

**Village of Shorewood
Meeting Minutes
March 16, 2026**

1. Call to Order

President McKaig called the meeting to order at 7:30pm.

2. Roll Call

All members of the board were present.

3. Statement of Public Notice

Clerk Harrell stated the meeting was properly noticed and posted according to law.

4. Special Order of Business

a. **Future State Presentation - Milwaukee County**—no action was taken.

b. **Consider approval of 2026 Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (PPS).**

Trustee Warren moved to approve the Village of Shorewood 2026 Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, and it was seconded by Trustee Stokebrand. Motion carried unanimously 7-0.

5. Consent Agenda Items

Trustee Ircink moved to approve the consent agenda, and it was seconded by Trustee Couto. No items were removed. Motion carried unanimously 7-0.

6. Items Removed from the Consent Agenda

7. Public Hearing

a. **Ordinance 3080: An ordinance to amend the regulations pertaining to location restrictions of office uses within the MX districts, as detailed in 535-25 of the Zoning Code.**

At 8:01pm, President McKaig opened this item for public comment. No public comments were made. Public comment was closed at 8:02pm.

8. Citizens to be Heard

9. New Business

a. **Consider Ordinance 3080: An ordinance to amend the regulations pertaining to location restrictions of office uses within the MX districts, as detailed in 535-25 of the Zoning Code.**

Trustee Ircink moved to approve Ordinance 3080: An ordinance to amend the regulations pertaining to location restrictions of office uses within the MX districts, as detailed in 535-25 of the Zoning Code. It was seconded by Trustee McGovern. Motion carried by a roll call vote of 7-0.

b. **Consider Ordinance 3081: An Ordinance Converting the Intersection of North Muray Avenue and East Olive Street into a Four Way Stop.**

Malado Cise, Shorewood resident, expressed agreement with Trustee Ircink, stating that the intersection has become increasingly dangerous and poses a risk to pedestrian safety.

Jeff Widell, Shorewood resident, shared concerns about the high number

of stop signs in the area, noting that drivers often come to expect stops regardless of signage and rely on courtesy from other drivers.

Micheal, Shorewood resident, expressed ambivalence regarding the stop sign installation and raised concerns about the lack of police enforcement for frequent traffic violations.

Michelle Sauberg thanked the Board for installing crosswalk lights, while noting that drivers do not always comply with pedestrian right-of-way.

Leslie F., Shorewood resident, voiced support for the stop sign, citing safety concerns as a parent of young children who regularly use the area.

After discussion by members of the board regarding this item, Trustee Warren moved approval of Ordinance 3081, An Ordinance Converting the Intersection of North Murray Avenue and East Olive Street into a Four Way Stop, and it was seconded by Trustee Ircink. Motion carried by a roll call of 7-0.

c. **Consider Phase II public assistance application for 4448 and 4450 N. Oakland Avenue from Spoerl Commercial LLC for the purpose of building affordable housing.**

i. **Overview of the Phase II application and financial analysis – Dave Erdman of Baker Tilly.**

ii. **Public comment.**

After Brian Spoerl responded to inquiries from members of the board, public comment was opened at 9:09pm.

Bill Meier (Shorewood resident) expressed four primary concerns: the Village Board's fiduciary responsibility to residents; the decision to sell the parking lot at 4448/50 N Oakland Ave without knowing its true value; the previously identified need for additional parking dating back to 1981; and the lack of outreach by Brian Spoerl to individuals paying for parking in the area.

Jay Sorenson (Shorewood resident) raised concerns regarding the proposal's fee structure, reiterated points made earlier by Baker Tilly, and identified perceived inconsistencies in Brian Spoerl's updates.

Eugene Groysman (Shorewood resident) opposed the project, citing concerns about economic feasibility and lack of community benefit. He suggested reallocating funds to the Shorewood School District and revisiting the project at a later, more stable time.

Eden Goldring (Shorewood resident; Orchid Chinese Medicine employee) provided written comment.

Tom Hoyum (Shorewood resident) stated that opposition to the

project is not about a lack of support for affordable housing but rather ensuring the best use of space in a densely populated area. He urged the Board to oppose the proposal.

Keith (Shorewood resident) expressed that the proposal lacks practicality, encouraged further review of infrastructure impacts, and emphasized concerns about increasing property taxes and support for local schools.

Paul Zovic (Shorewood resident) spoke in support of the proposal, citing his professional experience working with Brian Spoerl and affirming his integrity and trustworthiness.

Andrew Berholz (Shorewood resident) provided written comment.

Jeff Widell expressed concerns about decreasing parking availability as population increases.

Joan Salentine (Shorewood resident) voiced concern about limited consulting options beyond Baker Tilly, citing a potential conflict of interest. She also questioned Brian Spoerl's experience and follow-through and encouraged exploration of more equitable alternatives.

Christine Sweda (Shorewood resident) noted inconsistencies between Brian Spoerl's statements to residents and the Board, as well as discrepancies between prior CDA Committee discussions and current statements. She also raised concerns about potential impacts if project funding is lost.

Lisa Musak (business owner, 4433 N Oakland Ave) expressed concerns about accessible parking, noting many of her patients have mobility challenges.

Casey Saubinash (General Manager, The Slab) provided written comment.

Jay Scheer (Shorewood resident) supported maintaining the existing parking structure and increasing accessibility, noting current parking limitations.

Taffie, a Shorewood resident, described difficulties with visitor parking, including limited access for her father and safety concerns related to walking several blocks at night. She stated removal of the parking lot would worsen these issues.

Kayla Bauer (Shorewood resident) urged the Board to consider resident opposition, stating the proposal could harm small businesses and would not generate meaningful revenue for the Village.

Carolyn Crivello (Shorewood resident) provided written comment.

Barbara Kiley Miller (Shorewood resident) recommended pausing the project to allow for further research and evaluation of alternative options.

Emily Merrit encouraged increased community engagement and more thorough due diligence.

Michael (last name not provided) expressed concern about Village financial priorities, questioning investment in the housing project while funding appears limited. He also expressed distrust in Brian Spoerl's responses.

Anjum Aldun (Shorewood resident) supported the project and encouraged a more comprehensive evaluation of parking considerations.

Sinceree Dixon (Shorewood resident) expressed disappointment that public comments did not reflect the needs of individuals who cannot currently afford to live in Shorewood. He highlighted the potential contributions of these individuals to the community and local businesses, noting a lack of representation from non-property owners.

Closed at 10:18pm and a bio-break was taken.

Resumed at 10:23p.

iii. **Village Board discussion.**

After discussion by members of the board, Trustee McGovern moved to proceed with negotiations for a development agreement based upon the Phase II application submitted by Spoerl Commercial LLC to the Village Board, requesting \$1.6 million in public assistance, contingent upon WHEDA financing and other financing being awarded, and the execution of a development agreement that commits Spoerl Commercial LLC to building the affordable housing project for the public benefit. It was seconded by Trustee Warren. Motion carried by a vote of 5-2 (Stokebrand, Couto).

10. Report of Village Officials

a. **Village President**

i. **Proclamation for Sunshine Week.**

b. **Village Trustees**

i. **Complete Streets Annual Report, 2025 - Tr. Ircink**

c. **Village Manager**

11. Future items of Consideration

12. Closed Session

- a. Trustee Stokebrand moved into closed session pursuant to Wis. Stat. Sec. 19.85 (1)(e) to deliberate or negotiate the purchasing of public properties, where competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session, to a) discuss a development agreement for 4448-4450 N. Oakland Avenue, and b) to discuss prospective properties for a new DPW site. Seconded by Trustee Warren.

Adjourned into closed session at 11:10pm

13. Final Adjournment

Written Comments



Alternative Concept Proposed for Shorewood to Preserve Parking and Deliver Affordable Housing

*Idea would maintain public parking while creating new housing
– without relying on TIF funding or tax credits*

March 16, 2026 – Shorewood, Wisconsin – The proverb “necessity is the mother of invention,” often attributed to Plato, reflects the idea that difficult challenges can inspire creative solutions. In that spirit, Affordable Shorewood has spent the past week developing an alternative for the Shorewood Village Board to consider – one that addresses community concerns raised about the development plan proposed by Spoerl Commercial.

The concept, developed by local entrepreneur Andrew Bergholz, aims to preserve public parking while adding a mix of market-rate and affordable housing at the site of the public parking lot at 4450 North Oakland Avenue.

Key elements of the alternative include:

- Purchase of the public parking lot at 4450 North Oakland by Sconnie Properties for \$450,000, exceeding the price offered by Spoerl Development.
- Construction of a multi-level paid parking structure for public and private use.
- Development of a multi-story building with apartment units, including elevator access for residents and parking users.
- Up to five units designated as below-market housing under a 30-year affordability commitment.
- No reliance on Low-Income Housing Tax Credits or Shorewood Tax Increment Financing (TIF) as part of the financing package.
- Installation of a neighborhood mobility hub, including space for e-bike rentals and tenant bicycle storage.

Affordable Shorewood is asking the Village Board to pause the current sale process and to allow further development of this idea. The concept could allow approximately \$2.7 million in TIF funding to be returned to local taxing authorities, including an estimated \$700,000 to the Village of Shorewood and \$1.5 million to the Shorewood School District.

Bergholz brings significant experience in real estate and parking infrastructure. He previously served as President and Owner at Traffic and Parking Control Company (TAPCO), a Milwaukee-area firm providing traffic safety and parking solutions for governments and private businesses nationwide. Under Bergholz’s leadership, the company grew into a 300-employee operation

Through Scennie Properties, Bergholz currently owns properties in Shorewood and works with clients to buy, sell, rent, and manage real estate.

Bergholz is also renovating the building at 4451 North Oakland Avenue, directly across from the parking lot. The project will become “The Slab – Connect & Collect,” a retail and community-focused venue centered on sports memorabilia and collectibles. The space will include retail, a café and lounge area, and a second-floor event space intended to host community gatherings and neighborhood events.
www.theslab.net



The renovation is expected to transform the building into a new neighborhood destination.

A warm, fun, and inviting place for socializing. Here's a rendering of the building Bergholz is already renovating at 4451 North Oakland.

“I’m motivated to work with all parties and welcome the opportunity to discuss an alternative that meets multiple community objectives,” said Bergholz. “My background in real estate and parking gives me a unique ability to help preserve parking while adding new housing options for Shorewood.”

Jay Sorensen, a volunteer advocate with Affordable Shorewood, said the concept deserves serious consideration.

“This idea preserves public parking while also creating affordable housing and returning millions of dollars to our schools and local government,” Sorensen said. “We hope Village Trustees will take the time to allow collaboration on this concept.”

The Shorewood Village Board is scheduled to vote on the current development proposal on March 16 at 7:30 p.m. at Shorewood Village Hall. Bergholz will attend the Village Board meeting and is committed to working to finding a great outcome for the Village.

About Affordable Shorewood: Affordable Shorewood is a grassroots organization of renters, homeowners, families, businesses, and landlords who want Shorewood to remain affordable and livable for all. Founded by a group committed to preserving Shorewood’s small-town character, believes village trustees should prioritize the needs of current residents in all planning decisions. Learn more at <http://affordablesshorewood.org/>

Contact: Jay Sorensen, Volunteer and Advocate, jay “at” AffordableShorewood.org

Disclosure: There is no financial relationship between Affordable Shorewood and Scennie Properties, or their representatives.

From: [Casey Sabinash](#)
To: [Toya Harrell](#); [Rebecca Ewald](#)
Subject: Casey Sabinash - The Slab - Village of Shorewood Board Meeting (3/16/26) Thoughts on Parking Development
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 5:36:29 PM

Good evening.

I will be in attendance at this evening's Village Board meeting. Below is a statement I have prepared on behalf of myself and my team's start-up business. Please feel free to share these comments with others as you see fit. Thank you.

"My name is Casey Sabinash, and I serve as General Manager of The Slab™, a start-up hobby and hospitality business currently being developed here in the Village of Shorewood. I was brought onto this team with the responsibility of helping build and lead what we believe can become a truly successful destination operation.

My background in retail, marketing, and hospitality has given me the opportunity to travel across the country and study what makes a business like ours thrive. One consistent theme stands out. The most successful destination businesses are positioned in communities that make it easy for visitors to arrive and explore.

Right here in Wisconsin we have many examples of communities, large and small, that successfully welcome travelers from across the state and even across the country. These places thrive because they have developed the infrastructure necessary to support visitors and businesses alike.

The Slab continues to build-up a customer base that extends well beyond Shorewood and Milwaukee's North Shore. Our clients are passionate collectors, hobbyists, and patrons who frequently travel to experience unique destinations. Every week I hear from people in Milwaukee, Green Bay, Eau Claire, Madison, and other communities who are excited to visit Shorewood specifically to experience what we are building.

That vision relies on making it easy for people to come here and enjoy what our community has to offer. For that reason, I respectfully ask the board to pause and reconsider the current proposed development of this public parking lot, as we believe it may further limit the accessibility necessary to support the destination experience, we are working to build.

Our goal is to grow alongside Shorewood and help bring visitors into the village who will support The Slab™ and other local businesses.

Thank you for your time and for considering this perspective."

--

Casey Sabinash

General Manager - The Slab

Phone: (414) 522-6297

Email: casev@theslab.net

Website: theslab.net - Sign up for updates

Connect & Collect



CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sauer, James Michael

From: [Ann McKaig](#)
To: [Rebecca Ewald](#); [Toya Harrell](#)
Subject: Fw: 4450 N. Oakland project
Date: Sunday, March 15, 2026 8:16:58 PM

Please include with other emails received.

Rebecca: This may be a question for Nathan - per the statement below, that the parking is a public asset, how is a "public asset" determined from a legal perspective? And does the parking lot meet that threshold in that it should be protected? Is this person stating that we should protect the parking lot as if it were a park or wetlands?

Thank you.

From: Ann McKaig <PresidentMcKaig@shorewoodwi.gov>
Sent: Sunday, March 15, 2026 8:09 PM
To: James Michael Sauer <jmikesauer2@yahoo.com>
Subject: Re: 4450 N. Oakland project

Hi Mike,

Thank you for sharing your position. Any agreement we have with the developer would hinge on him receiving all the financing he needs before he has access to the Village TID 1 extension funds. So the process protects us. These funds are already on hand so there would be no delay to tax increment benefit upon completion of the project.

Even so, TIF does not direct funds away from those entities as you suggest. It actually creates tax base that would not have occurred otherwise, therefore creating more revenue for all taxing entities. That is a common misunderstanding.

I will make sure that your email is part of the record.

Sincerely,
Ann

From: James Michael Sauer <jmikesauer2@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 12:38 PM
To: Ann McKaig <presidentmckaig@shorewoodwi.gov>
Subject: 4450 N. Oakland project

[You don't often get email from jmikesauer2@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

The Village Board should reject the Spoerl Commercial proposal at 4450 N. Oakland Avenue outright. Shorewood is a small, dense, walkable community that has deliberately maintained its character through thoughtful land use — and converting a strategically located public parking lot into a subsidized 19-unit apartment building runs contrary to the interests of the residents you were elected to serve. This proposal asks the village to permanently surrender a public asset, take on years of financial exposure through TIF financing, and gamble on state tax credits that are not yet secured — all for a single developer's project that faced no meaningful competitive bidding. TIF diverts tax revenue away from Shorewood's schools, public safety, and infrastructure for decades, forcing existing taxpayers to subsidize a development that primarily benefits a private developer. There is no binding guarantee that rents will remain affordable long-term or that the intended workforce population will actually be served. Shorewood deserves better than rushing a permanent, irreversible land decision based on one incomplete proposal. Vote no, demand the village reclaim this land for uses that serve the entire community, and instruct staff to launch a truly competitive and transparent redevelopment process before any public financing is committed.

Mike Sauer

Sent from my iPad

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Ann McKaig](#)
To: [Toya Harrell](#)
Subject: Fw: Affordable Housing Shorewood Count Me In
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 1:50:45 PM

From: Liz Nelson <elizuk58@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2026 12:12 PM
To: Ann McKaig <presidentmckaig@shorewoodwi.gov>; Jim Arndorfer <trusteeandorfer@shorewoodwi.gov>; Eric Couto <trusteecouto@shorewoodwi.gov>; Arthur Ircink <trusteeircink@shorewoodwi.gov>; Matt McGovern <trusteemcgovern@shorewoodwi.gov>; Kathy Stokebrand <trusteestokebrand@shorewoodwi.gov>; Wesley Warren <trusteewarren@shorewoodwi.gov>
Subject: Affordable Housing Shorewood Count Me In

You don't often get email from elizuk58@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Greetings All,

I have lived in Shorewood for 40 years, 8 as a renter and 32 as a homeowner. The issue of affordable housing is at a crisis point in the US and I appreciate Shorewood taking the initiative to address it on some level. This is a very complex issue so I reached out to an Urban Planner who has experience with these very issues when he was a planner for the City of Janesville. He is now a planner for the City of Sun Prairie. He has his masters in Urban Planning and is also a Shorewood H.S. His name is David Salmon and he is my son. I'm sharing his thoughts on the affordable housing project proposed on Oakland Ave.

Important things to note about this affordable housing project:

1. The Milwaukee region is in dire need of more affordable rental units particularly for people earning less than the median income.
2. The Milwaukee region is a regional housing market which means that the amount of supply and cost to occupy units in nearby communities impacts the cost of housing in Shorewood.
3. Shorewood developed as a "streetcar neighborhood" where many of the charming apartments that line Oakland Ave and Capitol Dr were built because they were at the end of a streetcar line and workers were living their lives without private vehicles. Shorewood has had a shortage of parking since it first began to develop and while this may seem inconvenient to people now it's also one of the reasons Shorewood is so desirable. This community is as walkable as any in the Milwaukee region. When you have a higher concentration of housing, communities can sustain a higher concentration of amenities like restaurants, bars, and shops, and that's one of the reasons people love living in Shorewood.
4. If Shorewood were to fully "meet the need" for parking through off-street lots, they would need to tear down substantial numbers of housing units to do so. People who rent in Shorewood know that parking is constrained and many renters have to park within a couple blocks from their house similar to the east side of Milwaukee. People who eat, drink, and shop in Shorewood also know that parking is constrained and that they may need to park around the block to find a spot. This is what makes places

- walkable and is a feature of living in an urban place with a concentration of nice amenities. To say no to new development purely on the fact of parking is to fail to acknowledge that what makes Shorewood desirable in the first place, being walkable.
5. Infill development is a net positive for communities as higher intensity developments generate more tax base per acre than lower intensity buildings. This means they contribute more to the cost of maintaining infrastructure like sewer and roads and providing services like police, fire, and schools than do lower intensity buildings. They're also valuable for thriving main street businesses as it puts additional customers within a short walking distance of businesses. Because this parcel is currently owned by the public it's not only not generating taxes but is a net cost to the village because of the cost to maintain the facility.
 6. Shorewood is a safe community with many good amenities that is desirable for households of all incomes, backgrounds, and race and ethnicities particularly households who may otherwise be priced into living in much less safe neighbors due to a lack of available options. When the village was first discussing capturing extra years of TIF money in 2021 to use to build affordable housing the entire country was reckoning with questions about racial injustice, the roles that the US government and local communities had played in created segregated communities, and there was a strong desire to do something to address these historic injustices and to make Shorewood an even more inclusive place.
 7. Beyond questions of segregation and injustice, it's essential for communities to have a wide range of housing types and price points to support residents who have the desire to age in place. As people age they have a wide range of needs and the more housing options available the more likely they are to find an option that fits their lifestyle, health needs, and at a cost they can afford in the community they currently reside. This is not an option for everyone, especially in a place like Shorewood with such high demand, but it is another reason why adding affordable housing is a huge positive for a community. On top of this, the average household is getting smaller which means that for a community to maintain its population size it needs to add housing units.
 8. According to Marquette university, the average cost to produce a new housing unit in a multi-family building ranges between \$300,000 to \$450,000 and this cost sets the floor for what rents are needed to make a developer whole on a project. In order to produce new housing units with costs below market rate, subsidies are required. This is not due to developer greed, though they certainly make a healthy living in their line of work, this is instead due to the realities of how expensive it is do build in our current economy. Local governments do not have the ability to change how much it costs to build but they can take action. So yes its true the village needs to enter into an agreement with a private developer to build this building and any additional features that add cost to the building also add cost to the price of renting the unit. The village should ensure that this building fully meets the needs of people with disabilities, even if it costs the village more money to do so.
 9. It's very much in a local government's interest to purchase private land for public needs and to sell publicly owned property when doing so aligns with a community's interests and delivers something that the private marketplace won't or can't provide. This parking lot was originally created by the village in response to the need for more parking. At that time overnight street parking was not allowed in Shorewood, which substantially limited the supply of available parking for renters. Now with overnight parking available on-street, there is substantially more parking available than at the time this parking lot was created. Now the village has the opportunity to invest in

bringing new households to Shorewood, to do so with a lower price point than market rate, and to add to the tax base. This is one of those moments where the Village board is investing in Shorewood's future and it aligns with the communities interests of increasing the property tax base, being a community of choice, being inclusive to people of all means and backgrounds, and to welcoming more households to Shorewood.

10. Living in a community like Shorewood is not cheap. For most residents that cost is worth the benefits of being part of a world-class school district, having incredible parks, having an excellent public library, providing quality police and fire services, and being within walking and biking distance to Shorewood's business district. Shorewood has always been a community of choice and the choice to provide affordable housing reflects the desire to open the door to more households to enjoy the benefits this community has to offer, even if it means walking a little further. After all, Shorewood's walkability is one of the most desirable traits of this community. Trading out a surface parking lot for affordable housing is a tradeoff that the village board should make.

Warm Regards,

Liz Nelson (she/her)

1905 E. Jarvis St.

Shorewood, WI

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Ann McKaig](#)
To: [Toya Harrell](#); [Rebecca Ewald](#)
Subject: Fw: letter for tonight's board meeting
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 2:27:51 PM
Attachments: [Letter Re 4448_4450 N Oakland Ave.docx](#)

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Carolyn Crivello <carolyn.crivello@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2026 2:18:25 PM
To: Ann McKaig <PresidentMcKaig@shorewoodwi.gov>
Subject: letter for tonight's board meeting

You don't often get email from carolyn.crivello@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear President McKaig:

Thank you for your willingness to take comments via email. My comments would have exceeded 3 minutes due to the complexity and the length of the timeline it took the Village to get here. I would like to clearly and unequivocally state that I support an Affordable Housing project somewhere in Shorewood, but have very serious concerns about this project.

I'd also like clarification on where the public accessible parking spot(s) are if the lot is closed. I have family members who rely on handicap accessible parking and losing this lot will affect their ability to access and use our village.

Respectfully submitted,
Carolyn Crivello

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Foster-Tony, Taffie

From: [Ann McKaig](#)
To: [Toya Harrell](#)
Subject: Fw: North Oakland Public Parking Lot
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 1:47:27 PM

From: Taffie Foster-Toney <tftoney@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2026 1:20 PM
To: Ann McKaig <PresidentMcKaig@shorewoodwi.gov>
Subject: North Oakland Public Parking Lot

You don't often get email from tftoney@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good Afternoon Mr. McKaig

As a renter who lives across the street from the North Oakland Ave public parking lot, I ask that you and the other trustees reconsider the sale. The sale would be detrimental to the community. Was it considered where will the current residents will park? What about our small businesses? When there is no parking that keeps people from patronizing the business. There is already parking issues in Shorewood. Why would Shorewood create more parking issues?

Ms. Toney

Thank you

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Ann Mckaig](#)
To: [Toya Harrell](#)
Subject: Fw: Oakland Development
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 1:49:19 PM

From: Sara Jackson <saramasonjackson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2026 12:15 PM
To: Ann Mckaig <presidentMckaig@shorewoodwi.gov>; Jim Arndorfer <TrusteeArndorfer@shorewoodwi.gov>; Eric Couto <TrusteeCouto@shorewoodwi.gov>; Arthur Ircink <TrusteeIrcink@shorewoodwi.gov>; Matt McGovern <TrusteeMcGovern@shorewoodwi.gov>; Kathy Stokebrand <TrusteeStokebrand@shorewoodwi.gov>; Wesley Warren <TrusteeWarren@shorewoodwi.gov>; Rebecca Ewald <rewald@shorewoodwi.gov>
Subject: Oakland Development

You don't often get email from saramasonjackson@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hello,

I am writing to request the Board please consider whether any TIF funds used for the Oakland project can be given as a loan rather than a grant/gift. I haven't seen a good analysis of this option and think it is important to consider.

From what I can see in the Baker Tilly report from the May 2025 CDA meeting, the Baker Tilly analysis assumes the building will be sold for \$1m and stay affordable forever. In the event that does not happen and the building is eventually worth more than \$1m, I would like to see the Village repaid upon sale/refinance rather than seeing the developer receive all proceeds from the increased value of the land and building. Additionally, I don't see that Baker Tilly commented on whether Village support had to be in the form of a gift rather than a loan. Have they provided this sort of analysis or made a recommendation on this?

Additionally, the IRR calculation from Baker Tilly includes the cash put in from the "Equity Investors" as part of developer investment. This doesn't make sense when analyzing the developer rate of return on the project and seems to understate Sporel's rate of return. It looks like the developer receives a developer fee, will be paid as the general contractor, is likely to have operating income during the development and then will keep the proceeds from the sale of building and land in the future. That does not seem like a fair way to split the upside of this between the developer and the Village.

I hope all of this is considered when deciding whether to move the project forward.

Thank you,

Sara Jackson
4440 N Maryland
414-530-6829

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Timper, Jayne

From: [Ann McKaig](#)
To: [Toya Harrell](#)
Subject: Fw: Oakland parking lot.
Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 8:42:02 PM

Email about 4450 N. Oakland

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Jayne & Leigh Timper <thetimpers@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2026 6:03:33 PM
To: Ann McKaig <presidentmckaig@shorewoodwi.gov>
Subject: Oakland parking lot.

You don't often get email from thetimpers@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good evening. I am a 50 year resident of Shorewood, and use the lot quite a bit, from dentist etc. Right now folks are parking west on Lake Bluff past Murray. In the winter it crosses Murray heading east.

If you get rid of all those spaces, where will folks go with laundry, and groceries?

I would attend meetings, but do not drive at night.

Please reconsider the proposal.

Thank you.

Jayne Timper
2123 E. Lake Bluff

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Brusnahan, Timothy

From: [Ann McKaig](#)
To: [Toya Harrell](#)
Subject: Fw: Parking vs. Subsidized Housing - Oppose 4450 N Oakland Ave Sale
Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 8:44:44 PM

Please record

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Timothy Brusnahan <tbrusnahan@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 25, 2026 8:57:12 AM
To: Ann McKaig <presidentmckaig@shorewoodwi.gov>; Arthur Ircink <trusteeircink@shorewoodwi.gov>; Matt McGovern <trusteemcgovern@shorewoodwi.gov>; Kathy Stokebrand <trusteestokebrand@shorewoodwi.gov>; Wesley Warren <trusteewarren@shorewoodwi.gov>
Subject: Parking vs. Subsidized Housing - Oppose 4450 N Oakland Ave Sale

You don't often get email from tbrusnahan@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Shorewood Elected Trustees,

We are a family of five Shorewood voters, and we oppose the proposed sale of the public parking lot to a developer in the high-density North Oakland neighborhood.

We live two blocks from the site. Residents on Cramer Street already have difficulty finding parking on their own block due to overflow from nearby commercial properties and apartment buildings, and this overflow often extends onto the next block of Murray.

From our perspective, it appears that the board has developed a form of tunnel vision around the topic of affordable housing. In focusing so heavily on increasing low-income housing options in Shorewood, this project seems to attempt to resolve one issue while creating another, which is difficult for residents to understand. This is especially concerning given that the parking lot in question was originally designated to help manage ongoing parking needs.

In recent years, we have watched trustees approve multiple new developments in what is already the highest-density community in Wisconsin, yet these decisions have not adequately addressed the accompanying parking impacts. This ongoing trend is troubling, and many residents increasingly feel that their concerns are not being fully considered.

We will continue to monitor this proposal closely, and it will influence our voting decisions in the next election.

As a final note, after watching several recorded village meetings, we are surprised by the manner in which some trustees respond to community input. Trustees are elected to represent the interests, concerns, and priorities of Shorewood residents. Our community needs to trust that our trustees are trustworthy and truly attentive to the voices of those they represent.

We hope you are listening.

The Brusnahans

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sweda, Christine

From: [Ann McKaig](#)
To: [Toya Harrell](#)
Subject: Fw: Spoerl affordable housing project
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 1:46:51 PM

From: Christine Sweda <christinesweda@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2026 1:34 PM
To: Ann McKaig <PresidentMcKaig@shorewoodwi.gov>
Subject: Spoerl affordable housing project

You don't often get email from christinesweda@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

As a resident of Shorewood, I disapprove of the sale of the parking lot and excessive TIF funds provided to Spoerl for the affordable housing project. I think the parking lot should remain a public use asset and the TIF funds should be returned to the taxing jurisdiction (including roughly \$1M to the schools).

I kindly ask you to reconsider your view since 20-30 varying residents have attended roughly 6 CDA and Board meetings (20x6=120 up to 180) to express their disapproval, while only 2-3 residents attended only 1 meeting to express their favor. Please represent the majority of residents who do NOT think this project should proceed.

Thank you,
Christine Sweda

--

Christine Sweda

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Ann McKaig](#)
To: [Toya Harrell](#)
Subject: Fw: Strong Opposition to Introducing Parking Meters in Shorewood
Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 9:00:47 PM

Public comment on parking meters.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Graham, Hilary <HGraham@rwbaird.com>
Sent: Friday, February 20, 2026 12:50:17 PM
To: Ann McKaig <presidentmckaig@shorewoodwi.gov>
Subject: Strong Opposition to Introducing Parking Meters in Shorewood

You don't often get email from hgraham@rwbaird.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Village Leadership,

I am writing to express my strong displeasure with the idea of introducing parking meters in Shorewood, as referenced in the Village's recent request for input and the RFP related to parking management systems.

In my opinion, Shorewood has a real opportunity to continue supporting our local businesses by remaining a welcoming, convenient destination. Many patrons already choose Shorewood specifically because nearby communities have parking meters and ours does not. Introducing paid parking would be a clear deterrent, not an incentive, and would place our businesses at a disadvantage. The current time-limited parking regulations feel more than sufficient to ensure turnover without adding an unnecessary financial barrier.

Additionally, as a working parent with young children who cannot walk to school alone or be dropped off independently, driving and parking is not optional—it is necessary. Due to the increasing volume of renters and limited on-street availability, I often need to park on Oakland briefly to get my children to school before heading to work. The idea that I would need to pay for what is often a 10–15-minute activity is frankly offensive.

Given the high level of taxes Shorewood residents already pay, I would hope resident perspectives—especially those that reflect daily realities—are strongly considered before pursuing any system that introduces paid parking where none currently exists.

I urge the Village to reconsider any movement toward parking meters and instead continue policies that support residents, families, and local businesses alike.

Thank you,

Hilary Graham

Robert W. Baird & Co. Incorporated does not accept buy, sell or other transaction orders by e-mail, or any instructions by e-mail that require a signature. This e-mail message, and any attachment(s), is not an offer, or solicitation of an offer, to buy or sell any security or other product. Unless otherwise specifically indicated, information contained in this communication is not an official confirmation of any transaction or an official statement of Baird. The information provided is subject to change without notice. This e-mail may contain privileged or confidential information or may otherwise be protected by other legal rules. Any use, copying or distribution of the information contained in this e-mail by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from any computer on which it exists. Baird, in accordance with applicable laws, reserves the right to monitor, review and retain all electronic communications, including e-mails, traveling through its networks and systems. E-mail transmissions cannot be guaranteed to be secure, timely or error-free. Baird therefore recommends that you do not send any sensitive information such as account or personal identification numbers by e-mail.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Jim Arndorfer](#)
To: [Rebecca Ewald](#)
Subject: Fw: Three Facebook Posts I wrote on Housing
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 5:37:40 PM

From: Jim Arndorfer <jimarndorfer@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2026 5:36 PM
To: Jim Arndorfer <trustearndorfer@shorewoodwi.gov>
Subject: Three Facebook Posts on Housing

Today:

This evening the Village Board will vote whether to approve the Phase Two application submitted by Spoerl Commercial LLC for public assistance to support a 19-unit affordable housing development at 4450 N. Oakland Ave. Barring anything unforeseen, I intend to support passage. And as I do, I likely will be thinking back to the events of spring 2021.

On March 18 of that year, the village Community Development Authority was tasked with voting whether to extend an expiring tax increment district by one year in order to generate over \$2 million to support affordable housing. It was a vigorous debate. CDA Chair Peter Hammond and Trustee Davida Amenta supported the extension, arguing it gave the village a window of opportunity to support its decades-old priority of providing affordable housing and noting the village was becoming increasingly unaffordable. Arguments against the extension clustered around the lack of an identified project and reluctance to postpone the passing of tax savings on to residents.

Ultimately Chair Hammond and Trustee Amenta couldn't rally a majority to their side. The authority voted 4-2 to not extend the TID and not create a fund to support affordable housing (Trustee Kathy Stokebrand joined the majority as did current CDA Chair Jon Krouse, who proposed the prevailing motion.)

The backlash against the CDA's decision was swift and substantial, with a wide range of residents decrying it on social media, in correspondence and at the board meeting where it was taken up, insisting the Village Board not follow CDA's direction. Following this public outcry the Board voted 7-0 to support the extension of the TID to support public housing.

At the time, I was running for my first term for the Shorewood Village Board and applauded the decision. And since then the CDA and the board have explored a range of options to support affordable housing, including adding affordable units via vouchers and/or setting aside units in existing buildings (ultimately this was deemed not feasible). At the end of this journey a majority of the CDA has deemed the creation of the 19-unit affordable development as the best way to proceed. I recognize that not everyone in the Village supports the use of public money for affordable housing or this specific development. I disagree and believe a majority of residents support moving forward. That's one of the reasons why, barring anything unforeseen, I intend to support committing the funds the community insisted be set aside in 2021 for affordable housing.

Yesterday:

On March 16, the Village Board will vote whether to approve the Phase Two application submitted by Spoerl Commercial LLC for public assistance to develop an affordable housing development on what is currently a Village-owned parking lot at 4448-4450 N. Oakland Ave.

I've advocated for affordable housing since I was first elected to the board and after weighing the pros and cons of the development, including listening to concerns raised by members of the community, my intention — barring anything unforeseen — is to support the development.

One thing that will be on my mind is an anonymous flier that was circulated in the area surrounding the property in the run-up to a June 16, 2025 vote on the Phase One application.

The flier shared some of the same objections raised by other residents including the proportion of rentals in the Village, the elimination of parking spots and the opportunity to rescind the money set aside as part of the closure of TID 1 — a unanimous board vote in 2021 that received significant community support — and not use it to support the affordable housing.

But the first objection didn't address any of those points. Instead it attacked the potential residents of the development. From the flier:

“The proposed new apartment building ‘low income’ or ‘affordable housing’ [sic] means the renters earn 30-60% of Milwaukee County’s median income. That means the 19 units will have renters with annual income between \$21,500 and \$42,900 per HUD Income 2024 Guidelines for Milwaukee County. Will these renters contribute positively to the community and financially support businesses, restaurants, and retail stores?”

Do most Shorewood residents share this view? No. Do most opponents of the development share this view? Also — to be very clear — no. But this view informed the policies in our country and in our region until far too recently in a manner that created racist and classist barriers to housing for millions of Americans that are still felt today. It's unfortunate that someone thought this would be a good selling point in inciting residents against the development.

And that's the history that will be on my mind for Monday's vote. Is this development perfect? No. Do I wish that we could retain parking? Yes. Do I wish that we could add more units? Yes. But that would not be feasible to do so without going to the residents for more funding, which I find hard to do given the amount of pending infrastructure work before us.

But are these objections sufficient enough to pass up on the opportunity to provide below-market rate housing to 19 households for a minimum of 30 years? To my mind: no. I recognize that others may have a different opinion.

The Village has made the provision of affordable housing a priority for decades. The funding exists to proceed with this development, it supports our community's values, and I look forward to supporting it.

Copy of flier in comments.

3/12

On March 16, the Village Board will vote whether to approve the Phase Two application submitted by Spoerl Commercial LLC for public assistance to develop affordable housing at 4450 N. Oakland Ave. Barring anything unforeseen, I intend to support development of the proposed apartment building, which will include 19 units with below market rates locked in for a minimum of 30 years.

Our country, our state and our community face a housing affordability crisis. In 1991 the average age of a first-time home buyer was 28; it's now 40. In Shorewood and communities across Wisconsin, homeowners have been shocked by the jump in their assessments; if you're a homeowner imagine being on the outside looking in. Action is required to address this, now. Increasing housing

supply and options is one way to do this.

For decades Shorewood has made the creation of affordable housing a priority. The problem is, it's really expensive and it requires public subsidy. To its everlasting credit, in early 2021 the Village Board — with massive support from across the community — voted to extend the expiration of a tax incremental district to generate north of \$2 million to support affordable housing. Rather than immediately see the tax benefit of the TID's expiration, the community rallied around supporting the creation of affordable housing. The money is there. And with the proposed development at 4450 N. Oakland, we now have the opportunity to put that money to work. I believe it's time.

When I first ran for Village Board in 2021 I applauded the Board's decision and was very clear in my support for affordable housing. That commitment remains. I have weighed the pros and cons and in the end I believe that we should not pass on the opportunity to provide below market rate housing for 19 households for a minimum of 30 years.

Some of my considerations are below.

What's happening?

The Village is planning to invest \$1.6 million of proceeds from extending a TID to support the development of an apartment building with 19 below-market rate units on the site of a Village-owned parking lot at 4450 N. Oakland.

What's the total cost of the development?

The total cost of the development is \$7.1 million, with the vast majority of remaining funds coming from state and federal sources.

What does this mean for the current parking lot?

While the development has parking for the 19 units, the cost of supporting existing parking was prohibitive, which means that the 49 parking spots will be eliminated. Which means the amenity of parking on the lot (used largely by residents of the buildings on either side of it) will go away. I believe that the surrounding blocks have sufficient parking to absorb the displaced cars but it will be a loss of amenity and an inconvenience. That said, I think creating affordable units for 19 households for a minimum of 30 years is a better use of that property than a parking lot.

Is it true that the Village is selling the lot for below market value?

Yes, it is. And that's a feature, not a bug, of affordable housing development. As mentioned, housing is expensive. Land acquisition costs are a big reason for that. If the developer were to pay a market rate for the property, they likely only could build a luxury development on the site for it to pencil out. Reducing the land acquisition costs helps support the development of affordable housing. If the project moves forward, the Village will sell the lot for \$333,731. By comparison, Sturgeon Bay recently sold a parcel to create affordable housing for \$100. This is how it works. And just to make an obvious point: If we sold the land to realize its full value we would be eliminating parking for 49 spots to establish luxury apartments.

What about working with local landlords to create housing vouchers or set aside units as affordable?

This was explored but deemed not feasible due to administrative costs and lack of interest from landlords.

Is it possible that in 30 years the current or future owner could do something differently with the property?

Yes, it is. In the best of all possible worlds we could dedicate that site for affordable housing in perpetuity. With the tools we have, 30 years is the limit. That said, 30 years is quite a long time from a policy perspective. And more housing options are needed now.

Would you do anything differently?

I wish we could create more units in that building but the only way we could do that is by asking for significantly more money from the community. Given all the other infrastructure costs we're facing I would have a hard time doing that. This project enables us to provide below market housing for 19 households for a minimum of 30 years. I believe this project represents the values of our Village and I look forward to supporting it.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Ann McKaig](#)
To: [Toya Harrell](#)
Subject: Fw: Vote to Approve Phase Two of 4448-4450 N Oakland
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 1:55:20 PM

Thanks

From: Renee Tegge <renteg@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2026 10:28 AM
To: Ann McKaig <presidentmckaig@shorewoodwi.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Vote to Approve Phase Two of 4448-4450 N Oakland

You don't often get email from renteg@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Renee Tegge <renteg@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Mar 16, 2026 at 10:24 AM
Subject: Vote to Approve Phase Two of 4448-4450 N Oakland
To: <trusteecouto@shorewoodwi.gov>, <trusteeardorfer@shorewoodwi.gov>, <trusteestokebrand@shorewoodwi.gov>, <trusteestokebrand@shorewoodwi.gov>, <presidentnckaig@shorewoodwi.gov>, <trusteercink@shorewoodwi.gov>, <trusteemcgovern@shorewoodwi.gov>, <trusteewarren@shorewoodwi.gov>

Good morning,

I know each of you have invested a lot of time and energy in trying to make affordable housing a reality in Shorewood. I thank you for that.

These are the reasons I am asking you to vote no.

* The obvious ones: parking, congestion, business objections, no appraisal, and the benefit of 19 housing units juxtaposed to community objection.

* What else?

Only one developer, who has never done a similar project, submitted a bid. Makes me ask how feasible this really is. He already has his hand out for an extra \$1M from the Village.

How secure is the AHP funding from the federal government? Who ponies up the extra cash if that falls through?

At a time when dollars are scarce and needs are abundant, is this the best place to put our tax dollars?

For those of you who are committed to pushing forward at any cost, please remember, you don't have to get married just because the invitations have been sent out. There is still time to reconsider.

Thank you,

Renee Tegge

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Crivello, Carolyn

Dear Village Board of Trustees:

I am voicing that you do not approve selling the lot at 4448-4450 N Lake Drive to Spoerl Development. I know that many Village Trustees have announced their mind is made up without the public's comment, but I would request that the Trustees review this letter with an open mind.

This project is being jammed through without a majority support of the residents and without the public's comment being adequately involved. I fear that there is a perception among board members that the time spent is a sunk cost for the time and we cannot go backwards, but in reality, making a bad deal is worse than making no deal at all. There is tunnel vision, while ignoring the economic realities and red flags of this project. The current proposal is financially irresponsible and will cause detriment to the community based on its location.

By way of background, I am an attorney who has maintained a practice in commercial real estate for 9 years. I help developers complete projects regularly, on occasion LIHTC transactions. I think they are an important part of the community and help provide important assets to the community. I am pro development and think the addition of development broadly will be helpful to the tax base that Shorewood desperately needs. A municipal entity using tax credits or incentives to encourage development on its own is not a new concept or on its face something I am against, but this transaction does not financially make sense, was done without adequate investigation, and is done at the expense of the other competing community needs that there is a net negative effect.

1. Accessibility.

This lot contains the only 2 publicly available parking spots on this end of Oakland. There have been no plans to provide accessibility to those with limited mobility. I have asked where the other existing accessible parking spaces are on this end of Oakland that are public spaces and have not yet received a response.

I appreciate that some trustees really believe that everyone should walk or ride their bikes to things, but that is not an option for people who are disabled enough to need a wheelchair sticker, and those that have intermittent mobility issues that may not qualify for a sticker but still have accessibility issues.

The drawings that were submitted in advance of the May 30, 2025 meeting do not appear to even have handicapped accessible parking spaces. Perhaps there are, but they are not designated on the drawing.

2. This transaction was pushed through without adequate due diligence.

There are several issues in this transaction that really make me pause. The Village declined to get an appraisal on the land that it was willing to give up. Who would reasonably just give away a community asset without even understanding what it is it is giving up?

Second, there was no economic impact study. This makes this project also very hard to digest. Citizens are being told that “generally, new apartment buildings mean more economic impact.” But there is 0 data to back that up for this project, in this location, while giving up something that supports the local businesses nearby.

Third, there was no traffic impact study evaluated for this project. I’ve had clients change a small commercial use and have to get traffic impact studies for far less. The residents that park in that lot now are going to have to spill over to somewhere else. This is compounded by the Village’s decision to waive parking requirements for other projects. I understand some board members don’t want us to be vehicle focused and want people to walk, bike, or use public transportation, but that is not the reality that we are in. In the interim, this hurts local businesses that want to attract customers not only from the Village, but from the broader metropolitan area. How will that work if they cannot find something for blocks? Maybe it would be fine, but we wouldn’t know because adequate diligence was not completed. This is coming on the tails of the 10 month loss of access for these businesses.

The CDA has governing documents that require the CDA to make financial decisions to “be made with judgment and care, under circumstances then prevailing, which persons of prudence, discretion and intelligence exercise in the management of their own affairs, not for speculation, but for investment, considering the probable safety of their capital as well as the probable income to be derived.” Who gives away a valuable asset without knowing what it’s worth? Without knowing how it affects the economy? No reasonably prudent person would do that.

3. Questions about the developer’s capabilities and veracity with the CDA and the board. Either lack of truthfulness or lack of experience has the developer continuing to come back for more money.

Candidly, after reviewing prior meeting minutes I have some questions about the capabilities and veracity with the Village. On November 22, 2024, Spoerl Development told the CDA that it did not account for the elevator in its initial development plan and that this was a surprise. The developer also used its Whitefish Bay project as a comparison, which does use an elevator. I find that the developer did not know this was required completely unbelievable as it is a ground up development and it’s been Fair Housing law since 1988. He also just completed a similar project in Whitefish Bay. This is either hiding the ball, the developer lacks the experience to handle this project, or just lacks competence.

Secondarily, every time the developer comes back to the Village, there is a new request for more money. The maximum TIF fund wasn't enough. Then it was the land. Then it was the elevator. Now it's a request for another million dollars. This is \$2.7 million of tax payer money for a \$6.5 million dollar project. This developer clearly lacks cost controls, cost estimating, or is taking advantage knowing the Village has failed to entertain any other offers and has not pulled the project.

I am concerned that the Village will have given away money, with no covenants, and that we will end up with a half done building or need to contribute more money to have a completed project.

4. The economics of this transaction do not make sense and the city is getting a bad deal.

The developer told us on November 22, 2024 that this project was not even commercially viable even at Market Rents due to the lack of economies of scale. (citation: https://villageofshorewood.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/ArchivedAgenda/11222024-1803?utm_source=chatgpt.com) Why would the Village give money to a developer to do a project that even at Market Rate rents would not work? This is not a prudent person standard as required by the legal documents of the CDA.

We could be re-using these tax dollars in a more cost effective way by re-opening the RFP or at least adjusting the current plan to be in another location that does not harm the businesses we are trying to support or affect accessibility of the Village. If Affordable Housing in the LIHTC sense is what the village really wants, it shouldn't have any problem creating, re-opening, or extending the fund to make that happen.

Whitefish Bay had their project completed without having to contribute a single dollar towards the project. It's also highly unusual that a municipality would give funds as a grant, rather than a low or no interest loan as to ensure the funds are used as intended and the funds are returned to the municipality.

Even before the third kick at the cat for extra money from the Village, Spoerl was anticipating at 9.52% return (above the average for such projects). (Citation: <https://www.villageofshorewood.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Agenda/05302025-2468>), and assumed a vacancy above 7%, which is far above average (as cited by Baker Tilly). The payback period exceeds 20 years.

The only person winning with this plan is the developer. The balance of this project is not in the benefit of the village or its existing residents. The developer is a for-profit business. They are not a non-profit. They have not offered to reduce their management fee or their developer fee. While it is not unusual to partner with for-profit entities to complete these types of projects, the percentage of the project being publicly funded, the dollar value per unit, the dollar value of the project for the number of units is truly incomprehensible. This comes at a time where the Village tells residents annually it cannot meet its financial obligations and we need to raise our taxes. We are lining the pockets of an entity that is not even located in the Village.

For context, the Shorewood School District has the 3rd highest mill rate of any school district in the State of Wisconsin. (CITE: https://sfs.dpi.wi.gov/safr_ro/all_mill_rate.asp?year=2026) This project will make Shorewood less affordable for the residents that are already living here. This is just financially irresponsible to push this transaction through without understanding the economic impact. Many friends in the Village of Shorewood have discussed how unaffordable property taxes have become. Some residents are struggling to afford even a \$50 a month increase to their rent.

5. Comparators of other Municipalities

Other municipalities do not provide this level of financial support to private developers at this level. For example, the City of Lacrosse maxes out the amount per unit at \$45,000 per unit for new construction and \$800,000 per project as a loan. (cite: <https://www.cityoflacrosse.org/your-government/departments/community-development-and-housing/affordable-housing-loan-fund>). This requires 1% interest with repayment due in 20 years or repayment on sale. If the Village wanted to spur more development of low income housing, they would require that the money is repaid and given back to the fund to be used for other projects. The City of Milwaukee provides \$14,999 per unit maximum. (Citation: [https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/c3c8d339565c4ccab821f65433ee132f/page/3 - Existing-Efforts?utm_source=chatgpt.com](https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/c3c8d339565c4ccab821f65433ee132f/page/3-Existing-Efforts?utm_source=chatgpt.com))

6. The public was never heard.

In September 2024, the project was passed on the premise that there would be formal listening sessions for the project at various stages. From what I can tell from Village meeting minutes and other documentation, this did not happen. This was voted on and approved conditionally, and that never happened. It should be no surprise that people are upset when they were never listened to to begin with.

7. Summary

In sum, this project is so out of market and there is clear tunnel vision to put some affordable housing in Shorewood, but it's being done in such a financially irresponsible way, at the expense of existing businesses and residents. This project will cost existing taxpayers money, many of whom are struggling to pay rent or pay their taxes annually, while producing less than 2 dozen affordable units.

Affordable housing belongs in Shorewood somewhere generally, but this project is not for the benefit of the Village or its residents. There is too little benefit for high costs and unknown variables.

I also want to express my disappointment in what I've seen as a lack of concern for those who are disabled in the community from some of the Trustees' comments and statements. Shorewood should be for everyone regardless of income, disability, status, race, gender, and

sex. Those with disabilities deserve to be able to access all amenities in our community without any additional strain or difficulty, without a plan for how to mitigate this situation.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Crivello

Marquardt, Hannah

March 16, 2026

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The purpose of this letter is to share my interest in the availability of affordable housing in the Village of Shorewood and to share my experiences. The details I am sharing are of a personal nature in an effort to support this venture.

My name is Hannah Marquardt and I am the mother of two elementary students at Lake Bluff. I am currently the Building Substitute Teacher at Shorewood High School and have been an employee of the Shorewood School District since August of 2022. I moved to this neighborhood to be closer to my children's father, also a resident of Shorewood. He and I have been divorced since 2020 but are very amicable and coparenting well has been our highest priority throughout every circumstance. Within that priority of coparenting, we share the agreement and common value that our children receive a high standard of public education. This is why I took a job in Shorewood and moved our family here to be residents and able to enroll in the school system.

Some of the background of where I was prior to Shorewood: When I was newly divorced, finding a safe, affordable place to live was challenging. As a newly single mother during the peak of COVID, and due to having two small children, I had to act quickly and take what was available for housing. I found an apartment in Waukesha County. From 2020 until 2022, I rented from a company that was wildly unlawful with business and housing practices. Due to my income level, I was also required to pay a higher security deposit, per the building owner, and could not afford private representation when I questioned the practices, including the utility billing for water and sewer. One February night in 2022, I woke up in the middle of the night and watched a four-unit building next to me burn down in a fire. I watched a man jump out of the window from the second floor, and he and his roommate were both badly injured and required extensive hospitalization. I watched EMTs remove a lifeless body to my back yard on a stretcher after that resident lost his life, and his partner later died in the hospital. The cause of the fire was due to ineffective smoke detectors. After being in the residence for a year and a half, I also received a letter from an attorney's office about some of the practices that were standard for the company owner that I was renting an apartment from in Waukesha County had been brought back into a lawsuit with the State of Wisconsin. Please note this link to one of the settlement letters from the State of Wisconsin vs. Wisconsin O'Connor Corporation: <https://datcp.wi.gov/Documents2/20180607WIOConnorCorpSettlement.pdf>

It appears that even property companies with long litanyes of experience can be untrustworthy. Seeing that unfold was the catalyst for me to look for other housing.

I started to look for other housing and employment options, and was offered two jobs in the summer of 2022: one in the Waukesha School District, and one in the Shorewood School District. I knew that my kids would get the better education and cultural experience of SDS, and I really loved that the mission of the SDS included *diversity, equity, and inclusion*. I took the job in Shorewood I have loved being an employee in every building during the school year- both in the Library Media Centers in all four schools, as a Recreation Department Instructor for ballet, creative dance, and summer camp offerings, in the off-season as a Summer School aide and finally, as a Camp Shorewood employee. The point of this is to share with you that not only am I employed in the community, but I live and vote here as well. And I love being a part of the vibrant fabric of this place.

When I first moved to Shorewood in October of 2022, I rented from a company that owned many of the properties close to school and took what was available in a higher price range.. I immediately took a huge jump in rental costs by \$300 per month from the previous two years but felt that living in a community setting that was safe and walkable with excellent schools was a small compromise to make. The first building we lived in was a huge, had a habit of unhoused people sleeping and urinating in the foyer that we would have to step over to get out of the building in the morning, college students partying and fighting until all hours of night, cigarette and marijuana smoke constantly in my hallway, and cockroaches in the outdated basement laundry facility we shared with the 20-some other units. After seeing the cockroaches unafraid in the laundry room, I knew I had to move to a more family-friendly space. Shortly after the decision, I got a letter from the rental company informing me that my rent was going up and no updates (replacing the 25+ year -old carpeting, painting hallways, repairing broken windows and doors in common spaces, pest control) would be happening. I found a privately owned townhome, I was the first of 45 people to see and apply for, and when I say miraculously I was able to secure in 2023, that is no exaggeration. I am so thankful for my current home, and while it is a steep expense, with the rent incrementally creeping upwards to \$1500, I have a relatively quiet and residential space to raise my kids. Regardless of being a renter, I am still contributing to taxes in my district. I have voted in every election since moving here in 2022. I am an active participant in the community.

I am a graduate of UW-Milwaukee's Peck School of the Arts and have several post-secondary credits towards a Masters' Degree with the School of Information Sciences. I am not uneducated and have worked tirelessly on self-development over the years. I have been the Head of Household for six years,

four of which have been in a somewhat affluent neighborhood. I repeat, I have worked tirelessly to support and provide for my children, give them a safe neighborhood and school setting, and also be able to provide the basic tenets in my opinion, of a well-rounded lifestyle: music and foreign language lessons, recreational opportunities like swimming lessons, sports and creative and enhancing programming, and travel when possible.

While I have been challenged financially, I have always looked at my ability to care for my children as a blessing and opportunity. I hope to someday own my own home in this neighborhood. Looking at the paradox of high rental rates for decent homes and the lack in increase of wages for someone in my position as a substitute teacher, the difference in paying \$1500 per month for a two bedroom townhouse versus what the scale would be for the proposed building development would give me the difference of \$220 in housing expenses, or roughly \$2664.00 per year. That amount may seem small to some of the people listening to this, but to me, it is an invaluable nest egg towards the downpayment on a house, further education, and any number of enrichment activities and experiences for my two children. My goal has always been to continue to improve my circumstances, and an opportunity like sliding scale housing would be a huge value to my family and me.

If I can share anything from my perspective that I would hope would make what I am saying a valid argument *in favor* of using the TIF funds Shorewood has toward an opportunity like this affordable housing. This could be the difference in someone's life -not just mine and my children- between living in a run-down building owned by a rental company clearly not interested in any improvement to the community, to a space that could be a relief from the exhausting and devaluing game of constantly trying to stay ahead of the rent game, and trying to stay afloat in an unfriendly-to-single parents-economy.

I must also be clear about a perception that may be held by many in opposition to this endeavor: not all of those seeking affordable housing are "low-income" by choice. Many of us are trying our hardest to make a better life for ourselves, our families and our communities. I have worked my entire adult life to be a productive member of society and would love to *not* have to be petitioning strangers to allow anyone to apply for subsidized housing, and especially, to not have my status as "low-income" be equated with "no-value" stigma attached to me as a person. I would hope that I, and others in my situation, be seen as a member of a community that has tried to do things with nobility and care for the bigger picture while improving myself and my value to the market along the way.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. I hope my sharing these details will give a new perspective to what is an excellent opportunity to show the diverse, equitable and inclusive values that brought me to this neighborhood in the first place and keep me here, as well.

Very best regards,
Hannah Marquardt

Goldring, Eden

From: [Nancy Goldring](#)
To: [Toya Harrell](#)
Subject: Public Comment Village Board Meeting 3/16/26
Date: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 4:45:51 PM

Hi Toya,

My name is N. Eden Goldring. I was at the Village Board Meeting last night, and gave a comment on the affordable housing proposal. The gentleman I was sitting next to said that you would like a copy of my comment. I have added it to this email. Let me know if you need anything else.

Sincerely,
N. Eden Goldring

"My name is Eden Goldring. I am a Shorewood resident and work at Orchid Chinese Medicine, a reproductive acupuncture clinic located on the 4400 block of Oakland Avenue in Shorewood.

I appreciate the community's efforts to address housing needs, but I do not support the current proposal for affordable housing on the 4400 block of Oakland. Because of its placement, the project will have direct impacts on parking to nearby residents and businesses.

Our clinic serves many pregnant patients who depend on accessible parking for their appointments. The proposal would eliminate a 48-space parking lot that is currently used by renters and local businesses. It is important to note that the village is already approximately 300 public parking spaces below code. Parking is already limited, and removing this lot will increase competition for street parking for both residents and local businesses.

Residents in the nearby apartments have expressed concern that the loss of the parking lot would make daily activities such as carrying groceries or returning home late at night difficult and less safe. I hope these practical considerations will be carefully weighed as part of the decision-making process.

Shorewood is facing significant financial implications with this project, as well. I have been part of many conversations in which current residents have expressed concern about the ever-increasing costs to live in Shorewood. That is why I would like to ask the Shorewood Village Board to pause and take a step back before committing \$1.7 million of Shorewood taxpayer funds to this Project. Affordable housing is an important goal, but when a project requires this level of public subsidy from a small community, it is reasonable to ask whether we can afford a project of this size given our current financial conditions.

TIF dollars are public funds. They can either be directed to a development like this one, or they can be returned to the taxing authorities that serve everyone in Shorewood — including our Village and our district schools. At a time when our community is facing looming financial shortfalls, and discussing serious financial

pressures (including the possible closure of the **Middle School**, **school** staff layoffs, and necessary village **infrastructure** projects) we need to examine if this is the most responsible use of those funds.

At the February 25th CDA meeting, several significant financial questions were raised. During the discussion, new costs were introduced, including approximately \$300,000 for an elevator and about \$750,000 to fund supportive services for four units. These additions were described as necessary to remain competitive for tax credits. Before the board commits our community to this project, the board and community need to understand whether further additional costs or requests for local taxpayer support may arise.

The question before the board is not simply whether affordable housing is important, but whether this particular project is the most responsible use of Shorewood's limited public resources."

Moos, Daniel

From: [Ann McKaig](#)
To: [Daniel Moos](#); [Toya Harrell](#)
Subject: Re: 4450 Oakland Ave Parking Lot Development
Date: Tuesday, March 10, 2026 8:31:10 PM

Hi Daniel- thanks for taking the time to write and using such a kind tone. I am copying our Village Clerk so that it becomes part of our record.

I do support the development - I also support assisting lot users in the transition should the project move forward. There will be ample time to review our street parking policies, encourage private off street parking rental, education about using street-parking or applying for ADA parking accommodations, and perhaps even coordination with property managers to assist tenants who choose to move. Not all of these are Village areas of purview, but our community works together.

I live in an older apartment building, have toured apartments, and supported people who have needed to move. I am happy to do the same moving forward once we know the outcome.

Best wishes,
Ann

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Daniel Moos <danmoos@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 6, 2026 10:57:18 AM
To: Ann McKaig <presidentmckaig@shorewoodwi.gov>; Jim Arndorfer <trusteeandorfer@shorewoodwi.gov>; Eric Couto <trusteecouto@shorewoodwi.gov>; Arthur Ircink <trusteeircink@shorewoodwi.gov>; Matt McGovern <trusteemcgovern@shorewoodwi.gov>; Kathy Stokebrand <trusteestokebrand@shorewoodwi.gov>; Wesley Warren <TrusteeWarren@shorewoodwi.gov>
Subject: 4450 Oakland Ave Parking Lot Development

You don't often get email from danmoos@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Village President and Trustees,

This email is regarding concerns over the proposed apartment complex project at the location of the current parking lot at 4450 N Oakland Ave.

I am the building owner at 4447 N Oakland Ave. I've been working at this location since 1996 and have had many experiences, and have seen many Shorewood improvements since that

time: an abandoned gas station removed and replaced with housing (I believe that was the NE corner of Oakland and Kensington), several apartments/condos with store fronts built along Oakland. We worked through the previous Oakland Avenue renovation of the street, sidewalks and street lighting, of which I remember the village reaching out to have locals view and hear their input on light fixture choice, planters, etc., we helped with damages after the 2010 flood, among other experiences.

The inevitable bumps and bruises of construction and reconstruction through the years have resulted in an Oakland Avenue that is aesthetically pleasing and much more vital than in 1996. I'm in near daily contact with village residents, and throughout past projects the consensus was mainly along the lines of "that's going to be nice".

Interactions related to developing the parking lot unfortunately don't show the same response. The response has been "no", sometimes a dramatic "no!". Present residents are pressed for parking. When I meet someone in the evening at our building, parking is very difficult as Oakland parking is spoken for at that time of day. Business owners have mentioned that parking is a daily concern and losing 40 or 50 parking spots will, either directly or perceptually, impact patrons' intentions of coming to Shorewood. I have a new neighbor to the north of our building who is motivated, qualified, versed in development and will be an asset to the village. He is presently renovating his building and will have a new business running there soon. He's hoping the parking lot will stay and would love to be part of a solution that keeps or improves the public space we have.

Recent news indicated that the lot was placed at 4450 in the 1980s to address the need for parking. I believe parking needs have increased since the 1980s, or at the very least are needed just as much.

I respectfully ask the board to reconsider developing the 4450 Oakland space.

Thank you for your time and attention to this email.

Sincerely,
Daniel K. Moos

--

KKS, llc
4447 N Oakland Ave
Shorewood, WI 53211
(414)964-2223

email: danmoos@gmail.com

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Meier, Bill (Pt. 2)

From: [Bayer, Nathan J.](#)
To: [Ann McKaig](#); [Rebecca Ewald](#); [Toya Harrell](#); [Bart Griepentrog](#)
Cc: [Miller, Kayla A.](#)
Subject: RE: Village Board Meeting Talking Points
Date: Monday, March 16, 2026 10:26:41 AM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Good morning:

See comments/answers in red below.

Nathan J. Bayer | Shareholder

NBayer@CrivelloLaw.com
Direct:414-290-7505



Crivello, Nichols & Hall, S.C.

710 North Plankinton Avenue Suite 500
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53203
Main:414-271-7722
Fax: 414-271-4438
CrivelloLaw.com

This email is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. Section 2510-22. This email is a communication by or on behalf of an attorney, and may contain privileged communications or information. Unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender, or reply by e-mail and delete all copies of the message. Thank you.

From: Ann McKaig <PresidentMcKaig@shorewoodwi.gov>

Sent: Sunday, March 15, 2026 8:01 PM

To: Rebecca Ewald <rewald@shorewoodwi.gov>; Toya Harrell <tharrell@shorewoodwi.gov>; Bart Griepentrog <bgriepentrog@shorewoodwi.gov>; Bayer, Nathan J. <NBayer@CrivelloLaw.com>

Subject: Re: Village Board Meeting Talking Points

Does TIF Policy 40 require a developer to provide a property management plan including the name and resume of the property manager?

Not specifically. There is an overall evaluation of the applicant, which included a comprehensive review by the financial team at Baker Tilly, to ensure the developer had the financial means to perform as promised.

There is something else to keep in mind in relation to the property management team, and that is the WHEDA process that the developer is going through simultaneously right now. WHEDA does have specific and strict requirements related to the management team, and a developer would not advance in the WHEDA process without a qualified management team. Each developer has to provide WHEDA a management agent certification worksheet. WHEDA evaluates “development team eligibility,” and defines the “management agent” as part of that team.

This paragraph comes from the WHEDA guide explaining the application process:

Management agents listed on any HTC application must be certified by WHEDA and appear on the list of Approved Management Agents for the HTC Cycle year in which the Credit application is submitted. The management agent listed on the application must be retained by the ownership entity for at least five (5) years after the placed in service (PIS) date, unless a written request is submitted to and approved by WHEDA.

There are also penalties for failing to operate without a certified and approved management agent.

Here is a link to the applicable WHEDA site if you wish to peruse:

<https://www.novoco.com/public-media/documents/wisconsin-lihtc-qap-2025-26-08152025.pdf>

Also, while Mr. Meier sent this document, it contains no identifying information if it were to be separated from that email.

Have we been contacted by the AGO about an investigation into our implementation of TIF Policy 40 as it pertains to this proposal?

Not to my knowledge. That is not to say someone hasn't called them. But the fact that the village is considering selecting a developer to build affordable housing that has now made it through two layers of stringent WHEDA review, to be supported by extended TID funds that state statute specifically allows to be used for affordable housing, and with a Policy 40 that specifically refers to affordable housing as a positive for selection (see below), suggests that the AGO would likely have little interest in attempting to overturn the Village's policy decision.

Here is an example from Policy 40 referencing affordable housing:

8. Create a range of housing types and specifically encourage the development of workforce and affordable housing, especially housing that is for those earning less than the MilwaukeeWaukesha-West Allis area median income HUD calculation.

Is there any indication that the CDA did not fulfill their scope of their duty before voting to recommend that the Village Board negotiate an agreement with Spoerl Commercial, LLC?

See collective comments above. As noted, the stringent WHEDA process is acting as another layer of review, and one that the CDA and Board can consider.

Is there anything contained in this anonymous memo that would indicate we should defer the action as posted on the agenda?

That is a political question for discretion of the Board.

From: Ann McKaig <PresidentMcKaig@shorewoodwi.gov>

Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 5:55 PM

To: Rebecca Ewald <rewald@shorewoodwi.gov>; Toya Harrell <tharrell@shorewoodwi.gov>; Bart Griepentrog <bgriepentrog@shorewoodwi.gov>; Nathan J. Bayer <nbayer@crivellocalarson.com>

Subject: Fw: Village Board Meeting Talking Points

See below

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Bill Meier <billmeierjr@wormjr.com>

Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 3:21:24 PM

To: Ann McKaig <presidentmckaig@shorewoodwi.gov>; Jim Arndorfer <trusteeandorfer@shorewoodwi.gov>; Eric Couto <trusteecouto@shorewoodwi.gov>; Arthur Ircink <trusteeircink@shorewoodwi.gov>; Matt McGovern <trusteemcgovern@shorewoodwi.gov>; Kathy Stokebrand <trusteestokebrand@shorewoodwi.gov>; Wesley Warren <TrusteeWarren@shorewoodwi.gov>

Subject: Village Board Meeting Talking Points

Greetings,

Here are my talking points for the board meeting on March 16, 2026. I'm submitting these because I'm having a medical procedure that day in the afternoon and may not be speaking, but I will be in attendance.

Best wishes,
Bill

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

From: [Ann McKaig](#)
To: georgeebner@icloud.com; [Jim Arndorfer](#); [Eric Couto](#); [Arthur Ircink](#); [Matt McGovern](#); [Kathy Stokebrand](#); TrusteeWaren@shorewoodwi.gov; [Rebecca Ewald](#); [Toya Harrell](#); [Bart Griepentrog](#)
Subject: Re: Village Meeting 3/16/2026
Date: Sunday, March 15, 2026 2:19:29 PM

Thank you- I'm copying staff so that the trustees know it is on record.

PLEASE DO NOT REPLY ALL

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: georgeebner@icloud.com <georgeebner@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 14, 2026 4:48:13 PM
To: Ann McKaig <PresidentMcKaig@shorewoodwi.gov>; Jim Arndorfer <TrusteeArndorfer@shorewoodwi.gov>; Eric Couto <TrusteeCouto@shorewoodwi.gov>; Arthur Ircink <TrusteeIrcink@shorewoodwi.gov>; Matt McGovern <TrusteeMcGovern@shorewoodwi.gov>; Kathy Stokebrand <TrusteeStokebrand@shorewoodwi.gov>; TrusteeWaren@shorewoodwi.gov <TrusteeWaren@shorewoodwi.gov>
Subject: Village Meeting 3/16/2026

You don't often get email from georgeebner@icloud.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear President McKaig and Trustees,

I believe that there is good intentions by the village board to try to impact the affordability of housing in Shorewood. However, in light of the new information provided by Mr. Meier in Shorewood is Talking website I ask that you reconsider your vote on the project located at 4450 N Oakland. If any of the points Mr Meier makes are accurate a more cautious approach to this development might be prudent.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Thank you for your consideration regarding this new information,

George Ebner

From: [Anne De Haven](#)
To: [Ann McKaig](#); [Jim Arndorfer](#); [Eric Couto](#); [Arthur Ircink](#); [Matt McGovern](#); [Kathy Stokebrand](#); [Wesley Warren](#)
Cc: [Rebecca Ewald](#); [Toya Harrell](#)
Subject: Reflections of the Village Board Meeting last night - parking lot edition
Date: Tuesday, March 17, 2026 9:37:08 AM

You don't often get email from amdehaven@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Good Morning,

I grew up in Shorewood and moved back nearly 20 years ago. Over that time, even when I disagreed with the direction or decisions of the Village Board, I always trusted that those decisions were made with the best interests of the village and its residents at heart.

Unfortunately, that confidence has been significantly eroded as I have watched the parking lot development process unfold. I, and everyone else I have heard express concerns about this project, are in favor of more affordable housing, but this project is not the solution and comes with guaranteed irreversible damage to local businesses and residents. While I still believe a few Trustees are acting in good faith, my trust in the remainder of the board has been seriously undermined by both the process and the outcome.

I intended to speak at the meeting last night, but given how long it ran, and how clearly residents have expressed their concerns for months, I did not feel it was necessary to repeat what had already been stated repeatedly and thoughtfully by so many others. I genuinely believed that hearing, once again, how devastating this decision would be for the community, along with hearing a viable alternative solution, would at least give more of you pause. I did not expect unanimity, but I did expect meaningful consideration.

What is most troubling is watching the Board continue to advance this project despite clear and repeated inconsistencies in the developer's representations. Statements made at the meeting conflicted with prior information and raised serious concerns about competence, transparency, and preparedness for a project of this scale. Proceeding without even pausing to reassess whether this is the right partner demonstrates a disregard for due diligence and risk management, both of which are core components of your fiduciary responsibility.

As a resident, it is difficult to understand how we are expected to maintain trust in the Board when these issues are raised openly and yet appear to have no impact on the decision making process. Trust is not eroded by disagreement alone, it is eroded when concerns are voiced, evidence is presented, and the process appears predetermined regardless of what is heard.

Finally, Trustee Arndorfer's statement that residents who don't like it can move was deeply discouraging, dismissive, and, frankly, offensive. It conveyed a level of disregard for the people you are elected to represent and marked a clear turning point in how this decision will be remembered. By voting to move forward without

addressing that sentiment, those Trustees in favor effectively endorsed it turning away from residents and standing in stark contrast to Trustees Stokebrand and Couto, who continued to advocate for the community's concerns. Trustee Stokebrand and Trustee Couto, I continue to be grateful for your commitment to gathering necessary information, and assessing situations with open minds even when that might not be in line with the direction of the rest of the board. Please know it does not go unnoticed.

I never expected to feel this disconnected from local leadership in a community I have called home for most of my life. I hope the Board reflects seriously on how this process has been handled, the trust that has been lost, and what it will take to restore it.

Thank you

Annie De Haven

1717 E. Kensington Blvd.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the North Shore Consolidated O365 Email System (Bayside, Glendale, Shorewood, Brown Deer, Whitefish Bay, and North Shore Fire & Rescue). Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Meier, Bill

If Shorewood wants successful affordable housing, it must work with an experienced developer.

I am not opposed to affordable housing. I am writing to you as a resident who has abundant operating experience in the development of major affordable housing projects in Milwaukee.

I have lived in Shorewood most of my life and have parked in the 4450 N. Oakland lot for many years. I was astonished to learn that the Village was planning to develop the lot without providing accommodations for the tenants currently renting spaces there. I was particularly concerned because two of the spaces are designated handicapped parking spaces.

This prompted me to look more closely at the situation. What I discovered is troubling. From what appears to be a lack of adequate due diligence by the Village to the apparent lack of experience of the proposed developer, it seems the Village may be taking a significant risk with taxpayer dollars. If affordable housing is not developed and managed properly, it can lead to serious problems for both tenants and the surrounding community.

Allow me to begin this narrative by establishing my experience in the category of affordable housing:

- In the early 1990s, my company at the time, TMB Management, was hired to manage a 179-unit Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) project spread across 6 buildings in Milwaukee. I was hired to manage the Johnson Square project from construction through lease-up and ongoing operations. **This was the largest LIHTC development in Wisconsin.**
- Two years later, I worked for the Mandel Group to open and lease the YW Villages development, a renovation of six buildings by the YWCA of Milwaukee containing more than 150 apartments. This also was a LIHTC project, which was **the 2nd largest at the time in Wisconsin.**
- **I was the first person in Wisconsin trained in LIHTC compliance** who was not a state employee or affiliated with a non-governmental organization. My staff also received LIHTC compliance training, and each staff member had several years of prior real estate management experience, including HUD Section 8 leasing and compliance.

In the above developments, we actively and intentionally addressed significant concerns from the community, developers, and investors regarding the leasing of more than 300 low-income apartments in what was then the highest-crime neighborhood in the City of Milwaukee. We worked closely with social service agencies, community organizations, and the Milwaukee Police Department to provide support services for residents. These services included tenant training, literacy programs, health screenings, financial counseling, and legal services, among others.

Managing residential property successfully requires specialized skills. Managing low-income housing requires additional expertise. Maintaining compliance with LIHTC regulations requires yet another specialized skill set. Successfully managing a residential tax credit property requires broad experience, training, and operational expertise.

As part of my due diligence regarding the proposed development at 4450 N. Oakland, I researched the developer, Spoerl Commercial. I was surprised that the Community Development Authority (CDA) approved Phase One, let alone Phase Two, and has recommended that the Village Board proceed further. At this point, the Village should pause and reconsider.

Spoerl Commercial is a new company founded in 2022. Available information suggests the company has one, possibly two employees. The primary employee appears to be Brian Spoerl. LinkedIn lists one other employee: Tahar Shawar. However, according to Mr. Shawar's LinkedIn profile, he operates a technology company called Growth & Pitch that focuses on website branding infrastructure and other technology services. There is no indication that Mr. Shawar or Growth & Pitch has experience in real estate development or Low Income Housing Tax Credit projects.

The LinkedIn page for Spoerl Commercial states that the company has "over 30 years of experience," yet the company itself has existed for only four years. Mr. Spoerl personally lists either 25 or 30 years of experience in real estate, depending on the source.

Search results indicate that Mr. Spoerl previously worked at Irgens, a Milwaukee real estate firm. His LinkedIn page references several healthcare facility developments associated with Irgens. The page also contains a non-working link to brianspoerl.com and a post identifying himself as a healthcare real estate professional. A November 11, 2025 article in the Milwaukee Business Journal describes him as a "former medical office developer."

The listed office address for Spoerl Commercial appears to be a shared office space operated by "Spaces" which caters to those wishing to operate "virtual offices" and "co-working" spaces.

I was unable to find evidence that Spoerl Commercial or Brian Spoerl has significant experience developing or managing LIHTC properties. The only related projects appear to be two developments currently in progress: one under construction in Whitefish Bay and another proposed development in Sturgeon Bay awaiting planning commission approval, along with the proposed project at 4450 N. Oakland currently under consideration by the Village of Shorewood and the Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority (WHEDA).

After reviewing the limited information available about Spoerl Commercial, I turned my attention to the actions of the CDA. I questioned how the CDA could advance this proposal given the apparent lack of experience in developing and managing LIHTC properties and the apparent lack of staffing within the development company.

Throughout my career working with real estate developers, I frequently appeared before municipal boards, community development authorities, and zoning boards seeking project approvals. In most cases, these bodies consisted of well-intentioned community members. However, many members often lacked the background, education, or technical expertise needed to fully evaluate complex development proposals.

Some boards recognized these limitations and hired qualified experts to provide guidance. Others did not seek additional expertise, resulting in decisions made without a full understanding of the issues involved.

After reviewing CDA meeting minutes and watching the video from the February 25, 2026 meeting, it appears that the CDA may not have conducted sufficient due diligence regarding Spoerl Commercial or the requirements for a successful LIHTC development.

Would a reasonable person conclude that a company with no proven experience developing Low Income Housing Tax Credit apartments, minimal staff, no clear office presence, no demonstrated experience managing low-income residential properties, and no track record of LIHTC compliance is the right developer for such a project? I believe the answer is no.

I was unable to find evidence that the CDA asked how the property would be managed once completed.

I could not find evidence that the CDA requested or verified a professional resume for Brian Spoerl. Given his limited experience with LIHTC developments, this would be an essential step.

I also could not find evidence that the CDA asked how much personal equity Mr. Spoerl would contribute to the project.

Did the CDA consult Baker Tilly or another experienced LIHTC developer regarding the customary developer's fee for a project like this? If the proposed developer's fee were excessive, the Village could request that it be reduced to a customary level.

Spoerl Design Build and Selzer-Ornst are reportedly partnering on the construction of the Oakleaf project. What compensation will Spoerl Design Build receive for this partnership? This type of relationship adds to the profits realized by developers.

The CDA hired Baker Tilly as a consultant. If so, why has Baker Tilly not addressed the management component of the project? Property management is just as critical as development.

Why did the CDA choose Baker Tilly rather than consulting experienced LIHTC developers such as Heartland Properties, Gorman & Company, or the Alexander Company? All three are headquartered in Madison and have extensive experience with LIHTC developments across Wisconsin and nationally. It appears that none of these firms were even sent a request for proposal.

Why did the CDA vote not to obtain a market-rate appraisal of the parking lot? Failing to obtain an appraisal could expose the Village to criticism if it is later revealed that public land was sold without a proper valuation.

When a flawed process is followed, flawed outcomes often result. The CDA's recommendation appears to contain many unanswered questions.

In my opinion, the CDA's actions may constitute misfeasance, nonfeasance, or both. I understand that the Office of the Attorney General of Wisconsin has been contacted regarding a potential investigation into this matter. I intend to contact that office as well to encourage a review of this situation.

I do not understand why the CDA believes this development proposal is prudent.

Public opposition to this project appears to be growing. Residents are organizing, communication among stakeholders is increasing, and more individuals and experts are becoming involved.

I urge the Village Board of Trustees to carefully consider whether the CDA has fulfilled its responsibilities. The Board should halt this process before it becomes a public relations problem for the Village of Shorewood.

If this project ultimately fails, the individuals most harmed will be the tenants. That must remain the primary concern.

Furthermore, a March 12, 2026 article in the Door County Pulse reports that the Sturgeon Bay Aesthetic Design and Site Plan Review Board approved plans on March 9 for Spoerl Commercial to begin the first phase of an affordable housing project. However, because the developer changed the plan from two apartment buildings to one, the modification is considered "substantial" under the existing Planned Unit Development approval. As a result, the proposal must return to the Sturgeon Bay Plan Commission for additional approval at its March 25 meeting.