

CITY OF WAUWATOSA
7725 WEST NORTH AVENUE
WAUWATOSA, WI 53213
Telephone: (414) 479-8917
Fax: (414) 479-8989

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING
Tuesday, January 28, 2003

PRESENT: Alds. Becker, Ecks, Heins, Herzog, Kopischke, Krol, Sullivan, Treis -8

ALSO N. Welch, Community Dev. Dir.; A. Kesner, City Atty.; W. Kappel, Dir. of Public Works;
PRESENT: T. Kucharski, Parks & Forestry Supt.; Ald. Matthews

Ald. Heins in the Chair called the meeting to order at 8 p.m.

Appeal of Master Tree Plan for 8634 Glencoe Circle

Mr. Kucharski reported that Peter Beitzel, 8634 Glencoe Circle, has objected to plans to replace a failing maple tree in front of his home with a ginkgo tree. He submitted an appeal to the Board of Parks and Forestry, who discussed the request at two meetings and ultimately decided to uphold the master tree plan. Mr. Kucharski noted that a street tree inventory was performed recently and the master tree plan was revised in order to create more diversity in the urban forest.

Mr. Beitzel indicated that he has no objection to any tree except a small, decorative tree. The Parks & Forestry Board said a maple would block the street light, but the light is underneath the canopy of the existing tree, he said. A ginkgo doesn't have a large canopy and doesn't provide the type of shade that is needed. There is only one ginkgo on Glencoe Circle now. About half the trees there are very mature maples, and the others are very small maples, so a maple would fit in well with the current stock. Mr. Beitzel said he was told that he could plant a tree in his front yard, but he showed photos of the site and asked how he could do that considering the slope and amount of space.

Mr. Kucharski responded that plantings can be done successfully on slopes. Trees at Hart Park have established themselves on greater slopes than that. If Mr. Beitzel elects to do that, he would recommend not planting a tree at the curb due to policies in place on minimum distance between trees. He noted that there is not much canopy on the existing maple because it is in decline.

Asked when the replacement maples on Glencoe Circle were planted, Mr. Kucharski estimated that the younger maples would have been planted at least three years ago before the master tree plan was adopted. Ald. Ecks observed that in some ways Mr. Beitzel is a victim of bad luck in that his tree didn't die earlier. If the young trees were all ginkgos, there would be some consistency, he felt, but he was inclined to "grandfather" a maple under the old plan.

Moved by Ald. Ecks, seconded by Ald. Krol to recommend directing the
Forestry Superintendent to plant a young maple tree similar to others farther
down the block –

Responding to a question, Mr. Beitzel explained that a ginkgo is very open and doesn't provide shade. He has seen two varieties—two small ones and a fairly large one in a park setting that gets a great deal of light and water. He felt that the tree to be planted wouldn't do as well as the one in the park. Maples, elms, ashes, and oaks are much larger trees that are shade trees and adapt well in the city, he felt. The ginkgo doesn't have a big canopy, he reiterated.

Mr. Kucharski felt that with 75% of the canopy in the city in Norway maples there would be a big problem if a disease should strike maples as it did elms. That is why diversity was brought into place. The ginkgo is a city tree, he said. Trees in urban settings will not grow to mature size and shape because they are under urban stress. In the park, added water doesn't make it any bigger. In a setting with terrace and lawn and an area that isn't all concrete, it will grow to a decent size. It is one of the oldest trees and has hardly any disease or insect problems. Like the linden tree that also has a pyramidal shape, it still provides shade. If the trees are spaced out 35 feet on center, they will eventually touch each other and create a canopy. At some point, you have to start a plan and move forward, Mr. Kucharski said. Eventually there will be more ginkgoes as other trees die off. In an urban setting, maples last from 50-60 years and ginkgoes could last up to 100 years.

Ald. Becker felt that it is not unusual to have an exemption and didn't see a problem if one out of 10 people want a certain tree. He requested that Mr. Kucharski return to this committee in two weeks to explain the City's tree trimming policy.

Discussion ensued in support of the master tree plan. Ald. Herzog spoke of the need to have a plan and stick, indicating he would defer to Mr. Kucharski's professional guidance. These are the City's trees, he noted. While sympathetic to Mr. Beitzel's request, Ald. Kopischke did not feel it presents that type of compelling case needed to overturn the decision of the Board of Parks and Forestry. Ald. Treis commented on the need to look to the wisdom and training of the forestry people. He felt there is no alternative but to go along with the master plan.

Ald. Ecks encouraged committee members to visit this site before next week's Common Council meeting. Mr. Beitzel relies on the street tree to shade his house, he said.

The Chair reported that she visited the site this afternoon and there is no question that the maple provided a lot of shade. She expressed appreciation for having a master plan and trust in the forestry department. Whether a ginkgo or a maple is planted, neither will provide shade in the next several years, she noted.

Ald. Krol favored changing the master plan when cost and consensus allow. There is no major cost consequence to acceding to what the resident wants, he felt. He commented that foresters probably groom against disease.

Roll call vote on the motion, Ayes: 3; Noes: 5 (Herzog, Kopischke, Sullivan, Treis, Heins) Motion fails.

Moved by Ald. Kopischke, seconded by Ald. Sullivan to recommend upholding the decision of the Board of Parks and Forestry to adhere to the Master Tree Plan. Roll call vote, Ayes: 5; Noes: 3 (Becker, Ecks, Krol)

Elimination of the Requirement for Design Review Board Approval of Garages and Storage Buildings

The Board reviewed a proposal for a streamlined permitting process under which the requirement for Design Review Board approval of garages and storage buildings would be eliminated. Under the current process, Ms. Welch reported, someone wishing to construct any sort of accessory building has to wait as long as two or three weeks for design approval. This is an annoyance to the homeowner constructing a fairly standard garage. The following criteria for staff review and issuance of a permit were suggested:

- All elevations shall be shown
- Photographs of the dwelling's front elevation and the affected area shall be submitted
- Exterior building cover shall match the dwelling
- Roof pitch shall match the dwelling but need not exceed a 6:12 pitch
- Overhangs where provided need not exceed 12" in projection
- Roof color and cover shall match the dwelling
- Garages and storage buildings located on corner lots shall be approved by the Design Review Board

As at present, those homeowners who want to erect a taller garage with a steeper roof pitch to match their homes would have to go through the Special Use process.

Ald. Kopischke said he is very much in favor of this kind of streamlining and would like to more of this in the near future. He suggested adding language to make it clear to the property owner that simply meeting these requirements does not compel the Chief Inspector to issue a permit.

Moved by Ald. Kopischke, seconded by Ald. Sullivan to recommend introduction of a proposed ordinance with the provisions as listed and additional language clarifying that the Chief Inspector is not compelled to issue a permit –

Ald. Herzog agreed that this kind of streamlining is beneficial to both the City and residents. He asked about appeal rights, and Mr. Kesner said that appeals would be heard by the Design Review Board.

Moved by Ald. Herzog, seconded by Ald. Ecks to amend the motion to include language allowing for appeal to the Design Review Board.
Vote on the amendment, Ayes: 8

Ald. Treis felt there should be a limit on the number of sheds or accessory buildings on a lot, since there is sometimes a problem with larger lots. Mr. Kesner said that this new provision would apply to the first or second outbuilding only. Anything beyond that would require further review. Also, since building permits are required only for buildings over 100 square feet in size, this provision may not be applicable to a lot of smaller buildings. Ald. Treis favored limiting the new provisions to the first outbuilding on the site.

With consent of the second, Ald. Kopischke amended his motion to state that the provisions are limited to the first outbuilding on a site; any additional building would require Design Review approval.
Vote on the motion as amended, Ayes: 8

Proposed Outdoor Burning Ordinance

Mr. Kesner reported that Ald. Matthews asked him to address the issue of outdoor burning, which has generated constant complaints in her district. In the past, the City has essentially allowed outdoor burning under certain limitations but has not defined conditions or been explicit enough in prohibiting burning of certain items. In addition, language has been spread out throughout the ordinances and should be consolidated within the fire prevention code.

Mr. Kesner said that the proposed ordinance that was drafted in conjunction with the fire department defines very specifically where outdoor burning can occur, the vessels, and the manner. Burning would be allowed only in approved containers such as portable outdoor fireplaces or permanent outdoor fireplaces and only under specific conditions: outdoors on private property, under constant supervision, but not within 25 feet of any building or structure, trees or shrubbery, nor near an area containing dry grass, weeds or other combustible material. Mr. Kesner reported that he consulted with the DNR and found there is no prohibition on this type of burning for recreational purposes as long as it complies with local fire codes.

Ald. Matthews said she was called by a constituent who had problems with people using Weber grills to burn construction materials. Since the code is not clear on what is allowed, enforcement is left to the discretion of the firefighters or police officers who respond to such complaints. She felt that clearer language would help enforce proper use of the outdoor fireplaces that are becoming increasingly popular.

Germaine Schierow, 4617 N. 110th Street, said a neighbor uses his grill to burn anything he wants. She displayed a photo of a 2 x 4 burning on the grill and three other photos showing other fires on the grill. Police and fire personnel

have said the fires are okay, but she was concerned with the types of fires shown, especially in a very hot, dry summer. She spoke of an occasion when a fire in the grill generated sparks four feet above the flames. The grill is under a tree next to his house and a line of dry fir trees. She felt that there should be a requirement for the container to be covered at all times when there is a fire. Kathy Martin, 4641 N. 110th Street, added that the neighbor allows his children to throw “tons” of fluid onto the fire, and there often is nobody around when a fire is burning.

Mr. Kesner said that the proposed ordinance will clarify that any fire burned in an appropriate container in the manner defined still must be under constant supervision. It provides two extra powers to the fire department in that it defines not only what can't be burned but also adds other items under specific orders of the fire department. It also gives the department power to declare a ban on burning when conditions so warrant, a power they no doubt have now but is explicitly stated in this ordinance.

Moved by Ald. Treis, seconded by Ald. Becker to recommend introduction of the proposed ordinance with language clarifying the requirement for constant supervision by a competent person –

With the consent of the second, Ald. Treis amended the motion to include the Health Officer under Sec. 14.24.080 relating to power to suspend outdoor burning –

Vote on the motion as amended, Ayes: 8

Amendments to Relocation Plan for City/MMSD Flood Mitigation Project

Ms. Welch reported on proposed amendments to the agreement for acquisition of commercial properties in the City's cooperative flood mitigation program with the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD). The City will no longer pursue acquisition of county-owned land along the Menomonee River. MMSD will pursue an easement there. The City is pursuing temporary easements to allow construction of berms and also some permanent easements required because of changes in grade from the berming. Also, the City is no longer pursuing acquisition of the Marcus property but is pursuing a flood easement instead, which would provide for everything needed on that property. Ms. Welch requested approval of an amendment to the Phase 3 Relocation Plan so that it is part of the formal agreement with the consultant and MMSD.

In response to questions, Ms. Welch explained that the county owns land directly along either side of the river. Acquiring that property would have including responsibility for ongoing maintenance of the river walls and banks without significantly increasing parkland. This amendment is a modification of the agreement already in place under the Phase 3 Relocation Plan.

Moved by Ald. Kopschke, seconded by Ald. Treis to recommend approval of the amendment to the relocation plan. Ayes: 8

Development Proposals for Public Works Site

Ms. Welch reported that she contacted the developers who responded to the RFP for the 18 acre unimproved parcel of land south of Walnut Road and west of N. 113th Street adjacent to the City's public works facility. She noted the presence of all but one of the eight developers who responded to the RFP. Presentations by the developers proceeded, each with various types of visual representations and handouts:

Joe Marchek of Vandewalle & Associates, representing Bielinski Development, Inc.

The proposal is for townhouse condominiums in two forms laid out to buffer higher density in the center of the development with four-unit townhouses around the perimeter. The outer units would be up to 18,000 square feet in three stories with garages below and two living floors above. The 12-unit townhouses in the

center, six facing one way and six the other, would be built on a preset concrete underground garage. The townhouses would have separate entrances with two stories of living space and an optional loft. The neighborhood is designed around four main open spaces with two small courtyards with gazebos, one large square in the center, and a clubhouse. The east side of the site would be buffered with ponds serving as detention basins, buffered with native prairie plantings.

Over the last two years, Bielinski has gone from an outer ring suburban developer to looking at in-fill sites and how to improve the environment, using a site that has been disturbed and looking at open spaces and using storm water treatment and native plantings to cleanse storm water runoff. They have worked successfully with this model with MMSD in Germantown and Oak Creek.

A suggestion that is still evolving is limiting the need for improvement on Walnut Road by moving the entrance closer to the improved intersection. In this format, the density is 196 units, which was increased from the original proposal to illustrate what could be done with higher density and reorganize the site to create more open space.

Bielinski would like to work with the improvement plans for other publicly owned lands around the site to perhaps create a multi-use trail to provide neighborhood connections. They want to create a neighborhood by providing a lot of front doors, porches, and a street scene with most of the parking underneath but also with some street parking. The courtyards, buffers, and entrance areas would be heavily landscaped. A lot of work with the neighborhood and City staff is anticipated to make connections to the existing neighborhood through sidewalks and multiuse buildings. They are working very closely with the Village of Sussex on a site that is mixed use with retail. Their architect has designed buildings in Madison that are similar to the proposed 12-unit building and have been very successful.

Ald. Krol raised questions about the process to be followed and how the questions that have been raised would be answered within the process. Ms. Welch noted that her memo of January 23, 2003, outlines some of the general issues to be considered to pave the way to move forward and work out details. The proposals are varied, however, and it is difficult to come up with a neat flow chart with comparable information. Grading, for example, could be considerably different from one project to another depending on density and detention basin requirements. Those issues would need to be worked out after determining some of these general issues, she stated.

Chris Leffler representing Spectrum Development

The proposal is for a sports complex on a portion of the site. Detention ponds would be required, but there is no specific proposal for the remainder of the site although possibilities include open recreational fields and facilities or a hybrid of the other residential proposals. Potential users would include seniors, who may need another more centrally located place, skateboarders, and other Gen-X type sports participants. In addition to high schools, grade schools, and other community groups, letters are available from groups outside of Wauwatosa including UW-M who are looking for a facility like this. Wisconsin Lutheran College and Cardinal Stritch were also mentioned. As a central location with freeway access and proximity to Mayfair, the site would draw from the entire metropolitan area, benefiting local businesses, and could also draw statewide and regionally. The closest facility like this is in Indianapolis. A similar facility is being built in Iowa but it isn't close to this size.

The building would have a first floor open area with uses that could include a full-size soccer field and a full-size major league baseball field for hitting into nets, basketball, volleyball, batting, pitching, an area that could be converted to rock climbing, aerobics, and skateboarding with a running track around the outside. Also on the first floor would be locker rooms, video area, retail area, and perhaps a weight room, dance studio, and/or senior center. The second floor would have a restaurant dining area and banquet and meeting halls with combined kitchen and prep areas.

Mr. Leffler indicated that the proposal is an effort to see if there is interest in pursuing this concept since he is not entirely convinced that residential would work in this area given the public works site and the roads. It costs money, time and effort to put something like this together and get sponsors to help pay for it and groups

to commit to using it. He has people who could help pay for part of it and help run it and the letters from UW-M regarding use of the facilities. He also brought a January 23, 2003 article about West Allis proposing a similar outdoor facility at their dump site. He confirmed that this proposal is for an indoor facility owned and operated by a private entity on a for-profit basis. He estimated construction cost at \$4.2 to \$6 million.

Chris Leffler representing Spectrum Development in association with Atlantic Realty Partners

This proposal would probably look at some kind of multi-family development appurtenant to the proposed sports complex, using the sports complex as a buffer between the residential area and the public works site.

Phil Schultz representing Horizon Development Group; Dale Streitenberger and Greg Zastrow of Eppstein Uhen Architects

Horizon Development has been in the senior housing business for the last 19 years and is the largest developer of senior housing in Wisconsin. Wauwatosa is an aging community with over 24% of its population over 65 right now and not enough units to serve that population. The proposed housing would serve seniors in the neighborhood and, in turn, open up neighborhood housing to a younger population. A development of this nature allows for a large number of units. The proposal is for 530 units with about 636 residents, average occupancy being 1.2 persons per unit. The site has 50% green space.

The proposed combination of two and three-story buildings with double-load corridors and underground parking would have walk-up units at the ground floor providing access to sidewalks. All buildings would have elevators and underground parking. The area could be geared toward seniors and the general market as well with combined amenities. Some of the parking issues would have to be re-evaluated if geared toward the general market. Horizon is involved in an inter-generational development in Verona, Wisconsin, and has capabilities in that field.

A traffic impact analysis that was done indicates that the traffic impact of seniors is very low compared to traditional multi-family housing. Forty-four trips were estimated. The proposal is to develop 113th Street to Watertown Plank Road with no connection to Walnut Road other than for emergency vehicles. The developer would pay for the installation of traffic signals at Watertown Plank Road, if deemed necessary.

(The committee recessed at 9:40 and reconvened at 9:48 p.m.)

Helmut Toldt representing Toldt Development, Inc.

The project is designed on the basis of a traditional neighborhood with a gridded street pattern and a variety of housing units and building types designed specifically for this site to fit into the exterior character of Wauwatosa and the neighborhood. The goal was to integrate this with the adjoining community rather than isolate it. The proposal is for a network of streets and sidewalks as well as commercial space and live-work space with back-loaded garages and buildings with underground parking. A lack of garages is seen in the architecture and parking areas have been concealed and buffered.

It is important not just to landscape to the four property corners but to extend southward and use the development to improve the commercial strip along 113th Street by continuing the street pattern at the developer's expense with lighting, arbors, and trellises along the roadway. Roundabouts are planned at the three entrances to provide traffic calming without stop signs. Walnut Road would be used only for emergency and public works vehicles, utilizing some sort of a gate system if necessary to restrict traffic.

There is a need for a number of different types of housing in the city. About 18% of the city's population is over 65, but only about 3% of the housing is designed for that age group. An L-shaped building was designed with 75 independent living units and some assisted living. A clubhouse would provide community gathering experiences, not just for this development but for the neighborhood itself. Also, the city's population nearly doubles on a daily basis with people who come to work here but live elsewhere. The city doesn't provide enough quality housing or the right type for those individuals. Seven buildings with seven units each of condominiums, stacked flat with two-car garages entered from the back are proposed. They would have underground parking with a stairway to each unit. Townhouse condos would be sited east of a

large mews area (600 x 80 ft.). Other buildings look like very large single family homes with large porches. They are three-story courtyard buildings with elevators and underground parking that face into the large pond/courtyard areas. Three story live-work units would have flexible space for living or working on the first or second floor and a third-floor loft. Rental costs would be \$800 to \$1,200-\$1,300 per month and the condominiums would likely be priced in the range of \$175,000 to \$225,000/250,000. There was an attempt to make the development non-homogenous—not the same kinds of buildings and same individuals but a variety of age and income groups.

There have been a number of discussions with the DNR about use of the “Mt. Tosa” area. While non-committal about proposed uses, they were not rejected. Passive uses such as walking paths, public art displays, outdoor music, and gathering places are being considered. The area would provide a large open space, without structures.

Rich Conley representing Metropolitan Development

The developer has done a variety of projects throughout Wauwatosa, most recently the Camelot redevelopment on Blue Mound Road and Lefeber Point in the village area as well as other office buildings. The proposal is for 196 apartment units and a 4,200 sq. ft. recreation center and pool area. The main entrance to the area would be off of Walnut Road near the police station. There would be four three-story structures each with 45 or 51 apartments ranging from 800 to 1,200 square feet. They would have balconies, fireplaces, and below-grade parking. At the far south end and across a bridge there would be a variety of water retention ponds.

The intent is to preserve 100% of the green space in the eastern portion, incorporating bike and walk paths and retaining the trees. The main intent was to stay in the range of 200 units, using only about 2/3 of the site. A cul de sac would reduce traffic flow on the south end. There would be a service road to the city yard. The quality of this project would be maintained at the same level as other projects in the community.

Jack Shepherd representing Thomson Corporation in cooperation with The Shepherd Partnership

The architect is responsible for 35 projects in Wauwatosa including Serafino Square, Normandy Village, and San Camillo. Thompson Corporation was founded in 1956 and Shepherd Partnership in 1962. Normandy Village and Serafino Square have generated \$24,400,000 in real estate taxes over the years.

The primary objective here was to create a soft project that is informal and more like a park. The site has characteristics similar to those at Serafino Square which has a sloped site, larger units with underground parking, and a density of 31.2 units per acre. The density of the existing units along N. 116th Street adjacent to the subject site is 26.6 units per acre. The proposal here is for 300 units with a density of 16.25 units per acre.

This site should be used for housing because of the enormous need in Wauwatosa. At one time Wauwatosa and Shorewood were cited as the two communities in southeastern Wisconsin with the highest number of seniors. Also, there are 12,000 technical, professional, and support service employees at the nearby medical campus with significant expansion expected in the future. The Research Park’s employment base is also expanding. There may also be development on the county grounds in the future.

Proposed building sizes range from 4 to 26 units with compact building footprints and underground parking. Seventy one bedroom and one bedroom with den living units are proposed, 190 two bedroom, and 40 two bedroom townhouse units using only about 33% of the site. There would be two water storage facilities. Four hundred of the 680 parking spaces provided would be underground.

Two different engineering sources were consulted regarding traffic, and the consensus was 4.2 to 5.1 traffic movements per day per unit, which was averaged to 4.71. Both agreed that almost all traffic would use 113th Street, Watertown Plank Road, and from there travel to highways 100 and 45 and the medical complex. The developer is prepared to work jointly with the City in any park development that might

proceed in connection with the land immediately north of the police station contingent upon access to the park from the new development.

An assessed value of \$21,000,000 was estimated.

The Chair invited discussion of how to proceed. Ms. Welch said the fact that the land is currently zoned for light manufacturing use must first be considered. Does the Common Council feel residential use is appropriate here? Would there be support for Residential Planned Development or Business Planned Development zoning? Secondly, the issue of density must be considered in terms of both impact and taxes. Impacts should be weighed against benefits. Ms. Welch cautioned that the value of this undeveloped land should not be underestimated. Those are the overriding conceptual issues to be addressed before working out details of who, what, how much, etc. Infrastructure costs were mentioned as being critical as well. Infrastructure needs vary depending on the number of units and their configuration, Ms. Welch noted.

Asked about progress on filling the site, Ms. Welch was uncertain of the need for more fill. There may be enough on the site depending on potential excavation and detention basin size. We are approaching a point where it makes no sense to bring in more fill until we know what we are doing with the site, she said. We haven't yet turned away any fill.

The Chair said that she and Ald. McCarthy as representatives of this area agree that it is important to involve the immediate neighbors in a discussion so that they are kept apprised of what is going on. She was uncertain at what stage that should be done but suggested that a meeting in the police station conference room may be appropriate.

Ald. Herzog commended the developers for their plans and noted that some direction from this committee is now needed. The committee needs to articulate what they want at the site and needs to hear the city planner's perceptions on what the city needs and issues such as density and access. He indicated some interest in the sports complex proposal.

Ms. Welch responded that discussion of the need for elderly housing ignores the fact that 75% of the population is under the age of 65 and is also looking for housing units. There may be a need for more condo and townhouse options for the younger professionals, such as people working in the Research Park and medical complex. Also, there is a growing group of elderly for whom a townhouse or condo is an option rather than assisted living or caring for a home. We don't have a clear cut idea that there is one thing that is needed, Ms. Welch said, noting that mixed use certainly maximizes the options.

Asked about use of Walnut Road and 113th Street, Ms. Welch said that trying to channel occupants of up to 430 units off of 113th Street in addition to the commercial traffic already there would be setting ourselves up for a great many problems. Mr. Kappel added that access to Walnut Road is considered viable as far as public works is concerned.

Ald. Herzog suggested a "wish list" for developers to respond to: mixed use if talking about residential; divert traffic to 113th Street; less impact on surrounding neighborhood; less burden on the city; "biggest bang for the buck" in the purchase price or ultimate development providing the highest tax base; good quality construction that will last and be of good character; plenty of parking. He favored limiting any proposal the moves forward to the 7-8 who have taken time to respond to the RFP, closing off any other developers.

Ald. Ecks asked if there is other than a financial barrier to providing Mayfair Road access via a Walnut Road railroad underpass. Mr. Kappel said that there is no way to provide public access to Mayfair Road and still maintain a secure environment for the public works operation. He also was concerned about the loss of even more yard space, especially in view of possible mandates in the next few years on operation of the city yard. Ald. Ecks said that raises the question of whether we should do anything at all—maybe doing nothing has a protective aspect for the issues just raised. It would also be a legacy of land on which another generation of Council could make decisions after the public works issues are decided. He was concerned about added traffic on 113th Street, and noted that there are concerns about Walnut Road also. Mr. Kappel added that he would not want to separate the public works operation.

He considers everything from 113th Street east as part of the public works operation area. The landfill is not an inactive site, he noted.

Ald. Ecks asked if there would be any objection to asking the Comprehensive Plan Committee to wrestle with these questions. Ms. Welch said there is no problem with having another committee look at the proposals but the Comprehensive Plan Committee is not an advisory body. They are there to make decisions on the total comprehensive plan being developed for the city. She suggested a Committee of the Whole meeting may be appropriate. She noted that the developers who are here have committed time and effort and will go on to develop elsewhere if we delay too long in giving direction and moving forward.

Ald. Sullivan saw the issue of access to Mayfair Road as a distraction at this point, since none of the proposals was dependent on that access. To help with decision making, he advised narrowing down the options by each committee member picking their personal top three of what has been presented, then concentrating on the three that come out on top overall in that process. He did not think it necessary to pass the matter to another committee or Committee of the Whole. The Chair felt that zoning should be addressed first, but Ald. Sullivan was concerned that rezoning to residential use would eliminate one of the proposals he felt should be explored more, namely the sports center.

Moved by Ald. Sullivan, seconded by Ald. Kopischke that the committee members rank their top three choices to take, in effect, a straw vote –

Ald. Krol felt a decision should not be deeded to the future. We had always been considered landlocked, but this is an opportunity for something that might have economic benefit for the city, he said. He favored asking the Director of Community Development to prepare a one-sheet summary of what has been presented by the seven developers (ruling out the eighth as having dropped out) and presenting that information at the next meeting, after which the committee could create a short list by some voting process that would be recommended by Ms. Welch. Once there is a short list, it can be refined by talking about specifics. Ald. Krol noted that, per the motion at the last meeting, there hasn't been any information on fiscal impact, economic benefits, density issues, and the advantages or disadvantages of mixed use or residential development.

Moved by Ald. Krol, seconded by Ald. Becker to amend the motion by bringing the matter back with input from the Director of Community Development prior to the straw vote –

Ald. Becker endorsed seeking more information, observing that, at this point, he could unknowingly choose a project that would cost the City millions. The Chair agreed that it would be premature to take a straw vote. There are elements that haven't been addressed, such as the impact on schools, she noted. Ald. Treis concurred, indicating he would like to check on some of the data before proceeding.

Ald. Sullivan withdrew the motion.

Moved by Ald. Krol, seconded by Ald. Becker to consider the information in a summary fashion at the next committee meeting, highlighting some of the items that might pertain to the financial, mixed use, and sports complex aspects and what impact that may have on decision making, with the intent to then formulate some sort of short list of at least three projects from which the committee would concentrate its efforts to select one –

Ald. Herzog felt that the committee has to offer the developers direction. Fiscal impact information is in the materials, he noted. He said that by taking a straw vote for the top three, we wouldn't be eliminating the other four. They would have the option to change their plan, stay with their current plan and tell us of its benefits, or just drop out, he felt.

The Chair clarified that there was no intention to hear from the developers at the next meeting. The committee would be looking for direction from the Community Development Director. At some other point, all or some of the

developers may be invited to return. Ald. Krol added that he was seeking a summary of the items to be considered at the next meeting.

Ald. Kopischke felt that hearing each committee member's impressions would be helpful to the developers. He said that the recreational complex is a very intriguing idea that he would like to see developed further, and he was also interested in the projects presented by Toldt and Thomson. He liked the elements involving integrating with the rest of the neighborhood, use of public land, and multiple uses

Ald. Ecks suggested that this item should be first on the agenda at the next meeting and requested that tapes of this meeting be provided in the committee's packets for review.

Vote on the motion, Ayes: 7; Noes: 1 (Herzog)

The Chair encouraged the committee to view the site.

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

Carla A. Ledesma, City Clerk
Wauwatosa, Wisconsin

es