

Thomas Harrigan

From: Ted Eull <ted.eull@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2020 6:58 PM
To: David De Angelis
Cc: Village Trustee Kim Irwin; Thomas Harrigan; Village Trustee Patrick Kressin; Village President Neil Palmer; Village Trustee George Haas; Village Trustee Katy Cornell; Village Trustee Thomas Michalski; Village Trustee John Domaszek
Subject: Re: Permitted units under current zoning
Attachments: image004.png

Thanks Dave.

While I understand that this is not a specific development proposal, it is a "Preferred Downtown Redevelopment Plan" and so the stated numbers matter. It should be expected that development proposals will be submitted in the near future, and that both developers and the Plan committee will leverage and cite the Master Plan as an authority for what should be approved on a given site.

By calculating the density total across the whole area, but then using uneven allocation (i.e. no units on South Section) the net result is an elevated density specified on the East Section, which is adjacent to houses which face higher impacts from that density than the South or North sections. This is unacceptable and it should be readily apparent to our trustees that residents are not looking to cram 89 apartments into 3 acres on top of a neighborhood and very close to the bottleneck of the tracks. I'm frankly surprised that number is being considered and it breaks down trust in the entire process that the Board is pushing for this density before any specific plan has been brought forth.

I made certain recommendations for plan changes to Trustee Irwin at the open house, and I would like to elaborate on them here.

The plan should be revised to:

1. Show conceptual building, street layout and explain objectives in the Plan, but not "recommend" a single density number on parcels/sections.
2. Illustrate elevation examples (as it currently does) within the allowed height, but not specify 3-story height as "recommended" for all buildings (including all 3 buildings in East Section, as currently shows in table 5.2). The statement about 36-foot height limit with potential for bonus half-story with public benefit is clear and should be enough to guide evaluation of projects. The plan on the East Section is particularly overbuilt, and it's not clear why MF/Mixed use could not be considered for any developments on the South Section.
3. Update the economic analysis to include "Low / Medium / High" density models which offer calculations of different MF unit counts (e.g. 150 / 250 / 500); This should include some estimated unit counts for the SSND property since we now know that is going to be redeveloped as residential. (The numbers can be estimated without designing a layout of buildings on the SSND land.) The plan as prepared unnecessarily leaves out the extra density that will be built on that land.
4. Specify in the plan that PDO-allowed enhanced density (up to 22 units/acre) will be available, with evaluation on a project-by-project basis.
5. Address in 6-Implementation that traffic impacts around the railroad tracks are a significant concern of many residents, and that traffic impact analysis must be continually applied as development occurs, and could impact the approval of projects seeking enhanced density or projects coming after some new developments have already occurred.

6. Address in 6-Implementation that public services impacts (Police, Fire, School) are of significant concern of many residents, with same provisions as in #5 above.
7. Address the fact that many in the community have expressed preference that some developments include owner-occupied (condo) development, and that over time the village may approve a mix of types of development (MF rental, MF condo).
8. Address in 6-Implementation what purposes TIF will be considered for (public infrastructure, right-of-way, paths/plazas, etc.) and what it will not (environmental remediation that should be owner's expense), and some factors of what level of funding and decision factors will be considered.

I understand Trustee Kressin's position that developers do not want 2-story buildings, and will not build 2 stories. This does not mean the appropriate and acceptable height for every building should be 3 story; Some *should* be 1 story, or 2-to-3 stepped. Very good examples of recent successful retail development are the Collectivo Coffee on 68th street in Wauwatosa, and the Stone Creek Coffee at Glenview and Watertown Plank. While certainly some new 3-story buildings should be welcomed, that does not mean ALL new 3-story plans should be encouraged and approved (as is recommended in 5.1).

Most people I have spoken to would rather see slower and thoughtful incremental development, and I believe this was reflected in the survey responses you received, which also focused on improved retail over MF development. I understand that driving higher-density apartment buildings would mean larger projects and higher valuations (and tax revenue) from the business district, *but that is not the main objective of your constituency*. Preserving the character and livability of the village is a far higher priority in most residents' view than increasing the value of the commercial properties in the downtown corridor. I believe we can do both - welcome thoughtful development proposals within reasonable density/height limits, and preserve the quaint village. But the plan as currently written is clearly more concerned with the promotion of development density, and I believe that does not match the voters' wishes.

Please consider these points as you evaluate whether to approve or further revise the plan. I would appreciate if you can post this message on the Correspondence page of this project on the Village web site.

Best Regards,
Ted Eull

1610 Legion Drive

On Mon, Feb 17, 2020 at 3:12 PM David De Angelis <ddeangelis@elmgrovetwi.org> wrote:

Ted,

Please find attached a detailed explanation of the chart and how the numbers were derived. While the numbers used were base zoning and the other base zoning criteria were used the way those numbers were utilized were not on a strictly parcel by parcel basis. As you will also see SEH has proposed multiple ways to potentially explain and demonstrate the numbers. The Village Board will be reviewing this at their next committee of the whole meeting, which will be scheduled in the near future, and making the decision on how to move forward with information.

I hope this helps clarify the numbers and the chart for you.

Sincerely,

Dave

From: Ted Eull [mailto:ted.eull@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2020 7:36 PM
To: David De Angelis <ddeangelis@elmgrovewi.org>; Village Trustee Kim Irwin <kirwin@elmgrovewi.org>
Cc: Thomas Harrigan <tharrigan@elmgrovewi.org>
Subject: Permitted units under current zoning

Dave,

Tonight at the open house when I was speaking with Trustee Irwin you stated that the unit numbers presented on page 76 of the draft plan were "permitted under existing zoning without a PDO." I believe your statement to be incorrect, but would appreciate clarification if I am misunderstanding the zoning.

Given that the **East Section** combination of properties shown in the plan (Ray's/Bigsby/cleaners/office) is a total of about 1.25 acres, and is currently zoned B-1 (12 units/acre) I do not understand how the number presented on page 76 of 22 units (N), 26 units (O) and 41 units (P), totaling 89 units, could possibly be allowed under current zoning without a PDO.

EAST SECTION	N	MULTI-FAMILY	11,000	3	3	0	0	1500	22
	O	MIXED USE	19,800	3	2	0	1	1500	26
	P	MULTI-FAMILY	20,500	3	3	0	0	1500	41
Total Downtown Multi-Family Dwelling Units									243

(I believe the other section building unit totals would also require enhanced density, but for simplicity am focusing on the East Section.)

I'd like you to clarify this information for myself and for Trustee Irwin since you stated so unequivocally that this was permitted currently without PDO.

Best Regards,

Ted Eull