



City of Milwaukee

200 E. Wells Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
53202

Meeting Minutes

GRANVILLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

GEORGE HINTON - CHAIR

NEVA HILL - VICE-CHAIR

Robert H. Dodds, Jr., Natasha Dotson, and Johonna Duckworth

Staff Assistant, Chris Lee, 286-2232, Fax: 286-3456,

clee@milwaukee.gov

Legislative Liason, Ted Medhin, 286-8681,

tmedhi@milwaukee.gov

Wednesday, September 7, 2022

9:00 AM

Virtual

This will be a virtual meeting conducted via GoToMeeting. Should you wish to join this meeting from your phone, tablet, or computer you may go to <https://meet.goto.com/661216013>. You can also dial in using your phone United States: +1 (646) 749-3122 and Access Code: 661-216-013.

1. Call to order.

The meeting was called to order at 9:06 a.m.

2. Roll call.

Present (5) - Hinton, Hill, Dodds, Dotson, Duckworth

3. Review and approval of the previous meeting minutes from July 6, 2022.

The meeting minutes from July 6, 2022 were approved without objection.

4. Discussion, updates, or review of Granville Development District RFPs, listings, projects, programs, initiatives, events, grants, plans, activities, or other aspects.

A. 7300 W. Dean Rd. (6th Amendment to DPD for Friendship Village)

Ownership team appearing:

Michael D'Amato

Getzy Fellig, AB Real Estate

Marvin Bynum, Godfrey and Kahn

Michelle Winter

The ownership team gave an overview. The facility current operated as an assisted living facility and senior living facility. Both aspects had traditionally operated together under one ownership but not operated separately independently of each other under two different operators. The building was sold to the current ownership team who was seeking to apply for an amendment to the facility's Detailed Planned Development requirements to permit market rate housing to the senior living facility portion where the

number of vacancies was at 40 percent. The facility was underutilized. The project would also entail making substantial renovations and improvements to the facility overall and adding amenities such as indoor bicycle parking and a gym. The proposal would create a co-located, multi-generational housing opportunity to the area and incorporate market-rate multi-family housing as an additional use. Over time, a portion of these units may be transitioned to market-rate housing without age restrictions. There would be no additional residential units and no displacing of any current tenants. The project would help foster a more diverse community, add to the vibrancy of the area, and was located at an ideal setting with transit and strong pedestrian connections. The City's Granville Strategic Action Plan & Land Use Study called for more market rate housing and diversity.

Members said that current senior residents may have safety and security concerns living with younger and family tenants, the project was a unique one, ownership should incorporate intergenerational programming like those from successful facilities like St. Anne's, and there should be security measures to protect the seniors.

The ownership team said that there was onsite security and property manager, there was ample space to incorporate programming like a daycare, there was many surrounding amenities in the area to complement the facility such as bike trails, the owners were working with the senior residents to improve and create activities for the seniors, senior activities have been impacted in the multiple change in ownership over the years, and security was present onsite from 8 p.m. to 7 a.m. 7 days a week.

Beverly Wilson testified to being a current senior resident at the facility, having safety concerns based on her experiences, being opposed to the project, and to experiencing life and maintenance issues at the facility. She had experienced instances of visiting family or youths being disrespectful and rude to the seniors there, youths running down the halls, a naked resident walking around the facility and going into the women's restroom, security/owner/operator being very slow or non-responsive to address maintenance and safety issues like the naked resident, there being no uniformed security onsite, security being just a resident who was appointed to walk around the facility, renovations being only cosmetic and occurring only for common areas, there be renovations done to existing occupied units, her unit and others having ongoing maintenance disrepair issues that have not been addressed or fixed such as issues with HVAC, food provided there being inadequate, and seeing no engagement with residents on the proposed changes from ownership. She was fearful that the proposed changes would only exacerbate the current issues at the facility.

The ownership team responded to the concerns and inquiries made by members. They were aware of Ms. Wilson's concerns, have been in contact with her, and have tried to address them. They agreed with some of her concerns but not with others. The issues described were much a result of past operations/ownerships and the transition between the new owner and multiple operators. Their goal was safety for all residents, to not displace any resident, and to create a healthy mix of residents. They've encouraged residents and committed funds to them to organize activities. They have tried to minimize renovation disruptions. They have worked to meet the needs of the seniors there and have seen positive feelings from residents on the upgrades that have been made there. Ms. Winter, the resident lead and security, was open to all residents. Maintenance requests have been fulfilled concerning HVAC and common areas. The food mentioned was from the assisted living side. Issues and safety concerns were largely from the assisted living side. A wall was put up to separate the two sides. There were no security issues and few to no police calls. It took time to relocate the naked resident, who was from the assisted living side, due to

HIPPA requirements. They took over ownership in April, were aware of the issues, inherited a bad situation, and were working to address them. It would take time to fix the disrepair in individual units, which they will do. On timeline, they planned to submit their DPD amendment application to the City today. They would anticipate their application to go to the City Plan Commission and Common Council process in November. Their intention was not a cash grab, displace seniors, or to create a bad experience for them. They were committed for the long haul and success of the facility and have a project budget of \$5 million. Members were welcomed to tour the facility.

Members said that they were not comfortable with making a decision today, there were questions that remained unanswered, they wanted the ownership team to further meet with residents to address residents' concerns and to garner support, for the ownership team to come back to report to the committee on residents' input, that the motive behind the project seemed to be monetarily driven, and that they wanted to see more details on improving current conditions.

The ownership team said that they would comply with holding a meeting with residents, forward information of that meeting to the committee, that renovation would include all units both currently occupied ones and ones to be rented out, and that the project would result in a better quality life for all residents.

This item was held.

B. 7201 W. Good Hope Rd. (Medical Office Building for Weas Development Co.)

This item was held as the item was not ready to be presented.

C. Neighborhood conditions and concerns

Member Dodds said that he was appreciative of seeing Department of Public Works filling pot holes in the area, which has been an ongoing issue.

Nicole Hartley appeared and said that she was concerned with the departure of businesses on the northwest side over time, the prevalence of disrepair and litter at businesses such as the former Walgreens, and not knowing of any community meetings being organized by Royal Capital concerning the development at the YMCA site.

Chair Hinton said that the property owners of businesses would need to be approached of issues at their businesses, the local BID and aldermanic district office have been of assistance in finding business property owner contacts, and issues or complaints could still be relayed to the 9th aldermanic district office staff to provide assistance in addressing them or routing them to the proper channels.

Vice-chair Hill said that she would place a call regarding issues at the former Walgreens.

D. Other

There was no other discussion.

5. Review of the committee moving forward relative to its mission, goals, membership, meeting frequency, and other aspects.

Members discussed that, despite a vacancy in the 9th aldermanic district office, the committee should continue its work to represent the voice of the community, review redevelopment in the area, was sanctioned to operate independently, continue to meet as normal, that the committee was a good team, that the committee's work had been effective and successful, that their success and work should continue, that their work was now more important than ever, for members to continue to be engaged, and that committee recommendations should continue to be taken to other required processes.

Ms. Hartley said that despite being a long-time resident she was not aware of the committee's existence until recently, that more people needed to know about the committee, and questioned mailings to residents regarding development activity in the area.

Chair Hinton said that the aldermanic office was responsible to inform and send out mailings to the community, that the committee would try to do as much as possible in the absence of an alderperson, and that people should continue or start to attend committee meetings to be more informed.

Member Dodds commended chair Hinton for his leadership over the committee.

6. Public comments.

There were no public comments.

7. Next steps.

A. Next meeting date and time (Wednesday, October 5, 2022 at 9 am)

B. Agenda items for the next meeting

Agenda items to possibly include 7300 W. Dean Rd. and 7201 W. Good Hope Rd. items that were held.

8. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

9. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 10:24 a.m.

*Chris Lee, Staff Assistant
Council Records Section
City Clerk's Office*