
From: Richard Yuspeh <richardyuspeh@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 23, 2021 3:50 PM
To: steveander@gmail.com
Cc: kfg101@gmail.com; cnoyes@gklaw.com; Willard.Walker@walkerforge.com;
DFritz@ebn-design.com; pkingwill@gmail.com; peggy_russo@hotmail.com; Tammy
LaBorde; Alan H. Marcuvitz; Kathy Sawyer-Gutenkunst; WDineen@crivellocarlson.com
Subject: Eder Farm

Dear President Anderson and Village Trustees,

Recently after a Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting, Atty. Dineen and I struck up a conversation and he reminded me that our paths had crossed more than 30 years ago. I remembered the matter, but didn't recall his involvement for the City of Brookfield. What I do remember though, it was settled amicably and with a compromise.

Today, with the same spirit and hopeful outcome, I am reaching out on behalf of SaveRiverHills (SRH).

It is perhaps ironic that the October 27th informational meeting at USM had the same 7 Trustees, same location, same Eder property, and the same issues of density and zoning that had occurred in July 2018. The one BIG difference is that the property is now owned by ALL the residents of River Hills and has substantial debt.

The BOT should be commended for settling the Eder Family lawsuit and it's innovative approach to solving the debt issue by creating a TID to pay for it and adding a future benefit to the Village's tax base. The BOT made a compelling case on October 27th by finding not one, but two developers willing to purchase the property upfront and forego any builders incentives.

A month prior to the BOT meeting, SRH had its own informational meeting and launched a petition drive to seek a voice in the future direction of the Eder Farm development through direct legislation (DL) ordinances. Those petitions have been submitted and have met the threshold for consideration.

Now that the BOT has selected a developer for the Eder Farm, this seems like an ideal time to propose a compromise to prevent this project from getting tied down in unnecessary litigation, bad publicity, and most importantly, having the project not succeed.

If the BOT would ask the developer to reduce the number of units to 40 or less, and find a creative way to utilize some existing zoning ordinances (R3?) for the development , SRH would go from being opponents to proponents. In exchange for this concession, SRH will not pursue any further actions for DL or other means to oppose the development.

I am told that the TID can work at this level of development. Although the BOT will not meet until late January, perhaps some indication from individual Trustees could be conveyed to Alan Marcuvitz if this compromise can succeed.

Thank you for your open mindedness and your service to River Hills.

Wishing you a Happy Holiday and a Joyful New Year,

Sincerely,
Richard Yuspeh