

**Village of Elm Grove Board of Trustee Public Hearing Meeting Minutes**

Board of Trustee Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 6:03PM.

Roll Call:

PRESIDENT PALMER

TRUSTEE CORNELL

TRUSTEE DOMASZEK - absent

TRUSTEE HAAS

TRUSTEE KRESSIN

TRUSTEE MICHALSKI

TRUSTEE SAYAS - absent

DAVID DEANGELIS, VILLAGE MANAGER

HECTOR DE LA MORA, VILLAGE ATTORNEY

TOM HARRIGAN, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR

MICHELLE LUEDTKE, VILLAGE CLERK/DEPUTY TREASURER

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Reminder: This is a public hearing. Residents who wish to speak can sign up in the hallway and will be taken in the order in which they signed up. Speakers will be limited to 3 minutes. Urges everyone to be polite. Everyone has a right to speak. No screaming, yelling, clapping please. This is not a question and answer session. The Board is here to listen to comments.

This process has been going on for almost 2 years. This meeting will become part of the record. Every document is on the website under the project tab.

Zoning Administrator Harrigan gave a high level overview on the project. He went over the planner development overlay district and what that means. He showed a map of the proposed TID which included the proposed water. Mr. Harrigan went over the procedural requirements and review criteria. He showed a timeline of which meetings this project has gone through. There was an anticipated timeline shared with a final determination. He directed folks to the village website and showed where the information can be found. Tonight's public hearing is for a proposed amendment to the Village Comprehensive Plan, the rezoning, and the redevelopment proposal for the School Sister's property.

**Pete Moegenburg – 985 Madera Circle** – he has three points to make. The market. The project. The development. Professional real estate consultant. There is a high level of demand for this type of project. The level of absorption has been swift. The individual project have a high level of financial feasibility. The developer is top notch.

**Janis Crego – 13240 Oakhurst Drive** – would prefer condos. There are too many units. The buildings are nice looking. Hopes to have a stop sign to assist with traffic. Her husband would like to see the historic buildings and all houses.

Online Comment: "I would prefer to have the historic buildings used as condos. I think there are too many apartments. There will be too much traffic going in and out of the complex. I think at least stop signs should be placed and the entrance to help the movement of traffic that will be going in and out. This way hopefully people won't have to wait tll long to get through Watertown Plank Road. I like the landscaping and the architecture of the buildings is nice."

**Lisa Heisel** – did not want to speak.

**Village of Elm Grove Board of Trustee Public Hearing Meeting Minutes**

**Matilda McClusky – 12800 Watertown Plank Road** - not present.

Online Comment: "Listen to what is being said."

**Scott Schulick – 1155 Church Street** – Many Plan Commission comments were centered on the PDO. Went over the criteria of a PDO – the Plan Commission skipped over the first criteria point. He is not in fan of the fees and loans that would go along with the project.

**James Wendelborn – 1640 Fairhaven Boulevard** – not present.

Online Comment: "I disagree creating a TIF for the Sisters project."

**Judy Hufschmidt – 14250 Oakdale Drive** – Has questions about water. Will they have information well ahead regarding what areas water will be added in the residential areas? She wants to make sure people have enough time to make budgetary considerations.

**Thomas Glatch – 1855 San Fernando Drive** – not present.

**Sue Robinson – 12775 Green Meadow Place** – lives directly across from the proposed development. Does not want lot 1 and 4 to have their zoning changed. Believes this is spot zoning and does not exist in other places in the village. This has been denied in other parts of the village. She proposes that the zoning on the boarders would be maintained so not to disrupt and downgrade the existing neighborhood.

**Debra Pawlak – 13060 W Bluemound Road Unit 207** – not present.

Online Comment: "Living in Elm Grove, I often drive down Watertown Plank Rd and also enjoy EG Park. Too many Residents in a congested area will back up our road more and also over populate EG Park. We are at limit already. With no plans to add a park and widen Watertown Plank Rd...Offering the SSND Land to Mandel Group for multifamily living would stress an environment that is already stressed. Also the Village Atmosphere will no longer exist."

**Tyler Stanley – 735 Elm Grove Road** – not present.

Online Comment: "There is no reason we should give a highly profitable developer huge subsidies to build an investment property that only benefits said developer. There is no benefit to having a 150+ apartment complex situated in our modest village. If the developer truly wanted to benefit the village, they would propose a condominium complex of 50-100 units. Property ownership adds not only greater value to the village as a whole, but it allows citizens to make an investment in their future through our village. Apartment buildings do not benefit a community; they only benefit a company."

**William Graushar – 12550 Walnut Road** – not present.

Online Comment: "Elm Grove is a Bird Sanctuary, what is being done to Focus on this? What is going to be done to control the extra traffic? Why no condos, this brings stability; Apartments bring short term thinking and abuse on our environment. Looks like the developer wins and the city will loses."

**Michael Rohr – 13000 Wrayburn Road** – oppose the development. Feels the trustees are pushing back on the people of the community. Believes 90% of the community does not want this project. People want some development, but not this.

**Village of Elm Grove Board of Trustee Public Hearing Meeting Minutes**

Online Comment: "Feel board is not and has not been listening to the people of the village that this development is not wanted. Not that there should not be some development, just not apartments. Single family and owner occupied is what the residents want."

**Gregg Hotson – 725 Terrace** – not present.

Online Comment: ""When the founders of Elm Grove incorporated this village, they had a VISION. Elm Grove was to be a bedroom suburb, but not like most post-war suburbs like Brookfield. It would be an exclusive low-density community with sizable lots. They wanted to maintain Elm Grove's unusual small-town identity. We are in no way obligated to maximize Mandel's profits. Forget about the additional property tax dollars. Focus on maintaining our unique Elm Grove identity and quality of life- this is why I moved here. This village is a precious jewel. Mandel can convert the Castle to condos, but the remainder of the property should be divided into 1/3 acre single family lots. Tell the Sisters that Mandel's vision is not Elm Grove's."

**Mary Inden – 14745 Watertown Plank Road** – we can have differing opinions and still love and respect each other. She outlined some of the positives. Keeping Marion Hall and the Castle. Such a treasure. The tax roll will increase. Bringing Lake Michigan water into the village. As a former retailer – it would be a benefit to have new families here to spend their time and money in the village.

**Thomas Castile – 1865 Hollyhock Lane** – three points. Against the high density development. Any additional tax money will be tied up for 20 years. How do we pay for the second half of the water loop?

Online Comment: "Thank you for the opportunity to speak."

**William Hall – 12450 Stephen Place** – the village is doing well. The best way to derail this is to bring in hundreds of rental units. What it will bring to the village is uncertain. The trustees are tasked with representing the village residents and representing the interests of the village. The village as it is now has never been stronger.

Online Comment: "The board of trustees has been elected to represent the village and protect the integrity of Elm Grove. Properties in Elm Grove are selling at absolute record high prices. Case and point, a 3500 sq foot home, literally just sold for 1.3 million dollars within walking distance of the village. Elm Grove is clearly and rapidly becoming one of the single most desirable places to live in Milwaukee, no question. One of the very best ways to derail this incredible progress in our community property values is to approve hundreds of rental properties to be constructed in the middle of the village! If we want to keep Elm Grove on its current path, and reliable housing environment, we need to have mostly condos, and private homes. I also want to emphasize that the board of trustees should NOT be acting in any way to financially benefit developers. I understand rental units are in the financial interest of the developer, but they are simply NOT in the interest of the village. Thank you!"

**Jennifer Stuckert – 14949 Juneau Boulevard** – this will change Elm Grove. The sister's property is prime real estate and is not blighted. Does not like the density proposed. Prime real estate does not need to be developed in this manner. Go back to the drawing board in terms of zoning. She is asking the trustees to have the courage to vote no. Another proposal can be considered that conforms more to the village. The density proposed changes the fabric of the village.

**Dale Streitenberger – 14375 Wisconsin Avenue** – endorsing the proposal. We went through a lot of work for this proposal. We can embrace this in a good way. There is a variety of housing for older adults. Upgraded infrastructure, updated water. Positive for downtown. He has heard these similar comments

**Village of Elm Grove Board of Trustee Public Hearing Meeting Minutes**

in other communities. He is an empty nester. He loves Elm Grove and doesn't want to leave it. There will come a time when he will not be able to take care of the property he has. Holding on to the castle is a major item no matter what we do.

**Lisa Becker – 1155 Church Street** – rejects proposal. Too many apartments. Would like a greater diversity of ownership for this property. TIF should not be granted for this project where development would otherwise not occur. Residents should not assume debt for the items they have proposed. Put the TIF to an advisory referendum. Municipal water should be independent from this project.

Online Comment: "In favor of the development and the future infrastructure services that will be brought into both the development as well as the future needs of the Village of EG."

**William Hall – 805 Circle Drive** – retired architect out of Boston. He has never seen projects like this offered TIF money. More the other way around. This is not a blighted area. The project will be a success. Thinks it is a good thing for the town. Nice architecturally. The TIF is ridiculous.

**Debbie Robinson – 1065 Longwood Avenue** - against the proposal. Would like to see some acknowledgement of other ideas. Reduce density. Please don't do any gerrymandering to send kids to another school.

**Jeff Behring – Red Barn Lane** – reiterate some of the points made. The lots that outline the project don't fit with the rest of the subdivision. Too much density on this project. Supports Lake Michigan water. Believes we can raise a bond to pay for this ourselves.

**Stacy Barry Coffee – 12805 Dunwoody Road** - Opposition. Echoes what other items were shared. Too large for small village. 2.5 times larger than emerald woods. The buildings are large and close to Watertown Plank Road. Bringing water should be a separate issue. Will put strain on fire and EMS.

**Kerri Ochotnicky - 14255 Oakdale Drive** – opposed. This should have been a referendum and not a board decision. It is no different when the school needs to raise lots of money. Another thing is ownership versus renters. Her children want to move back to Elm Grove to raise their kids. No single family folks. If she wants congestion, she will go to Brookfield. Believes many problems will arise from this. If the trustees make the commitment, they need to stay on the board. The schools cannot support all the changes. We will be a Brookfield. Bring water in through a bond.

**Ted Eull – 12850 Green Meadow Place** – opposes project. The scale is out of proportion for the village and space. He has emailed the board about the zoning. The TIF amount is insane. Would like the historic buildings preserved. Does not agree with underground parking.

**Martha Kendler – 1775 Village Green Court** – has been on licensing and finance for ten years. Opposed to density. Opposed to the level of TIF amount being requested.

**Aaron Duke – 14245 Juneau Boulevard** – opposed to proposal. Density is out of proportion. Does not like what it would do to traffic. Believes we should complete the municipal water another way outside of the TIF.

**HEARING NO ONE ELSE PRESENT WHO WISHED TO SPEAK – THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD WAS CLOSED AT 7:05PM.**

Thursday, November 18, 2021

6:00 PM

Village of Elm Grove Board of Trustee Public Hearing Meeting Minutes

Adjournment

There was no further business.

**MOTION BY TRUSTEE CORNELL, SECOND BY TRUSTEE MICHALSKI, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.**

**ALL WERE IN FAVOR. MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:06PM.**

Minutes transcribed by: Michelle Luedtke

Minutes Approved on: 12/20/2021