance. At the second Reinders/Wangard open house on November 14, 2016, one hundred and seventy (170) questionnaires were completed by people in attendance. For the open house held on November 14, 2016, a meeting announcement post card was mailed on Thursday, November 10, 2016. This is not enough time for notice, and not all residents received the announcement in time. Is concerned about some comments that have been made such as referring to the Village as, "archaic Elm Grove", and "Elm Grave". These attitudes are extremely disturbing and personally offensive.

8. Sharon and Tom Smallwood- 950 Katherine Drive (Letter read by Margo Koleski)

Density and size of the buildings are too large. Final plan discussions should take place when the optimum number of residents are home in the Village. The beauty and smallness of the Village is at stake.

9. Rick Fronberry- 1025 Lower Ridgeway

In the letter which President Palmer sent to the Village Board Members in April of 2016, that

establishes the purpose of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee, nowhere is there charge to make a recommendation to the Village Board. Giving the public three (3) minutes of testimony is not a reflection of meaningful public interaction. Many of the issues of this committee are addressed in the comprehensive plan developed in 2007.

10. Janis Crego- 13240 Oakhurst Drive

Development is too large, two stories would be better, too much traffic. Already apartment building going up on 111th and North Avenue. Why are we not voting on this? Many people are unaware this meeting was going on.

11. Tadeo Balderrama- 920 Katherine Drive

Village is a tremendous place to live. Height, density, contamination, access to Elm Grove Road are the four (4) major concerns. Volume seems out of place for Elm Grove. Contamination is a concern. Disturbance to the soil when digging out the underground parking will affect water wells of residents near the proposed redevelopment. Water contamination is a concern for little children who are drinking the water. Increased traffic on Elm Grove Road is a concern. Parcel size is a concern, the proposed redevelopment appears to be only six point three (6.3) acres. Mirror and agree with all the previous comments.

12. Jeanne Edwards- 1025 Woodland Avenue (Letter read by Tadeo Balderrama)

The Wangard project will completely alter the look and feel of the downtown area and I do not support it. Two hundred and fifty four (254) more people living in Elm Grove is going to create a traffic issue. I enjoy living in a quieter Village without so much activity downtown. The proposed development will change that atmosphere. Have you forgotten we were voted best suburb in America the way the Village is now?

13. Tim Stemper- 1720 Highland Drive

Who is financing the apartments? The Village? Will there be rent subsidies?

14. Jim Koleski - 940 Katherine Drive

Left Milwaukee in 1994 for career reasons, chose Elm Grove when moving back to the area. This was due to the tranquility of the Village, and low traffic. The Village Board does take comments directly from citizens at every Village Board meetings. The physical size and density is too excessive. The longest proposed building would be nearly the length of Lambeau Field. Almost Sixty (60) feet tall. The concept of planting trees two and one half (2.5) inches in diameter to shield the houses on Elm Grove Road is not adequate. There would be increased pressure on the Village Police and Fire Departments and other Village services. Contaminates

are a major concern. What is going to happen when the soil begins to be excavated? There was unprofessionalism when the traffic counts were gathered last summer on Elm Grove Road. The hose located on the traffic counter was connected incorrectly, and zero (0) car counts were observed.

15. Dennis Kaun- 1780 Wedgewood Drive East

The culture of the Village will be changing if the apartments are brought into Elm Grove. Against the proposed project.

16. Susan McClusky- 580 Rosedale Drive

It is a joy to see kids riding bikes in the Village. How is that going to look when all the traffic increases? Traffic is a major concern. We need to think of children, moved back to Elm Grove from Boston, Massachusetts because of the pace of life and feel of the Village. Against the redevelopment proposal.

17. Mike Elton- 13400 Juneau Boulevard (Letter read by Adam Berger)

The idea of adding apartments of this size and density takes away from the quaintness of Elm Grove. Will not support this plan in its current form and everyone in the area will not support it either.

18. Paul Ryan- 14500 Hillside (Letter read by Adam Berger)

Has been following the updates and correspondences regarding the Reinders/Wangard development and shares the sentiments of the letter published earlier today (November 29, 2016) by Adam Berger at 925 Catherine Drive.

19. Christina Martinez-Gonzalez- 13700 Juneau Boulevard- (Letter read by Adam Berger)

Opposes development as currently proposed. One hundred and seventy (170) cars times two (2) will increase traffic and pollution to neighborhood. Cardiovascular and respiratory disease could increase due to the increased traffic. There is also a risk that well water could be contaminated.

20. Adam Berger- 925 Katherine Drive

Moved to the Village in 1998, has grown fond of the Village. The Village is feeling pressure from all 4 sides. The proposed math of the Wangard/Reinders redevelopment is not fit for the Village. Height and density are unacceptable. Want to be clear that he is not anti-development. Wants something to occur on the site, but is opposed to the proposed redevelopment.

The failure to collect data, failure to collect information and provide it to the public is unacceptable. Hope the developer is listening to all of the commentary that has been provided from residents this evening. The proposed development would add five (5) percent to the Village population. The proposed project fails to meet the statutory requirements in the Village Code of Ordinances regarding enhanced density. At a maximum, a two (2) story development in EG may be acceptable. The site is a hazardous waste site. It is the responsibility of the property owner to clean up the site. Please read additional comments and other residents comments on the Village website, Community Projects, Reinders/Wangard Redevelopment.

21. Pamela Mueller- 1145 Lone Tree Road

The buildings are too high and too dense. Downtown has limited space for commerce. The land is valuable, and should be developed in a thoughtful way. We can do better than what has been proposed. The land should be developed in a way that the majority of citizens would appreciate.

22. John Anderson- 14730 Crestwood Court

Has lived in the Village over thirty (30) years. Everyone appreciates the quality of life, it is a community based area. Main concern is the footprint. Will this change the community? We don't have a chance to "re-do" the development in this kind of situation. Need to ask what "fits the community".

23. Michael Noel- 865 Morningside Lane

Moved to the Village in 1986. Moved here due to the quaintness. Concerned about the traffic, increase in number of people. Biggest concern is the impact on the feel of the community, traffic, and living so close to the development that it would have a negative effect on the value of the home.

24. Brent Barg- 13830 Wrayburn Road

Lived in Elm Grove for a majority of his live. Echo's a lot of what has previously been said about height and density. Why do we want to be another "me too", like Wauwatosa, like Brookfield?

25. Britt Mason- 2115 Underwood Parkway

There is an investment model behind this project. Reinders has a non-performing asset sitting idle. What this all boils down to is, how much are we willing to allow the owners of the property to profit from the land? Alternative to developing the property may not be as valuable to the owners or the developer. Would like to see this issue be taken to a referendum vote.

26. Tom Herzog- 1550 Church Street

Neil Palmer said he wanted “value” for the land. The essence of Elm Grove is quality, not value. The thought is that the development will reduce taxes, untrue. Tax Incremental Finance, can last up to twenty seven (27) years. This information was not provided during the finance presentation delivered to the Ad Hoc Committee. The development would place more kids in schools that do not get additional funding. No one gains from the water main extension, except the developer. Businesses in the Downtown are told they "need this" development to occur. Density is way too much. The developer wants to vacate Elm Grove Road in order to have his density calculation equate in his favor.

Not against apartments, but am against too many apartments in too small of a space. Take a look at the Watermark condos. All units have sold. Against the apartments because they are too tall, too massive.

If zoning is changed to Rm-1 and the density allowed, it should be limited to three (3) stories, not a parking garage and an additional three (3) stories on top. Quality of the development should be exceptionally high. Should provide community space on the development site. Should limit all ingress and egress. Traffic study should be created by independent consultant, not someone hired by the developer.

No Tax Incremental Finance for the project. If it is worthy, it should stand on its own.

27. Marc Mc Sorley- 1505 Sunset Drive

There has been no interaction with the public except for tonight. That is not fair to citizens. Density, this development does not qualify for any additional bonus around eighteen (18) units per acre. This proposed development needs to go to referendum.

28 Pat Rierson- 13245 Oakhurst Drive

Bought home in Elm Grove to live near Tonawanda grade school. Is an interior designer by trade, and belongs to the American Society of Interior Designers (ASID). When working on projects, always looked to the height, width, and length. This is attributed to safety concerns. The height. This development is too large. The developer is just trying to make a statement such as, “mine is bigger than yours”.

29. Tom and Chelsea Magnor- 1640 Longwood (Read by Tadeo Balderrama)

Concerned the schools do not have the capacity to handle the increase in population. Traffic is a concern for the safety of pedestrian foot traffic. Construction of these apartments will change the aesthetics of the Village. The development of this property should be able to stand alone without Tax Incremental Financing.

30. Tina Prade- 14245 Juneau Boulevard (Read by Tadeo Balderrama)

Proposed development would change Elm Grove. The Development that occurred in Wauwatosa changed the walkability of the Village. Renter vs. Owner ratio are elements that need to be considered.

31. Michael Rohr- 13000 Wrayburn Road

If this project advances, the citizens should really consider whether their voices are being heard. Do not miss the messages and comments that are being said at this meeting.

32. Dave Rierison- 13245 Oakhurst Drive

Who decides if this project goes ahead? The Committee or the property owners?

33. Lisa Becker- 1155 Church Street

Agree with what has already been said. Tax Incremental Finance is absolutely a no. The project has too many units. Reinders should clean up the contaminated site.

34. Ted Eull - 1610 Legion Drive

Trust that the Plan Commission and Village Trustees will have the citizen's best interest in mind. What is planning to be proposed is an extraordinary development, which is asking to leverage a Planned Development Overlay [Zoning District]. The proposal has unreasonable density which will adversely impact neighboring properties and is not harmonious with the surroundings. The developer's profit is not the citizen's benefit. A referendum is appropriate.

35. Tim Klein- 13125 Dunwoody Drive

Has lived in Elm Grove for a longtime. One of the unique things of Elm Grove, and what makes it great, is the majority of the homes are owner occupied. Believes Elm Grove should not do apartments because people do not tend to stay in apartments. The citizens in the Village have a sense of ownership.

36. Kristina Sayas- 12535 Stephen Place

Was raised in Evanston Illinois, can attest to the permanent nature of developments once they are built. An "I love Elm Grove" sign hangs in the kitchen. Loves participating in the Junior Guild. The Village makes me think of small town America. Does the perfect small town America still exist? The functioning small towns of yester year have all but disappeared.

END OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Hearing no other comments, the Chairman closed the meeting by stating that there has not yet been a formal application submitted to the Village for the development. The Ad Hoc Committee will reconvene next week Wednesday, December 7th to formulate recommendations for the Village Board of Trustees.

3. Adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 7:39PM

Respectfully Submitted,

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

**VILLAGE OF ELM GROVE
AD HOC COMMITTEE – REINDERS DEVELOPMENT
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, December 7, 2016**

Present: Chairman Trustee Haas, Marlee Jansen, Rebekah Schaefer, Christina Berger, John Galanis, Martha Kendler, Joe Klein, Jan Schoenecker, and Stew Elliott
Absent: Pete Moegenburg,
Also Present: Wayne Wiertzema, President of Wangard Partners, Tim Anderson, Development Manager of Wangard Partners, Mary Clair Lanser, President of Lanser Public Affairs, Village Manager David De Angelis, Hector de la Mora, Village Attorney, Zoning/Planning Administrator Thomas Harrigan, and members of the public.

1. Bring the meeting to order

Chairman Trustee Haas brought the meeting to order at 6:03PM.

2. Discussion and possible recommendation to the Board of Trustees and the Plan Commission

Discussion was held on how a recommendation should be composed and reviewed before being submitted to the Board of Trustees and the other standing committees. It was noted that in the minutes from the first Ad Hoc Committee meeting, held on May 18, 2016, “consensus is not a goal of the Ad hoc Committee. Rather, thoughts that bring rise to valuable considerations and can be shared with potential developers should be encouraged.”

Chairman Haas began the discussion by referencing the working document titled, *Topics to be Considered*.

1. Land Use

Chairman Haas asked if the proposed land use is appropriate for the site. The Committee was in agreement that the proposed use as a mixed-use, residential Planned Development Overlay is more preferable than the current use and zoning as M-1 Limited Manufacturing.

2. Building Sizes, heights, and elevations

Chairman Haas opened the floor for committee members to comment on the proposed building sizes, heights, and elevations.

Jansen commented that the proposed building size is too large, especially the “middle building” [Building B]. Community members commented on the building size during the public comment session, and all comments reflected the building as being too big.

Elliott highlighted most of the objections in size have been directed more toward building height than mass of the building.

Galanis recommended there not be a third floor. If the third floor is removed, the development would not be as dense. This will also help with traffic.

Kendler commented on building height. The building height should be reasonable and complimentary to the culture of the community. Particularly if the retirees will be living in the building, mobility of residents in the building was never a talking point.

Berger noted the building height in comparison to the surrounding areas is excessive as currently proposed. From a size perspective, building 'B' is out of scope and magnitude. It also appears to be excessively long from a footprint perspective.

Schoenecker commented that a point of concern is the proposed density. As residents and members of the Ad Hoc Committee, it is not the Ad Hoc Committee's responsibility to make these decisions.

Chairman Hass clarified it is the charge of the Committee to provide a recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees.

Elliott shared that the third story makes it too out of scale for the property. The footprint does not appear to be too out of character for any other purpose.

Klein commented that if the number of units within the proposed redevelopment stays the same, and building 'b' is reduced down to two stories, building 'b' would take on a massive footprint that would not be acceptable. If that is to be a proposed compromise, it should not be allowed.

Schaefer opined the density is too high. Schaefer is pro-development but great care should be taken as the proposed re-development is located in the downtown area. Townhouses are not an issue. Two stories is much more acceptable from a neighborhood perspective.

Haas stated concern about the height, especially the building proposed on Watertown Plank Road. Haas would like to see one of the three buildings shaved down. The fact there is a peaked roof adds to the height. Foot print is not as much of a concern. Building on Watertown plank should be two stories.

Klein commented that aesthetic or design might be good reasons to reserve the number of floors – for variation in heights of the buildings.

Galanis motioned the proposed apartment buildings be limited to two (2) floors.

Kendler seconded

Aye: 6

Nay: 3

Motion carried

Footprint:

Kendler commented the total amount of buildings is fine, but perhaps break up the size of building 'b' and add a second town house.

Jansen does not agree a vote on the footprint can be made without knowing all the variables.

Committee decided to provide no recommendation on footprint alone.

Elevations-

De Angelis provided clarification as to what the Committee should be considering when commenting on building elevation: do the buildings appear to be differing in appearance? Is the look and feel appropriate for this development? Is the proposed building mass appropriate? Do the buildings 'flow', or are they disproportionate?

Haas is in favor of the homogenized appearance. The buildings are somewhat similar. However, the proposed buildings do not look that different than some of the apartments going up around the area.

The Committee discussed whether the Village Building Board is the more appropriate body for reviewing building elevations, exterior, and aesthetic value.

Berger noted her reservations specifically in viewing the development from the west and the mass of the buildings.

The Ad Hoc Committee agreed not to provide a recommendation in regard to building elevation.

3. Proposed Residential Unit Density

The proposed residential unit density is just over 21 units per acre.

The Committee vote on whether the density, as proposed, is too high at 21 units per acre is as follows:

Aye: 8

Nay:1

Hass noted the general public sentiment is that the development has too much density.

De Angelis explained the property is currently zoned as M-1, limited manufacturing district. The Comprehensive Plan has the property listed as mixed use residential. There are a number of ways to accomplish this. The property could be straight residential as an Rm-1 Multi-family residential district, with 8 units per acre. Or, go up to 12 units per acre as a Conditional Use within the Rm-1 zoning district. The Planned Development Overlay (PDO) district allows for the ability to approve enhanced density.

Units per acres within the mixed compatible use PDO district can be less than but not more than a maximum total of 22 residential units per acre.

Klein commented that density is a difficult topic, due to traffic concerns and the potential strain on public services.

Kendler stated concern over traffic.

Jansen highlighted that the Village Ordinance requires the proposed redevelopment be in the best interest of the community in order to receive the enhanced density bonus.

Haas suggested a bonus range not be provided, but rather asked the committee members to state say concerns over traffic and other services provided within the community.

Kendler commented that 8-12 units per acre would be more acceptable. Traffic, and preservation of the community's culture, are the main concerns when considering density.

The committee came to a consensus that the density as proposed is far too high. The major concerns are increased traffic, impact on the community's culture (look and feel of the Village), and impact on the surrounding neighborhoods.

4. Impacts of development on Village services for police, fire, and EMS

Committee defers this topic to the appropriate departments and agencies.

5. Should the Village evaluate providing Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) for those allowable project components which provide benefit to the Village? Potential project components eligible for TIF funding:

- Municipal Water
- Hazardous Soil Remediation
- Soil Stabilization (geo-piles)
- Re-route Elm Grove Road
- Streetscaping
- Underground Parking

Consensus of the committee is that in some circumstances, such as instances where there is public benefit, TIF funding would be appropriate.

Galanis commented that TIF funding would be OK for everything except underground parking,

Schoenecker commented that there would be a problem with providing TIF funding for soil remediation. There are still hazardous waste liability issues. The Reinders have never been good 'house keepers'. Not in favor of TIF funding for soil remediation, or soil stabilization (geo-piles).

Haas commented that TIF funding for site remediation would be OK. It would be in the public's interest to have the sight remediated. It is not uncommon for communities to provide funding for remediation

on industrial sights. However, that is not to say 100% of the site remediation costs should be funded.

Klein noted that typically cities will have taken over land that has been deemed brownfield, or is highly contaminated. The city would TIF to clean the site, and make it more desirable for a developer to consider developing. Caution should be taken to assure TIF funding is not simply going to the Reinders because they have an unclean site.

The majority of the Committee agreed on the utilization of TIF funding for specific eligible costs of the redevelopment are as follows:

TIF funding should not be utilized for:

- Hazardous soil remediation
- Soil Stabilization (geo-piles)
- Underground Parking

[Kendler exited the meeting at 7:09PM]

TIF funding could potentially be utilized for:

- Municipal water
- Re-routing Elm Grove Road
- Public Streetscaping.

Note* TIF funding could be considered for financial support soil stabilization (Geo-piles) so long it is not enriching the economic benefit of the developer.

5. Site Development and Design

Re-routing of Elm Grove Road at Watertown Plank Road: There is concern regarding the proposed re-routing of Elm Grove at Watertown Plank Road, specifically whether there would be adequate protection/shielding for homes located on Elm Grove Rd.

Traffic Impact of new development: Berger found the traffic study conducted by traffic Engineering Services wholly inadequate, as it was based on 2011 data.

Berger noted that efforts to monitor the traffic in 2016 was done inaccurately. De Angelis noted that the Village traffic counter placed in the field became inoperable, a new traffic counter was rented and installed incorrectly in the field.

Mr. Wiertzema noted that the data used in the Traffic Engineering traffic analysis was from 2013. Since the last meeting, the traffic counts were reassessed, and the traffic counts were actually lower than the original counts.

Berger stated the traffic analysis is worthy of a fresh study.

Berger read from a comment letter provided by Kendler who had left the meeting. Kendler's traffic concerns are, "excessive traffic and the lack of having a traffic study that includes all projects the trustees and Village leaders are aware of and that may impact traffic in the development area."

[Jansen exited the meeting at 7:17PM]

De Angelis commented that the village engineers will provide a traffic analysis study based on the previous traffic study that has been provided. The determination will be made if the assumptions in the original study are valid. National traffic standards will be used in the comparison.

Consensus of the committee is that the traffic impact of the proposed new development is an issue that needs to be addressed by a more comprehensive traffic study.

View shed of proposed project from surrounding properties:

Committee members commented that the overall mass and height has an effect on what this will look like and feel like in the Village's downtown. The landscaping should include some rather larger caliper trees.

Berger stated the view shed issue is of large concern to people who live across from the proposed development. Additionally, the lighting plan for the proposed development will need to be reviewed extensively by the Plan Commissions.

Greenspace: The committee is in agreement that the green space component is OK.

Public space and pathway- the committee is in agreement that the proposed public space and pathway is a positive thing.

Parking: The committee would like to see the number of parking spaces for residential units increased to two parking spaces per unit.

Sound reflection by buildings: The committee agrees this is a non-issue.

7. Benefits/Detriments to Village

Benefits- The proposed redevelopment would eliminate an eye sore, enhance the downtown, increase tax base, and enhance the Village's walkability.

Detriments- Public safety is a concern for people/children on the pathway and attempting to cross Elm Grove Road to Watertown Plank Road.

3. Other items which may come before the Committee

Berger stated that anything constructed on the site needs to be keeping in character with the Village.

Galanis commented the one bedroom units should be designed larger. Currently designed at 750 square feet for one bedroom.

Berger commented that an outstanding concern is that it may be too late to enter the apartment game. Wauwatosa now has 2,300 rental units. New construction going on nearby in Brookfield. Are we going to be able to compete and have the property filled successfully? Concerns about the vacation of Elm Grove road and use it in the density calculation.

De Angelis recommended that the committee meet again, to formally approve the minutes. Office staff will send out dates to schedule the next meeting.

4. **Adjourn**

Schoenecker motions, and Schaefer seconded to adjourn. Motion carried 7-0
Meeting was adjourned at 7:41PM

Respectfully Submitted,

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