

Thomas Harrigan

From: Adam Berger <adam.berger@doeringfleet.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 6:44 PM
To: Thomas Harrigan
Cc: David De Angelis; Neil Palmer; marleejansen@yahoo.com; Mary S. Stredni; marthakendler@northwesternmutual.com; Joe Klein; Village Trustee George Haas; John Domaszek; Village Trustee Katy Cornell; Village Trustee Patty Kujawa; Village Trustee Patrick Kressin; Village Trustee Thomas Michalski; Stew Elliott; John Galanis; marleehansen@yahoo.com; Rebekah Schaefer
Subject: Wangard/Reinders Proposed Development
Attachments: IMG_7149.jpeg; ATT00001.htm; Your Neighborhood Rent vs. Own.pdf; ATT00002.htm

Elm Grove Trustee's, Plan Commission Member's, Building Board, and Ad Hoc Committee Members:

By way of very brief background, my wife is a lifelong EG resident. She sits on the Ad Hoc Committee so I will speak for myself so as not to blur a line. It's important to us that her role is one of community messenger and mine is one of personal messenger. I first lived in Elm Grove in 1998 and have lived on Katherine Drive, adjacent to the proposed development, for five years. We love Elm Grove and the way our hearts slow down as we drive into town, the friendly community, walkability, community services, and deep vesting in our community demonstrated by homeowners and businesses. My neighbor and I have worked to organize and communicate with residents we felt were not being proactively communicated with through this process and held a get-together where 50+ residents voiced concerns and gained consensus around the top issues we wanted to communicate as core tenets of any development.

Elm Grove residential apartments rental units are on the periphery of town. They are not in the heart of Elm Grove, with negligible exceptions. They are located on Marilyn Drive, just off Bluemound Road directly on and off Elm Grove Road near Bluemound. Here is an image of one such apartment complex, dwarfed by Emerald Woods!



The proposed development has not heard the communities loudest messages. If they did, they have wholly ignored the messages of height and mass. This development is not congruent with the essence of Elm Grove. Wangard and Reinders have not heard the loud and clear message documented by the Citizens for the Essence of Elm Grove and the bullet pointed list, discounting it as "a small group opposing the development." That's not fair - the group is expressing concerns and key characteristics of a development, not opposing the development. We ALL want something, but the messaging was clearly not for this! Not at 182 and not at 174.

Certainly, the massive scale and density of the proposed apartments is not acceptable and the developer will not be able to meet and has already admitted they do not intend to meet, the standards of the nicest residential housing in Elm Grove. Comparisons to homes in Indian Hills or Juneau Blvd or the condominiums at The Watermark set the standards for Elm Grove. Wangard expressly stated they would fall short. They will not provide public benefit without cost to the community. They are not hearing the yelling voices, but rather seem to tune into the smaller number of supporters and interested apartment tenants. Why are we wasting time when Wangard/Reinders will not be able to meet the statutory standards for increased density above 8 units/acre and has disclaimed their intent to do so going in. Please see the attached which shows EG in the area adjacent to my home and this property is 95% homeowners and 5% renters. The renters are privately owned homes rented long-term to families.

I do not trust people who do not listen OR who listen and charge ahead claiming to have listened to the citizens but acting with disregard for the voices of the majority.

1. In the end, I support a development - NOT THIS DEVELOPMENT.
2. In the end, I support a fair process - whether election, application, or game - NOT THESE CIRCUMSTANCES. The Village officials and applicant are using presumptive yes's by talking to us as if they are moving forward and it's a foregone conclusion. This is a sales tactic and one I, as a professional in sales, would never employ as it has deep ethical ramifications going back to consent and volition. We are smart people and deserve better!
3. In the end, I support residential housing on the site - NOT 174 UNITS. NOT 150 UNITS. I have proposed 125 would be acceptable to me - max of two stories. Max 2 stories to include the mixed use building 60 feet from Don's residential home.
4. In the end, I support the alignment of Elm Grove Road and the walking/bike path - NOT AT THE EXPENSE OF PROPERTY VALUES
5. In the end, I support adding retail to downtown EG - NOT trusting the illogical and simplistic traffic study that was based on 2013 data and that failed to collect data from 2016 because it was not administered correctly and checked for operation!
6. In the end, I support people to make personal decisions on home ownership or rental - NOT DUMP 170+ APARTMENTS IN THE HEART OF TOWN. I do concede that some may be former EG homeowners. Many will not. They will not have the vested interest in our community and it will become less safe for our kids, pedestrians, bicyclists, and guests. Have you ever noticed that you can tell when a driver on the road is nearing their home? They slow down. Apartment residents don't have the same level of community vesting typically.
7. In the end, I support a developer - NOT THIS DEVELOPER (because they seemed willing to listen until we said something they didn't want to hear and that's not true listening)
8. In the end, I support using the land - NOT RUSHING THIS MASSIVE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH which President Neil Palmer seems intent on doing. NOT forgoing the due diligence that is part of the EG design review (which as the Laubusch email dated 11/15/16

states took them over a year for a single family home). Careful and methodical steps must be taken, not jamming this behemoth into the most central sliver of EG real estate that exists near downtown and fast tracking it so they can start construction in the spring as they desire.

9. In the end, I support evolution - AND THAT INCLUDES RELIEVING TRUSTEES WHO DO NOT ACT IN OUR BEST INTERESTS OUT IN APRIL 2017.

The citizens have spoken, continue to speak, and the developer continues to selectively listen, respond poorly (taking renderings from (1) a vantage point that varies from what they were asked for and from an angle that obscures the buildings behind trees rather than straight-on coming into Elm Grove from EGR and (2) showing renderings from neighboring properties which include a treeline Stu Wangard himself has regularly said would be largely cut down based on a "Tree study" they had conducted. Last night they offered a valuable nugget of insight. Stu told us the replacement trees would be no larger than 2.5 inch caliper trees. Those are 8-12 feet tall maximum and will not provide adequate screening for 10+ years. Property values will be negatively impacted. Have you ever considered buying a home next to an apartment building? Exactly - most won't. The neighboring properties will suffer diminished value - like my dear friends the Koleski's, Smallwood's, and Balderrama's or investors who just bought a Lower Ridgeway home to flip like my friend from JTF Development.

I encourage anyone to contact me if the voice of the people needs to be heard. I want to see Elm Grove stay true to the ESSENCE OF ELM GROVE. I want to see Elm Grove respect the residents of Elm Grove. I want the residents heard. A public hearing was scheduled for 11/29. Other than an online meeting notice, will the Village send postcards like Wangard did and resulted in 170+ attendees versus the prior meeting posted electronically which garnered only 50 residents? I don't believe EG really wants residents comments and feedback. I believe EG's Village President wants to fast-track this development. It's his professionally career to shepherd undesirable projects through the process, but it's not what his elected office "job" is for me, you, and the rest of Elm Grove. I want to remain a resident of EG so long as I live in Wisconsin.

Alternatively, I would love to see a continuation of the Village Park through this site with some commercial development here and at the Park and Shop. If EG is considering offering 15 year TIF funding to a developer at the cost of many millions of dollars and defer any incremental tax revenue to the Village, I suggest we invest in ourselves and NOT in a developer and not in a property owner who has largely left Elm Grove and owns a contaminated site in the heart of town with petroleum, lead, and arsenic. If we were to commit \$5M in TIF funding for this project, I would much prefer to see that invested in buying the land and making the world's best small-town downtown experience with art, gardens, great places for kids to play in addition to the park, and retail - our own miniature Millennium Park.

I had a former Chief of the Environmental Protection Agency review one single illustration shown by Wangard at this week's open house and these were the comments:

"That data set looks rather unprofessional and uninformative. Most of the hydrocarbons listed are irrelevant and a waste of money to test for those parameters. Looks like someone trying to impress and confuse the audience with unpronounceable hydrocarbons. Of the analyses of interest, arsenic and lead, I saw no indication of units of measure, e.g., mg/l, or depth at which the samples were taken. Also, if the concern is a historic petroleum tank leak, it appears they didn't test for oil. The HC they did list are not degradation products of oil nor are they a good indicator of an oil spill. Also, geophysical considerations are important to anyone concerned about transport via the groundwater."

Now this Chief is also my father and a chemical engineer and 30+ year veteran of the US EPA. He is strongly concerned about our well water and the safety of his grandkids (and potentially his son and daughter-in-law).

I have since sent him a link to the studies conducted as posted and updated today. The study lacks a Phase 2 environmental study. This is of serious concerns. Local businesses must conduct such studies in order to resurface a parking lot, never mind build 250,000 square feet or more of real estate that rises 55 feet out of the ground and is partially buried beneath. The study and the communication thus far lacks an explanation of why the contamination is being capped and not remediated. I think I know the answer, but can I explain it to my kids who drink the water and bathe in it?

If I am inaccurate or misstating a fact or thought it is not with intent. I seek nothing other than a tasteful and palatable solution for our Village and insist that we deserve it and will fight for it, with our time, money, and effort in a way that is likely unfamiliar to a developer. The solution must guarantee water quality and comply with all current regulations in place without loose interpretation or exception. In the end, I will speculate that the implicit cost of the land imputed by the property owner is driving the density needed for their desired return on investment. This is their hail mary pass, but it doesn't need to be ours. Let's slow down, consider the options, alternatives, and move forward pragmatically. We must not rush into this!

Sincerely,

Adam M. Berger

Rent vs. Own

Did you know that the concentration of renters in a neighborhood can impact property values? Generally, a low concentration of renters and a higher percentage of owners is best for rising values.

In the area around
925 Katherine Dr, Elm Grove, WI 53122



Additional Information



Based on an area of 0.054 sq. mi. (Residential Area)

Total Dwellings: 22



Rented Owned Vacant

Median Age of Homes: 62 Years

Total Population: 54



Gross Rent Estimate of a 1-Bedroom Apartment: \$723