

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

Wednesday, February 17, 2020

Meeting was called to order at 5:32 PM by Chairman Olson.

1. Roll Call.

Present in person: Mr. Falsetti

Present via Video Conference: Chairman Olson, Mr. Thedford, Mr. Koleski, Mr. Janusz, Ms. Steindorf, Mr. Matola, Trustee Domaszek.

Absent: Mr. Roge

Also present: Phil Aiello of Mandel Group, Michael Duncan of Engberg Anderson, Eric Pontoff Engberg Anderson, Dan Romeck of Mandel group, Mr. Harrigan, Ms. Walters

2. Review and act on joint BB/PC meeting minutes dated 02/10/2021.

Mr. Domaszek motioned and Mr. Falsetti seconded to approve the February, 10th, 2021 minutes as submitted. Motion carried 9-0.

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

Phil Aiello, Eric Ponto, Michael Duncan, Dan Romeck were present before the board.

Chairman Olson explained this is a working meeting. The Board will not be addressing the Single-family homes at this time.

Phil Aiello presented an overview of the redevelopment proposal. Mr. Aiello explained the southern portion of the property has been reconfigured with single-family lots after receiving concerns from neighboring residents. This portion of the plan now has eleven single-family homes and a cul de sac servicing the area.

Eric Ponto presented an architecture review of the original plan and existing buildings on site in an overlay. Then he reviewed the current proposal.

He reviewed the architectural details of Notre Dame and Maria Hall and the differences between front and rear elevations architecture. Mr. Ponto explained the design of the new buildings is an attempt to allow Notre Dame and Maria Hall to remain the focal point. Mr. Ponto explained the historical buildings can be viewed to have three main sections, a top, middle and bottom. The top portion is the most complex and compelling, the middle is composed of repetitive patterns and the bottom is a somewhat simplistic stone base. The backside of these buildings is much more simplistic compared to the front.

Michael Duncan presented several 3D videos of the proposed redevelopment.

Mr. Koleski is concerned the feel is not residential.

Chairman Olson asked if a materials board will be available for review.

Mr. Ponto stated material samples will be available for board review at a future meeting.

Mr. Ponto highlighted that Building two uses the same materials as building one, with white clapboard siding and wood finish materials. Building three has a mid-century modern look and feel, again incorporating walk-up units at the ground floor. Mr. Ponto explained how the rear of building three has been modified since the October 6th, 2020 Building Board conceptual review. There are now wooden bays for each residential unit and detailing at the ends of the building are integrated into the main body of the building. Additionally, the stormwater detention ponds and berms have been adjusted to preserve more existing trees. Mr. Ponto provided an overview of the species varieties proposed for the natural landscaped area, a variety of prairie plantings.

Mr. Falsetti stated that he is trying to understand the transition from the end of building one with the white clapboard siding and pitched gabled roof as it turns inward toward the courtyard.

The intention was to reflect the variety of existing architecture within the Village of Elm Grove. The sidewalks, street plantings help the new building feel like an extension of the neighborhoods.

Mr. Koleski opined that the straightness of building one does not lend a residential feeling.

Mr. Falsetti asked if Mr. Ponto would explain the use of the flat roof on building three.

Mr. Ponto explained building three is different due to its location within the development. As it is set farther back and internalized on the property, there is more leeway for the building to have a dynamic nature to it, something a little different.

Mr. Matola asked about the selection of white cement board siding. There appears to be a yellow color within the brick of Maria Hall.

Mr. Ponto stated the intention of the white material across the drive is to separate and provide contrast to the historical building, but also building number one. The intention is to break down the mass. Mr. Ponto noted the end section of building one (in the white cement board siding and pitch gabled roof) is the main crux as this is the transition point from internal to external. Perhaps this section can be changed.

Mr. Matola added the focus being on tying the historical building with the new building, but understanding that once the corner is turned, there is a different look and feel.

Mr. Koleski asked about the choice of black windows and wrought iron railings.

Mr. Falsetti did note that the black would relate to The Watermark across the street.

Mr. Aiello noted The Chiswick Mandel development in Fox Point, WI utilized dark windows and it has a very rick feeling to it.

Ms. Steindorf stated that in her opinion, the redevelopment should have a sense of timelessness and relatability. As proposed, it seems there is no relatability to the historic buildings. All the new buildings seem to have an urban farmhouse feel that will be outdated within a few years.

Mr. Falsetti asked what the distance from the road to the new building would be.

Mr. Duncan stated the distance would be 37ft to the road.

Mr. Janusz noted that building three does not show the top-middle-bottom delineation as seen in Norte Dame Hall.

Mr. Thedford asked if a monument reflecting the history and importance of this site will be incorporated into the redevelopment.

Mr. Aiello explained that was made a requirement by the School Sisters of Notre Dame and will be incorporated into the landscaping plan once finalized. Specifically highlighting the Sisters pillars and land ethic.

Chairman Olson stated it is almost 7:00 P.M. and asked the Board if there are any other questions. Seeing none, Chairman Olson entertained a motion to adjourn.

4. Item New Business

none

5. Adjournment

Mr. Matola motioned to adjourn and Mr. Janusz seconded. Motion carried 8-0. Meeting adjourned at 7:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Diane Walters
Administrative Assistant