

**DISCLAIMER – THE FOLLOWING ARE DRAFT MINUTES FROM THE BUILDING BOARD AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE UPON APPROVAL FROM THE BUILDING BOARD**

**VILLAGE OF ELM GROVE  
BUILDING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES**

**Tuesday, March 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2021**

Meeting was called to order at 5:33 PM by Chairman Olson.

**1. Roll Call.**

Present: Chairman Olson, Mr. Thedford, Mr. Koleski, Mr. Janusz, Mr. Falsetti, Mr. Matola, Trustee Domaszek, Hector de la More (via video conference) Katy Cornell (via video conference).

Absent: Ms. Steindorf, Mr. Roge

Also present: Mr. Harrigan, Ms. Walters.

**2. Review and act on meeting minutes dated 02/02/2021.**

Mr. Domaszek motioned and Mr. Thedford seconded to approve the February, 02, 2021 minutes as amended. Motion carried 7-0.

**3. Review, discussion and possible action on the redevelopment proposal for the School Sisters of Notre Dame Campus 13105 Watertown Plank Road.**

Chairman Olson explained this is a working meeting following last meeting's informative session.

Chairman Olson summarized his memo about tonight's working session discussing elements of the topics.

For each of the three buildings, discussion will address each Board member's thoughts on architectural character from these points: Building Style, Context and Compatibility, Spatial perception, walking and driving. They will document potential revision and changes thoughts as well.

The same process will take place while looking at materials; Siding, Stone, Wood metal and roofing.

Landscaping will address the following elements; Planned vs Natural, Streetscape and Neighborhood Integration.

The feedback provided from the Board members will be taken back to the developer and the design team for their consideration.

## ***Elm Grove Building Board - SSND Redevelopment Review***

***March 2, 2021***

### **Overall Architectural Character - Building 1 & 2**

1. Mr. Matola - Building One - A more consistent view from left to right on the north elevation of the building is desirable. The white clap board portion of the building appears out of place. Where it turns the corner of Building One into the "center" of the development is the portion of the building which is questionable. The townhouse row style is done well, but there is a gap and a wooden structure at the end. It could look more harmonious from left to right. The three elements could be linked in a more consistent pattern. It appears there are three separate buildings, with the corner piece needing more unity to the other building elements.
2. Mr. Thedford - The petitioner described there being movement and gradient transition from east to west on Building One. Not sure if this is happening. (Slide 27)
3. Mr. Matola - Slide 27 highlights the abrupt change of the eastern most corner on the north elevation of Building One, the feature really stands out.
4. Mr. Domaszek - Would this be a good spot to have something taller that ties in the historic buildings?
5. Mr. Koleski - Building One, looking at the roofline, I see a wall a of asphalt moving 180 linear feet. This applies to both Building One and Building Two. It would be helpful to break up the massing of the roof.
6. Mr. Matola - The three features that stick up above the roof, help to break up the roof on the North elevation of Building one. (Slide 2)
7. Chairman Olson - When you begin to see the incorporation of some of the verticality on Building One, it begins to draw your eye to more of the verticality of the historic buildings.
8. Mr. Thedford - How can we have plane change so that it does not appear to be one large building (Building One, Slide27).
9. Mr. Koleski - Would like to understand the use of the wood material on the western end of Building one, how does that fit?
10. Mr. Falsetti - It seems there is a need to tie the two buildings, One and Two to the historic buildings. I see an opportunity for that at the vertical columns at building one, tall white

stack (rectangular hole at top), and on building two it is on the right hand side next to the gable. (Slide 27).

11. Mr. Thedford - Could there be an opportunity for a built up cornice.
12. Mr. Janusz - Is there more than one or two ties to the historical buildings that I am not seeing?
13. Chairman Olson – In the base of the buildings, a solid stone bottom ties into the historic buildings as well. However, the way it is put into place is different than what most people are looking at.
14. Mr. Koleski - The use of the wrought black iron porches, and the way they stick out, I would like to see it brought more into the building. Not understanding the relationship of the black to the structure and its consistency. The black porch railings are a focal point on Watertown Plank Road.
15. Mr. Matola – Referencing Slide 10, this is what people are going to see when you drive in to the area, when you turn the corner, you lose all the detail that is on the wings. It appears to be a vast expanse of windows, as though all the vertical elements go away when you look at the side view.
16. Chairman Olson - Are there ways to treat it? When you turn the corner, are there ways to blend the transition? (Slide 10)
17. Mr. Thedford- Can there be a contrast in this location so it does not appear engineered. (Slide 10)
18. Mr. Koleski - Not understanding the verticality that sits at the end of these buildings. Can this be explained? (Slide 10)
19. Mr. Matola - This is the area that needs the most attention, provide a reason as to why it should stay, or provide some alternate proposals. This is the primary feature as you turn the corners. (Slide 10)
20. Mr. Falsetti- This is the area of my biggest concern. Noticed when viewing the flyover, the end of the porches is 24' from the road. As you drive down, the size of the building is very noticeable as you head west bound on Watertown Plank Road. If you are driving east on Watertown Plank Road, you see the historic buildings, however the westbound approach really stands out. First instinct, the building is too long on the left hand side. (Slide 9)
21. Mr. Koleski- The whole wall of wood is what you are going to see as you are approaching

east or west. (Slide 9)

22. Mr. Matola– Referencing Slide 6, center of building one, inside of the court. This view with the landscaping, does mask what is happening. It appears we lost the vertical element of the front of the building on the rear. What can be done to soften this? (Side 28). The four vertical tall white gabled feature ends need to be tied together, somehow. Feels forced at the moment.
23. Mr. Thedford - Appreciate the lobby component of the interior of Building One as there are ends, but there are other areas that need focus. (Slide 28)
24. Mr. Matola - The stone band is much less pronounced here on the rear of Building One (Side 28). Perhaps bring up the band to the bottom of the windows?
25. Mr. Falsetti - West elevation of Building One (Slide 28) – Perhaps it would be helpful if we dotted in the existing homes to provide additional context as to what will actually be seen here.
26. Mr. Matola - Can we ask for a rendering of what the approach from Stephen Place turning from Red Barn will look like while viewing Building Two. Concern being the setback of the building from Watertown Plank. We never get a perspective of the building from the outside.

---

***Comments submitted by Board members prior to the meeting are as follows:***

27. Mrs. Steindorf - I see nothing tying the three buildings to Maria Hall or ND Hall. Mandel, in my opinion did a nice job of tying the Echelon buildings to the Eschweilers, they have made no effort here. Building Three is a particular travesty. We don't need Industrial Modern in our community. Nothing says "Keep Elm Grove Charming" less than that. Looks like Mandel is cheaping out in back because it won't be seen from the street. What about making the ends of the buildings mimic ND Hall?
28. Mr. Koleski - Appreciate the challenge of creating a transition from the existing SSDN buildings to any new development. Building One is a stark contrast to the existing structures. I am not clear how the East transition shows any connection. Additionally, the building needs more of a residential feel that blends into the character of Elm Grove - not standing out in contrast. Would like to see more uniqueness of the exterior. The amount of glass on the building is in sharp contrast to existing structure and does not convey a

residential feel to me. The balconies become a focal point as I look at the building which shows an industrial look in my mind. What can be done to bring those back into the line of the building. Would like to see more warmth in the color and less repetition in design elements. The roof line is not consistent with the existing property and limited change. It is a very long peaked roof. What can be done to show some uniqueness of some separation of the building along its length. (Slide 4) Looking south from Watertown Plank road, does not convey a great deal of detail, straight lines. The west end of Building One, being all windows and deck and wood materials. Very little detail or residential look to break up the size and space.

### **Overall Architectural Character - Building 3**

1. Mr. Thedford - There is far more value on Building Three than the interior side of Building One which were just discussed, appreciates the increased presence of stone.
2. Chairman Olson - Does anyone have any thoughts on the softness of the curve?
3. Mr. Thedford - On the backside you see how the curve creates a magic minimization of the scale of the building. There have been some attempts made in trying to make a large building less impactful.
4. Chairman Olson - Due to the fact the roof is flat, it is not as large and expansive as the roofs on Building One and Two.
5. Mr. Thedford - Building Three stands out as a bit more modern and has a tone of a mid-century approach, appreciate the texture that it adds.
6. Chairman Olson – It would be helpful if a 3D video can be created where the video starts in the central green space and circles around the Building Three. Also another 3D video demonstrating a 360 degree turn while standing in the court yard space. This would allow for a sense of the materials of all buildings and differences in styles.
7. Mr. Koleski - Building Three appears to be more of an office structure, there is still an opportunity to take it further and make it more unique in its appearance.
8. Chairman Olson - It might make sense to have more of a vertical break up on the front of Building Three.
9. Chairman Olson – Asked the Board members what they think about the building ends.
10. Mr. Matola – Building Three is already 10' lower than the building adjacent to it. This might have been their attempt to blend the height of the buildings together. Not sure if I like it,

just trying to understand it. Not sure if this has anything to do with moving the water from the roof?

11. Chairman Olson - I like the center element which brings the stone up, not sure if this is something that might happen at the end which brings in the same element? (Slide 7).
12. Mr. Thedford - There is an extra transom window at the very top of the end of the building. Not sure if it is appropriate, but more trying to understand it.
13. Chairman Olson - Anything that can be done from the existing buildings to make it feel more residential?
14. Mr. Matola – Chairman Olson brought up the center stack of stone which creates the verticality, which exists on all buildings. Not sure Building Three has a defined entrance like Building One and Two do. This view (Slide 7) has an "insurance building entrance" look and feel. It does a great job of bringing in the features from the front of Buildings one and Two, everything that is facing Watertown Plank Road looks consistent.
15. Mr. Matola - Every place there is a transition between buildings, it would be helpful to have and 180 degree view of a 3D rendering which demonstrates the transitions between buildings.
16. Chairman Olson - Asked the Board, is Building Three something the Board is comfortable with and can work with, by incorporating the comments we have just discussed? Understanding Building Three has a different stylistic appearance to it?
17. Mr. Matola - One question on the size of the building from front to back, it appear this building is 10' deeper compared to Building One and Two. Does it matter this Building three is much deeper than the other two?
18. Mr. Koleski - Is there an opportunity to break up Building Three into two separate buildings?
19. Chairman Olson - Is there a way to break it apart and create some air mass between the building to soften it? Something to consider for the design team.
20. Mr. Thedford - Perhaps the lobby area could be utilized to assist in this break up effect?
21. Mr. Matola - Building Three is actually the smallest face of any new building, something to consider.
22. Mr. Falsetti – Could there be an option where the gap above the white continues the elevation look so you only have two of the roof ramps going up, rather than four?

23. Chairman Olson - Let's go to the back of the Building three (Slide 20). This is an area where they break up the building with the porch seating areas, but perhaps this is another area where the verticality comes into play as well.
24. Mr. Thedford - This is where the wheels fall off (Slide 20). When the dwelling units engage the exterior, typically wood materials become involved. I like what they have done since the original proposal of the white monolithic design.
25. Mr. Matola - We must treat the rear of Building Three just as we would the front portions on Watertown Plank Road. There will be a lot of homes adjacent to this development who will have a view of the rear of Building Three.
26. Mr. Thedford - The three piece theory is gone on the rear of Building Three in its entirety. (Slide 20)
27. Mr. Koleski - The wood and black railing on the rear of Building Three becomes part of the structure, it is tasteful. (Slide 20)
28. Mr. Matola – (Slide 11) There is a feature which meets the roofline which creates a difference which breaks up the roof line. This is a very subtle nuance on the south elevation of Building Three which breaks the roofline and the white clap board siding.
29. Chairman Olson - It would be nice if the aforementioned vertical break was stepped back just a bit.
30. Mr. Thedford - If the narrow wood vertical band could jump down just three or four feet, it would do a lot to help break it up the massing (Slide 11). Perhaps incorporating this vertical wooden band and roof line stepdown into the western elevation of building three, this would assist in breaking up the white siding.
31. Mr. Olson - Interesting they incorporate the thin wood strip detail with the roof line drop down on slide 12, but is not carried all the way through on the rear of Building Three. That may help in breaking up the massing.
32. Mr. Thedford - Building One elevations, they have popped the roof up and brought the eve down and created a window shed type roof which is interesting as well. Right hand side of east elevation on Building One. (Slide 28)

---

***Comments submitted by Board members prior to the meeting are as follows:***

33. Mr. Koleski - How does this structure relate to the existing SSDN buildings? The building

would appear to stand in sharp contrast to #1 and #2 as well. The roof line is very different and does not have any unique elements. The rear of the building materials would appear to be less varied with use of cement board extensively. (Slide 11)

### **Material Selections/Appropriateness- Buildings 1, 2 and 3**

1. Mr. Matola - Black frame windows and features end up being the least visible in the long run. What other colors would we be able to mimic? Perhaps some sort of grey or a dark grey color? Agree with Mr. Koleski, if the balcony is pushed in so that it does not stick out so far, perhaps this would help. However, I do believe black is the best choice for the windows that I see.
2. Mr. Thedford - Agree, the black adds a feeling of shadow lines more than anything. (Slide 28)
3. Chairman Olson - Like the warmth of the stone and the patterning on the stone from what I can see.
4. Mr. Thedford -The warmth is great. There will be a mossy patina that will grow at the base. The way it is rendered is large and smooth, and that plays into the historic buildings.
5. Mr. Matola - The stone carries in to the existing structures, but when you look at the white, it contrasts greatly. The new development should frame the historical buildings, but they should blend somehow.
6. Mr. Koleski - From a materials standpoint, it appears there is no continuity from side or back, in any of these buildings. It's all siding of some kind, does not appear residential.
7. Chairman Olson - Color: we would like it investigated as to other options that we might consider, beyond white.
8. Mr. Thedford - Hoping that in actuality, what they are showing for the white, is on the warm side.
9. Chairman Olson - Is there an issue with using the siding? Perhaps not at the expenses they are showing right now, but in certain applications?
10. Mr. Thedford - Chop the vast expanses of the clap board into small pieces 4' to 8', what is the appropriateness and scale of that?
11. Mr. Matola - Perhaps bringing in more of the stone on the rear of Building One?

***Comments submitted by Board members prior to the meeting are as follows:***

12. Mrs. Steindord – Perhaps provide some colors (creams) that tie in, and maybe some arches somewhere to soften the rectilinear qualities of the buildings. The Eschweilers in Wauwatosa are brick and the Echelon buildings are brick. Here ND and Maria are brick and stone and the majority of these buildings are cement board and I presume cedar.

13. Mr. Koleski - Overall color of windows, railings, wood and roofing material clashes with the existing buildings on site. How can some elements of SSDN be incorporated with the new structures?

**SSND Redevelopment Review - Landscaping**

1. Mr. Domaszek - What trees are they proposing on the North Eastern Corner of the site plan?
2. Mr. Domaszek - When looking at the landscaping plan, a large number of trees which are in those single family lots will be coming down. Something to keep in mind as we begin looking at this.
3. Mr. Domaszek - What people really are concerned about is the existing "park area" that will be gone.
4. Mr. Thedford - What is the signage going to look like which says, these paths are public and open for use?
5. Mr. Thedford - How are they honoring the School Sisters of Notre Dame? There is a landmark feature at the front of Maria hall, Grape Trellis Relocation. What is the program for the signage and how does it play into the overall development plan?
6. Mr. Matola - Where is the snow going to be plowed and stored? There does not appear to be many options for this.
7. Mr. Falsetti – How will garbage removal be handled, will dumpsters be stored underground?

**4. New Business**

none

**5. Adjournment**

Mr. Koleski motioned and Mr. Domaszek seconded Meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Diane Walters  
Administrative Assistant

DRAFT