

DISCLAIMER – THE FOLLOWING ARE DRAFT MINUTES FROM THE PLAN COMMISSION/BUILDING BOARD JOINT WORKING SESSION AND ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE UPON APPROVAL

**VILLAGE OF ELM GROVE
JOINT PLAN COMMISSION BUILDING BOARD
WORKING SESSION MINUTES**

Wednesday, February 10, 2021

Meeting was called to order at 6:02 PM by President Palmer.

1. Roll Call.

Present: President Neil Palmer, Chuck Long, Robert Reineke, Tom Michalski, Joe Kujawa, Anita Steindorf, Jim Koleski, Frank Falsetti, Andy Matola, Jim Olson, Pat Cashin, Kiel Thedford, John Domaszek, Brett Roge, Tim Janusz

Absent: Jim Jodie

Also: David De Angelis, Tom Harrigan, Hector de la Mora, Katy Cornell

2. Review and discussion regarding Mandel Development Proposal for the redevelopment of the School Sisters of Notre Dame Property.

There will be no action or public comments at this joint review.

President Palmer provided an overview of the meeting memo and supporting materials. The focus of this joint working session is to identify and discuss the specific roles both the Plan Commission and Building Board will assume when reviewing the redevelopment proposal.

Dave De Angelis updated the Commission and Building Board on several redevelopment proposal elements:

- Municipal water, possible extension from Wauwatosa or Brookfield.
- Traffic Impact Analysis, independent review.
- Stormwater Management Plan review.
- Process for Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) request and review.
- EMS, Fire and Police reviews for impact on our services.
- Public Works will review sewer and water plans and impacts.

Mr. De Angelis indicated that all standing committee members will be receiving an email from him relating to conflicts of interest disclosure. All recipients will be required to respond to the email indicating whether they do, or do not have any conflicts of interest as it relates to participating in the redevelopment proposal review process.

President Palmer suggested the Plan Commission may want to consider breaking the plan review items into manageable pieces and address them in separate meetings. It was noted that all future meeting dates will be posted to the Village webpage.

Mr. Olson asked if there is an intended schedule for the redevelopment review process.

President Palmer explained the Village does not have a fixed review schedule. Many elements of the review will run in parallel, mid to late summer is a guess as to when the review process will be completed. This will be dependent on how quickly we receive revised and requested items.

It was noted the February 3rd meeting memo demonstrates what the separation of responsibilities and authority is between the Plan Commission and the Building Board.

President Palmer asked the Building Board members if they have questions about their role in the review process as it relates to §7-1 *Building Permit Approval*.

Mr. Falsetti stated that as he understands, the Building Board reviews the architecture and quality of the building materials.

Mr. Olson noted in §335-30H(2)(i):

“The architectural design, landscaping, control of lighting and general site development will result in an attractive and harmonious project compatible without unreasonably affecting the property values of the surrounding neighborhood.”

Mr. Olson indicated that he has received feedback from residents who state they do not like the appearance of the buildings. Specifically the design does not appear to have an “Elm Grove” look and feel. How do we address these concerns?

President Palmer commented that all the standing committees will have similar challenges. Every standing committee is charged with specific duties as it relates to their individual scope of authority in the review process. It will not be possible to satisfy everyone’s taste, but keep in mind the Building Board is charged with ensuring quality in design and materials. As presented, does the proposal appear that it will decrease the property values in the Village, from an architectural standpoint?

Mr. Domaszek noted that it is the charge of the Building Board to review the architectural elements of the redevelopment proposal and to either make a recommendation, or take no action. Ultimately, the Board of Trustees will be required to take final action on the redevelopment petition.

President Palmer emphasized that the Building Board members have the ability to help the public understand the responsibilities of the Building Board and the review process.

Mr. Domaszek asked if it will be appropriate for the Building Board to opine on the proposed single-family lot configuration and sizes.

President Palmer noted that will specifically be the responsibility of the Plan Commission.

Mr. Domaszek asked if traffic ingress and egress configurations should be reviewed at the Building Board.

President Palmer explained the Traffic Impact Analysis independent review results, and the proposed traffic configuration will be reviewed at the Public Works and Utilities Committee.

Mr. Koleski opined that it would be very helpful to see a three dimensional model of the redevelopment proposal for review. Additionally, it is very important for the Building Board to receive comments from the public.

President Palmer indicated that he will inquire with the applicant if the three dimensional rendering is something which can be provided, and public comment can be taken at public meetings at the discretion of the board chairperson.

Mr. Thedford asked for additional clarification. Is the final step in the review process for the Building Board to either recommend, or not recommend the proposed building design, materials and landscaping plan for approval to the Village Board of Trustees?

President Palmer confirmed the Building Board will take a vote to decide what the recommendations to the Board of Trustees shall be. The vote should be based on the Village Ordinance which governs the Building Board's authority, and it is acceptable to include items in the recommendation the applicant may not necessarily agree to.

Mrs. Steindorf asked if by approval of the proposed Rs-3 and Rs-4 Single-family lots, is the Building Board then forced to accept an architectural style due to the lot sizes and configurations?

President Palmer opined that whatever is decided for the single-family zoning theoretically affects the style of the new home, but if you look at the legal definition for detriment to a community, it would be extremely difficult to prove the value of the new home constructed on a given single-family lots is a detriment to the community, by way of depreciation in value.

Mrs. Steindorf opined that what she would like to see in the proposed architectural design are timeless and relatable qualities. What is being proposed does not relate to the existing architecture of the historic buildings. This is an opportunity to relate the new buildings to the historic Notre Dame and Maria Hall.

Mr. Matola questioned what will happen if the Building Board reviews a proposed multi-family building, but the total unit count is reduced to the point where the dimensions of the building change, requiring re-approval from the Building Board.

President Palmer emphasized that it is the charge of the Building Board to review the proposal that is in front of them at that time.

Mr. Kujawa opined that the Building Board should have the ability to comments on the design style of the new buildings. Additionally, Mr. Kujawa asked if the Plan Commission has the ability to say, apartments are not allowed.

President Palmer stated the Plan Commission can propose the applicant change any aspect of the proposal. Also, per Village Ordinance, the Plan Commission has a defined process for making a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

President Palmer asked the Building Board to begin considering what specifically the new buildings should look like. If the consensus of the Board is for the architecture to steer in a new direction, the Board should strongly consider holding meetings on days that are not regularly scheduled for Building Board meetings.

Mr. Domaszek suggested the Building Board consider holding a working session.

Mr. Harrigan indicated there are not items submitted for action of the Board on February 17th, which would be an ideal time to hold a working session of the Board.

3. Other Business

None.

4. Adjourn

Mr. Domaszek motioned to adjourn, Mrs. Steindorf seconded. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 7:23 pm

Respectfully Submitted,

Diane Walters
Administrative Assistant