

PUBLIC COMMENT

From: Len Bland
To: [Daniel Nakahara](#)
Cc: [Bill Vaananen](#)
Subject: Proposal for 464 and 502 Elm Street
Date: Saturday, March 31, 2018 1:55:25 PM

Dan,

We have been Deerfield homeowners for 27 years at 506 Cambridge Circle.

We are opposed to the proposal for 464 and 502 Elm Street. The developer has not addressed the water problem in their new proposal. The ducks (and mosquitoes) are still the winner. Dense packing of homes are not in the village rules and contrary to the interests of the village.

Their proposal exceeds property coverage by over 50%. That will lead to more water for an existing water problem.

We have spent thousands of dollars over the years remediating problems in our house from poor village water drainage. Now, the developer wants to cover the property with asphalt and homes that will dramatically increase the water problem.

The village report states:

“As previously stated, this site is unique and very uncommon due to the elevation drop from the northeast corner of the property to the southwest corner, a difference of almost seven feet. This elevation requires the overland flow route to be located in the southwest corner of the property, thereby, sending potential overflow toward abutting properties to the west and south. It should be noted that the existing site already flows to the southwest corner of the property. However, unlike the previous submission, these plans provide a sufficient downstream topographic survey that accurately depicts the downstream overland flow path. This path shows that there is sufficient elevation drop to carry any site runoff west to the school parking lot while not impacting the nearby structures.”

Our home is in the direct flow path of the excess water they will generate on the way to the school parking lot. How can the village report say that it won't impact nearby structures when we are already impacted by the flow? This will create a river flowing through our back yard and potentially require additional house repairs. Does the water magically jump over our properties to get to the parking lot? Are they going to pipe the water to the parking lot? No! It will collect in a cesspool for mosquitoes in our back yard and put more pressure on our basement walls.

- **Will the developer pay for these repairs?**
- **Will they pay for the loss of property value** if we were to sell our house?
- **Will they pay for the damage to the basement** that the water may cause?
- **Will the developer cover medical expenses** when someone in the village contracts West Nile Virus?

I have enclosed a picture showing the water that can presently accumulate on Elm Street properties (459 Elm).

My previous letter stated:

We have been Deerfield homeowners for 27 years at 506 Cambridge Circle. In that time, we've seen some terrific developments completed and changes made:

- The complete overhaul of downtown Deerfield.
- Increasing the safety for our kids by requiring everyone leaving Shepherd Jr. High to leave on Elm Street instead of adding more traffic to Grove.
- Making a commitment to a green community with terrific tree lined streets and back yards by making it more expensive to remove trees.

These changes have made our neighborhood and home better, safer, and more beautiful.

In 2005, we wanted a bigger house. We love our neighbors and community of single family homes. Living on a quiet street near downtown and transportation has been great. Our award winning schools and our reputation for one of the safest communities in the state also formed the basis for our decision. As a result, we could think of nothing better than to invest in expanding our home instead of moving. We completed that expansion within the zoning guidelines for Deerfield. We made the town better and our neighborhood better.

The present proposal to rezone Elm Street to allow 12 units of 3 story town homes will destroy the character of our neighborhood.

I am a business person, and I welcome the opportunity for real estate developers to improve our housing and make money. We have watched dozens of nearby homes torn down and rebuilt with larger, desirable single family homes. The developers made money on this work and are making money on similar projects throughout the village.

A zoning decision to build 12 large units on the space of 2 single family homes is egregious enrichment that will begin destroying the character of our neighborhood. I oppose the zoning changes for the following reasons:

- **High Traffic Levels:** This will add to high traffic levels from Shepherd Jr. High and the Patty Turner Center that already clog up the streets in the morning and when school lets out. When street repairs are made on Deerfield road it severely impacts travel times.
- **Increased Flooding:** It's easy to see the slope of the land from the railroad to the creek. When we pave over open land, there is less ground to absorb the water. We already have problems with basement flooding and pools of water in our back yard. We've seen the creek at levels that nearly flood the walking bridge. The water displacement from covering over so much land will only make the problem in our back yard (and everyone else's from here to the

river) worse.

- **Destruction of Greenery:** These two properties have terrific greenery that we can see from our window every day. If you allow these zoning changes, we will be looking out our windows onto a high rise devoid of the greenery that Deerfield is known for. No developments or houses over 2 stories are on this side of the train tracks.
- **Increased Crime Potential:** I'm also concerned that this will lead to a domino effect where homes on the street next door turn into multi-family dwelling high rises. We are already beginning to see auto theft in our neighborhood for the first time since we lived here. I'm aware of only murder in the time we have been living in Deerfield. That occurred across Elm Street in multi-family units. This type of density is correlated with [higher crime rates](#).

I'm confident that the developer can earn a terrific return on their investment and make our community better while staying consistent with our zoning rules. Please deny their overly aggressive building request that changes the nature of what we love about Deerfield.

Please ask the village facilities manager to call us and explain how the water will get to the school parking lot without flowing past our home and into our back yard.

We are opposed to any variances for these properties.

Regards,

Len Bland
506 Cambridge Circle



From: wjjsun
To: [Daniel Nakahara](#)
Subject: concern about Elm street R5 re-zoning in deerfield
Date: Tuesday, April 3, 2018 5:45:14 PM

Dear Plan Commissions,

I am living at 915 brookside lane, I received a mail about the Avanti project near my home on Elm Street (464 and 502 Elm Street).

I strongly say no to this project for below reason:

They (Avanti Builders) wants to construct townhomes on these two adjacent lots.this area is shepard school. for the safety for kids, we should not approve such a project in this area. The traffic for this area will be impacted.

This area is R-3 single-family home, we do not agree to re-zoning it to R-5 for multifamil dwellings.

BRs
Jinjian Wang
4/3/2018

Village of Deerfield
850 Waukegan Road
Deerfield, IL 60015
Plan Commission
c/o Dan Nakahara

Re: Opposition to Avanti re-zoning proposal/Elm Street

Dan/Plan Commission:

I would like to stress again my opposition to the proposed eight single-family homes proposed to be built directly across the street from my home.

In addition to the same drainage concerns for properties to the west, the removal of existing trees, and ongoing safety concerns, the new plan is still TOO DENSE! Eight single-family homes on property zoned for TWO! Sixteen additional parking places in addition to 8 two-car garages! Basically a parking lot surrounded by 8 homes that are pushed back beyond the required perimeter limits. All squeezed onto just over 1 acre.

Here again are the variances Avanti is seeking, along with the request for re-zoning to R-5:

1. Minimum land area per dwelling unit (Avanti's current plan requires 72,000 ft. or 1.62 acres. They are allowed (all they have) for their 1.08 acres is 46,848 ft.).
2. Front setback: Avanti is required to build 37 feet back from front property line on Elm. This is based upon the average setback of other homes on Elm. Avanti is asking for a variance to build 14.5 feet from the east property line on Elm Street.
3. Perimeter setbacks: Avanti is required to have 25 ft. setbacks on the north and south sides of the property. Avanti is asking for a variance of 17.5 feet.
4. Maximum lot coverage cannot exceed 30%. Avanti is asking for 35%.

All of the variances exceed established codes and guidelines set by our Village.

Why does Avanti need 8 homes? Avanti will argue that Deerfield needs more housing. I will argue they made a terrible business decision and the consequences of his decision hit his bottom line.

Avanti is proposing 8 single-family homes. If Avanti reduced the number of homes from 8 to 6, they would still be exceeding the Minimum Land Area Per Dwelling Unit (or MLAPDU) by 15.2%.

Eight exceeds the MLAPDU by 53.7%.

Additionally, Mr. Revzin represents that he has developed other multi-unit developments. Where and when? Pursuant to the Secretary of State, his business was incorporated on September 16, 2015. He has also represented himself as President of this company. The Corporation File Detail Report reflects Victoriya Revzin as the President and Secretary. His name does not appear on the certificate. While this

may not be a concern to the commission, who we do business with remains a concern of mine.
Misrepresentation is a red flag to me.

I hope the Plan Commission will again consider this proposal again to be too dense and come to the conclusion that two single family homes on the property would be acceptable to the village and neighborhood. Ordinances are implemented for a reason. I understand a request for a minor variance, but again he is asking for too much.

Thank you for your consideration.
Jan Cohen

OFFICE OF THE ILLINOIS SECRETARY OF STATE

JESSE WHITE
SECRETARY OF STATE



CORPORATION FILE DETAIL REPORT

File Number	70361906		
Entity Name	AVANTI CONSTRUCTION GROUP INC.		
Status	ACTIVE		
Entity Type	CORPORATION	Type of Corp	DOMESTIC BCA
Incorporation Date (Domestic)	09/16/2015	State	ILLINOIS
Agent Name	MARINA SHAPIRO	Agent Change Date	09/16/2015
Agent Street Address	580 ROGER WILLIAMS AVE STE 26	President Name & Address	VICTORIYA REVZIN 2070 SKOKIE VALLEY RD HIGHLAND PARK 60035
Agent City	HIGHLAND PARK	Secretary Name & Address	VICTORIYA REVZIN SAME
Agent Zip	60035	Duration Date	PERPETUAL
Annual Report Filing Date	08/08/2017	For Year	2017

[Return to the Search Screen](#)

[Purchase Certificate of Good Standing](#)

(One Certificate per Transaction)

OTHER SERVICES

[File Annual Report](#)

[Adopting Assumed Name](#)

[Articles of Amendment Effecting A Name Change](#)

[Change of Registered Agent and/or Registered Office Address](#)

April 3, 2018

Village of Deerfield Planning Commission
c/o Dan Nakamura

Re: 464 and 502 Elm St.

My name is Steven Kahn. My wife and I purchased our home at 843 Brookside Lane in 2001. We picked our home based on its location in a single family home neighborhood and also based on the serene nature of the street-- namely, well-kept homes on a mature tree-lined street. Applicant's project as proposed will damage this neighborhood we call home.

Applicant has requested zoning changes and variances to build 8 single family homes on two combined lots where currently only 2 single family homes exist. First off, the combined property is 1.08 acres, yet the land area required by current zoning ordinance to build 8 single family homes would be 1.65 acres. This is a **35% deficiency**. The concept of the variance is to allow for a land owner to deviate from the promulgated ordinance where there is hardship not created by the land owner. Applicant cannot purchase 2 lots and then complain the zoning is causing him undue hardship. Applicant has chosen the number of units proposed and their size. The hardship is purely self-inflicted. It could not have been contemplated by the ordinance that such a substantial variance be so freely and easily granted.

Furthermore, Applicant's plans still do not meet even the R-5 zoning requirements for perimeter setback. Instead of the required 30' setback, applicant is proposing a variance to allow a 17.54' setback. This is nearly a **50% setback deficiency**. In other words, applicant is asking that the setback provisions, which are promulgated to ensure that new construction buildings do not tower over adjacent properties, are set aside so applicant can build its 30' high buildings closer to the neighboring properties than even the requested R-5 zoning would allow. Based on **angular distance**, it's as if Builder were building a **nearly 40' tall building**. At some point, the requested changes and variances, if granted, completely negate the purposes for the zoning requirements. I believe applicant's proposed plans more than surpass that point.

I am all for progress and renewal in our Village. There is, however, a point at which we would be trading the character and enjoyment of our neighborhood for the benefit of one builder who is trying to maximize his own profit. Further, by allowing such a gross variance to the zoning ordinance, neighboring home values will most likely be negatively affected.

For the above reasons, we respectfully request that the Planning Commission rejects applicant's project as proposed.

Sincerely,



Steven and Julie Kahn
843 Brookside Lane

APRIL 5, 2018

AS RESIDENTS OF 517 ELM STREET, DEERFIELD, IL...WE WOULD LIKE TO EXPRESS OUR REASONS FOR **NOT** ALLOWING R3 TO R5 ZONE CHANGE AT 464 AND 502 ELM STREET.

- 1) TOO DENSE OF BUILDINGS ON SUCH A SMALL PARCEL OF LAND
- 2) OVERFLOW OF TRAFFIC
 - a. STREET IS ALREADY OVERSATURATED WITH VEHICLES FROM THE PUBLIC WORKS TRACTORS / SEMI TRUCKS / EMERGENCY / POLICE / WATER TREATMENT PLANT
 - b. MORNING / AFTERNOON – PARENTS DROPPING / PICKING UP THEIR CHILDREN ONLY WAY IN AND OUT OF THE SCHOOL – VERY DIFFICULT TO EVEN GET OUT OF YOUR **OWN** DRIVEWAY.
 - c. AFTERSCHOOL CHILDREN WALK ON THE STREETS (NO SIDEWALKS) MAKING IT UNSAFE FOR THEM AND THE VEHICLES.
 - d. SPORTING AND COMMUNITY EVENTS AT BRICKYARD – ONLY WAY IN AND OUT
 - e. PATTY TURNER SENIOR CENTER – ALSO ONLY WAY IN AND OUT / ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC
 - f. ONGOING CONSTRUCTION FOR 12-18 MONTHS AT MINIMUM TO CREATE EVEN MORE CONGESTION, STRESS AND NOISE.
 - g. INCREASED WEAR AND TEAR ON THE ROAD WITH ADDITIONAL TRUCKS / TRACTORS / CONSTRUCTION VEHICLES – WHO PAYS FOR THE DAMAGED ROAD?
- 3) POTENTIAL FLOODING WITH THE WATER TANKS BEING STORED UNDERGROUND – STREET ALREADY LOW AND MANY YARDS AND BASEMENTS FLOOD ESPECIALLY WITH ALL THE RAIN PAST FEW YEARS – NO CURBS SO WATER WILL SEEP INTO OUTLYING NEIGHBORS PROPERTIES.
- 4) HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS – 30'-9" – WALL BLOCKING ALL THE BACKYARDS OF ADJACENT HOMES
 - a. NO PRIVACY FOR THOSE NEIGHBORS NOW HAVING NEW HOMES PEERING INTO THEIR YARDS – MINIMAL SET-BACKS GRANTED TO NEW PROJECT (WHY?)
 - b. DEFORESTATION OF ALL THE MATURE / HEALTHY TREES THAT ONCE WERE ON THE TWO PROPERTIES IS NOW AN OBSTRUCTION OF A WALL OF STONE (IT IS ALREADY A VILLAGE ORDINANCE TO MAINTAIN AS MANY MATURE / HEALTHY TREES AS POSSIBLE – WHY IS THIS PROJECT AN EXCEPTION?)
- 5) PROPERTY VALUES REDUCED OF ALL THE SURROUNDING HOMES
 - a. AVERAGE PRICE OF HOMES (300K – 450K) – TRYING TO PUT IN 10 HOMES AT (600K-700K)
 - i. NO ONE WILL WANT TO PURCHASE THE SURROUNDING HOMES DUE TO LACK OF PRIVACY

- ii. CONGESTION
 - iii. LESS CHANCE FOR YOUR PROPERTY VALUES TO INCREASE – SURROUNDING HOMES ARE NOW A BAD INVESTMENT FOR POTENTIAL BUYERS.
 - b. STRONG POTENTIAL FOR THE NEW DEVELOPMENT TO BECOME AND EYESORE FOR THE NEIGHBORHOOD
 - i. THE BUILDER WILL NOT DEVELOP BUILDING ON THE SLABS UNTIL THAT UNIT IS SOLD – POTENTIAL TO LOOK LIKE A CONSTRUCTION SITE FOR SEVERAL YEARS (BUILDER TO PUT FENCING AROUND THE UNBUILT SLABS) AGAIN WILL DETRACT FROM POTENTIAL BUYERS TO PURCHASE SURROUNDING HOMES
 - ii. AN EXAMPLE – TAYLOR JUNCTION – OF THE 9 UNITS – AT LEAST 4 OR MORE HAVE NOT BEEN PURCHASED / BUILT OVER A YEAR AGO
 - c. CHANGING A SINGLE-FAMILY HOME NEIGHBORHOOD INTO AN UNDESIRABLE MIXTURE AND INCOHESIVE AREA OF DEERFIELD
- 6) ISOLATED ZONING (454 ELM STREET)
- a. ONE SINGLE RESIDENCE IS NOW AN ISOLATED SINGLE-FAMILY HOME (R3)
 - b. THE DUPLEX ON THE CORNER SIDE OF THIS RESIDENCE IS BUILT AT A HEIGHT AND EXTERIOR FAÇADE TO RESEMBLE A SINGLE-FAMILY HOME AND THUS DOES NOT DETRACT FROM THE OVERALL NEIGHBORHOOD COHESIVENESS.
 - c. THE PROPOSED NEW DEVELOPMENT FAILS TO KEEP THE SINGLE-FAMILY HOME APPEARANCE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD
 - i. DUE TO THE MINIMAL SET-BACKS
 - ii. HEIGHT OF HOMES WITH GARAGES AS THEIR FIRST FLOOR (TOWNHOUSE LOOK NOT A SINGLE-FAMILY HOME)
 - iii. HEIGHTS OF EACH COMPLEX AND THE OVERALL DENSITY OF HOMES ON THE PROPERTIES.
 - d. SHOULD THIS BE ALLOWED TO MOVE FORWARD – WHAT WILL STOP OTHER DEVELOPERS FROM PURCHASING TWO HOMES IN ANY AREA OF DEERFIELD AND DESTROY ANY OTHER NEIGHBORHOOD? WOULD YOU WANT THIS IS YOUR BACKYARD?
- 7) NONE OF THE SURROUNDING NEIGHBORS WANT THIS DEVELOPMENT TO MOVE FORWARD – WE ELECT THE OFFICIALS OF OUR VILLAGE TO REPRESENT THE PEOPLE AND THE PEOPLE VOTE **“NO”** TO THIS PROPOSED OVERUSE OF THESE TWO RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.

WE APPRECIATE YOU READING OUR LIST OF REASONS WHY WE DO NOT WANT THIS PROJECT TO MOVE FORWARD IN OUR DEERFIELD NEIGHBORHOOD. WE WOULD WELCOME THE DEVELOPMENT OF SINGLE FAMILY HOMES ON THIS R3 ZONED PROPERTY.

THANK YOU,

SUSAN AND MICHAEL SANSWEET

March 21, 2018

Dear Larry Berg, *Larry*,

RE: Elm Street Development

First, let me thank you for volunteering to be on the Village Planning Commission. Not an easy job. I am writing in response to the new plan being submitted by Avanti for 464 and 502 Elm Street. It is encouraging to see they are proposing 2-Story, single family homes. It's discouraging to see that they are still being greedy and trying to cram 8 houses into space that will accommodate 5 homes based on current guidelines. They exceed the lot coverage rule by 50% (need 1.65 acres, they have 1.08). Not even close!

In addition, they are trying to build too close to all the lot lines.

- East set back: Required – 37' Plan – 14'
- North and South setback: Required -25' Plan - 17.54 (Bldg.) 14.06 (AC)
- West setback: Required - 25' Plan – 18.96

The builder could easily pass this plan if they would work within the rules and guidelines for new construction. 5 homes will fit nicely and allow for adequate green space.

Some smart people put together the rules and guidelines, so I hope the Village will support those rules and guidelines and make the builder reduce the size of his project.

Thank you for considering this request.

Jim & Nancy Couto
849 Brookside Lane
Deerfield, IL 60015



Dear Village of Deerfield Planning Commission,

April 4, 2017

On Tuesday evening, April 3rd, a small group of neighbors sat down with Gene Revsin of Avanti Construction to discuss his proposed development of 8 single family homes on the 1.08 acre of land at 464 and 502 Elm that he would like to see rezoned to R5 and is currently zoned as R3. Those attending this meeting received no handouts, plans, or written information of any kind to review further. I know these plans have been submitted to the Planning Commission, and I sincerely appreciate Dan Nakahara sending the plans out to us.

Avanti has consistently portrayed himself as an experienced contractor of Planned Unit Developments. In fact, at the pre-filing meeting back in July 2017, "Chairperson Pro Tem Jacoby asked where they have had other successful developments in the area. Mr. Revzin responded that he has completed two similar developments; one in Chicago and one in Park Ridge." Avanti has been asked about his experience many times over the course of meetings, workshops, and hearings in the past, and each time he has misled us to believe that Avanti Construction has overseen previous Planned Unit Developments. This is simply not true. The Hinkley Park Townhome Development in Park Ridge he referred to Tuesday evening was built by C3 (Chicago Condo Collection). I continue to question any other locations he has thrown out there, but Avanti cannot be found to have ever developed any PUD's or even single family homes. And after pointedly asking Mr. Revzin Tuesday evening for specific names and locations of his previous developments, he finally admitted that Avanti Construction Group was not the general contractor overseeing these developments, but instead was contracted to do work on those developments. I have done further research on his company that would shed even greater light on his background, and if you are interested, please do not hesitate to contact me.

This concerns me for two reasons: Lack of experience and forthcominess. Other major PUD's like this proposed plan in communities like Deerfield have been developed by major construction management companies with a long list of previous projects to back them up. I can't help but wonder to what extent anyone would go to when choosing a contractor to build a new home, but experience with similar projects and referrals would be at the top of the list. I would also look at the contractor's ability to effectively communicate with subcontractors, customers, and other involved parties, in this case the Village of Deerfield and the surrounding neighbors. Finally, I would ask if this contractor has a strong financial record and if there could be any economic hardship that may be a red flag to the success of the project and seeing it through to its end. Gene Revzin and "Avanti Construction Group", after thorough research and through his own admission, has quite possibly never constructed anything but kitchens. Is this really who we want starting his first major project in Deerfield? The surrounding neighbors definitely don't think so, and with the very real possibility of any number of issues arising from construction to eventual storm sewer and backyard flooding, I think Deerfield would not think so either.

The idea that a drastic change from grass to concrete will not produce serious runoff issues to the 7 foot lower elevation of the southwest corner of the property is alarming for those adjacent properties to the south and west. And those property owners have little faith in the proposed plan that "shows an overland flow path that would sufficiently carry any site runoff west to the school parking lot while not

impacting the nearby structures". The "overland flow path" is very concerning. I don't think this can be assured to not cause future flooding issues.

As part of a Preliminary Development Plan "the applicant is required to provide the development schedule and the list of variations including an explanation of the reasons for such variations". While I would very much like to be informed of a complete development schedule and plan (will these homes be built as they are sold?), I am most concerned with the latter. Why is Avanti asking for 8 single family homes to be built even when the plan far exceeds the zoning ordinance, particularly in regard to: minimum land area per dwelling unit (exceeds by 57%), and setbacks (exceeds by 30% and by 44% when including patio and A/C units), and lot coverage (exceeds by 5%)? I will share with you the reason Mr. Revzin gave us Tuesday evening: He (and I quote) "will take a financial loss if his development does not pass with at least 8 homes. Anything else would be a financial loss" for him.

The fact is: 8 single family homes squeezed onto this 1.08 acre of land is way too dense. Five homes would, in fact, fall within 97% of the minimum land area per dwelling unit requirement of 9,000 square feet per single family home, but this still would not be a feasible option for him to reap any financial gain. I do not believe, nor does any number of communities with variance definitions included in a PUD ordinance, financial hardship to be a reason for the variances Avanti is seeking. This economic hardship in itself should be a red flag for the project. Of course, I have no personal vendetta toward Mr. Revzin, after all, he is the one who came back with another excessive proposal to prolong this endeavor of his. I am simply more concerned with the community of Deerfield and the standards it has put forth in regard to rezoning and zoning ordinances. These have been put into place for good reason by the Village of Deerfield and I sincerely hope the planning commission adheres to these standards.

In summary, my concerns with the proposed development by Avanti are as follows:

- Lack of transparency and questions regarding honesty and experience
- Concerns with flooding, sewer, and drainage
- Density, lot coverage, setbacks, and other variances

Mr. Revzin's foot is just too big to fit into this glass slipper (aka 464/502 Elm).

Thank you for your time in considering my input when deciding how to vote on this proposal.

Sincerely,

Linda Vaananen



Village of Deerfield Plan Commission
850 Waukegan Road
Deerfield, IL 60015

April 5, 2018

Dear Chairman Berg and Village of Deerfield Plan Commissioners:

I am a Deerfield homeowner on Brookside Lane, where my family and I have lived for over 17 years. I am writing to ask you to vote against the current resolution to re-zone the two properties on 464 and 502 Elm Street. The builders are seeking to build 8 large homes averaging 2,650 sq. feet, squeezing a project that is far too dense onto a lot zoned and intended for two homes.

In addition to the same drainage concerns voiced by your panel and concerned neighbors at the November meeting, and in addition to the removal of all existing mature trees as well as ongoing fire and safety concerns, the new plan is still TOO DENSE! Eight single-family homes on property zoned for TWO! Sixteen additional parking spaces in addition to 8 two-car garages! This is basically a parking lot surrounded by 8 homes that are pushed back beyond the required perimeter limits. All of this squeezed onto just over 1 acre. Members of your own commission agreed at the recent pre-filing conference that density is still a serious concern. I was there in attendance, and was glad to hear their agreement and support for our cause.

Let's take a moment to look at the excesses the builders are requesting:

1. **Minimum Land Area Per Dwelling Unit:** Avanti's current plan *requires* 72,000 ft. or 1.62 acres. All they are allowed (all they have) for their 1.08 acres is 46,848 ft. Their plan exceeds village ordinance by 53%!
2. **Front Setback:** Avanti are *required* to build 37 feet back from front property line on Elm. This is based upon the average setback of other homes on Elm. Avanti are asking variance to build a mere 14.5 feet from the east property line on Elm Street. Drive by the property and imagine two homes 14' from the property line!
3. **Perimeter Setbacks:** Avanti are *required* to have 25 ft. setbacks on the north and south sides of the property. They are asking for a variance of 17.5 feet. The patios and air conditioning units bring the setback to around 14'.
4. **Maximum Lot Coverage:** Avanti's maximum lot coverage *cannot* exceed 30%. They are asking for 35%.)

Why would the Village allow this flagrant exception to the rules allowing a builder to stuff such a large product onto such a small property?

Please consider the property rights of we, the dozens and dozens of neighborhood homeowners who have voiced our opposition, signed petitions, organized community informational gatherings, attended plan commission meetings in force, and remained vigil for months and months.

The builder has stated that he cannot build less than 8 homes on the property for fear of a financial loss. **Financial Hardship is NO REASON for the Village to waive the builder's obligations to conform to the limitations of our Village ordinances.**

Deerfield is going through some transitions, that is for sure. The Village is on the right track to consider the development of new condos and townhomes near the Metra Station on Lake/Cook Road. That is an area appropriate for new growth. *Not* appropriate for consideration is an oversized re-zoning project that is strongly opposed by the entire single-home community on Elm and the surrounding neighborhood. More than 260 petitioners agreed.

Please help us turn down this proposal in its current form and demand that the builder scale back his project to fit within the margins established in our Village of Deerfield ordinances. That's why we have them. That's why we have you.

Thank you,

Bill Vaananen



From: WENDY OLMEN
To: [Daniel Nakahara](#)
Subject: 464-502 Elm St
Date: Wednesday, April 4, 2018 3:39:41 PM

To: Village of Deerfield | Plan Commission

From: Stan & Wendy Olmen 454 Elm Street Deerfield

Re: AVANTI

Construction 464-502 ELM ST

April 4, 2018

We want to first extend our thanks once again, for allowing us opportunity to tell The Commission our thoughts, concerning the proposed Elm Street Development by Avanti Construction Group.

Last night, Avanti invited the neighbors immediately adjacent to the property boundaries, for the neighbor outreach meeting. We all appreciated Gene Revzin's time and efforts, and talks went as expected. After over 2 hours of thorough discussion, the neighbors agreed that Single Family Two Story Homes is the right land use for the parcels, but it was also a collective consensus, that 8 homes on 1.08 Acres is simply not enough available space to build on.

Mr. Revzin feels it's a financial hardship for him to build less than 8 houses. Mr. Revzin further stated that his only recourse would be to continue renting out 464 & 502, for the unforeseeable future. We explained that while we do understand his plight, we can't say yes, to the construction of 8 homes and the variances needed for it, above and beyond a fair and responsible percentage.

If allowed to build this R5 PUD, Avanti will leave us all to live with the residual effects and impact, to our very well known corridors of Elm Street, Brookside and Cambridge Ct.

Thank you all, for your time.

Stanley & Wendy Olmen

From: Amy
To: [Daniel Nakahara](#)
Cc: cdsander@yahoo.com
Date: Thursday, April 5, 2018 1:27:12 PM

Daniel,

My name is Amy Sanders. I live at 512 Cambridge Circle. I am opposed to the current Avanti plan for Elm Street. Please share my email with the board members. The variances and density requested is too much for the two single family properties. Further, this is not in keeping with the intent (or letter) of the comprehensive plan.

Thanks,

Amy

Sent from my iPhone

From: Casey Personal
To: [Daniel Nakahara](#)
Subject: Elm Street properties
Date: Thursday, April 5, 2018 4:29:55 PM

Daniel,

My name is Casey Sanders, and I live at 512 Cambridge Cir. My wife and I are both opposed to the Avanti plan for 464-502 Elm Street. Please share my thoughts with the Board members.

The proposed plan for the Elm Street properties does not fit with our neighborhood and also violates the village zoning ordinances. The plan asks for both rezoning to R-5 and then includes variances from the requirements of that zoning. To begin with, it asks for significant setback variances on all four sides of the property. The buildings toward the north, west, and south side of the property would be too close to other properties in the area. The east side would require a setback for the front yard that would put it too close to the street and would look out of place compared to the average setback of other properties on Elm.

I also have concerns about the drainage on the property in the proposal. The amount of green space lost on the property would not just be the footprint of the buildings, but it would be lost in all of the driveway space being paved. The drainage proposals seek to use existing drains and add underground measures to mitigate effects of drainage issues. I think the effects of drainage issues will be magnified by the lack of green space in the middle of the property causing more drainage and flooding issues for neighbors in surrounding properties. Based on the size of the property, a single rainfall of more than 1.15 inches would have the same volume of water in cubic feet as the capacity of the underground system in the proposal. That happened 9 times just in the last year.

There are just too many problems in their proposal to support it. All of our ordinances are there for a reason. We must adhere to these if we want to preserve the way our neighborhoods in Deerfield look and feel to the families that live here. Please vote no to the request to rezone.

Thank you,
Casey Sanders

From: Neil Hurley
To: [Daniel Nakahara](#)
Subject: Avanti 464 and 502 Elm Street Proposal
Date: Thursday, April 5, 2018 8:43:53 AM

Village of Deerfield Plan Commission
850 Waukegan Road
Deerfield, IL 60015

April 5, 2018

Dear Chairman Berg and Village of Deerfield Plan Commissioners:

We are Deerfield homeowners on Brookside Lane. We are writing to ask you to vote against the current resolution to re-zone the two properties on 464 and 502 Elm Street. The builders are seeking to build 8 large homes averaging 2,650 sq. feet, squeezing a project that is far too dense onto a lot zoned and intended for two homes.

In addition to the same drainage concerns voiced by your panel and concerned neighbors at the November meeting, and in addition to the removal of all existing mature trees as well as ongoing fire and safety concerns, the new plan is still TOO DENSE! Eight single-family homes on property zoned for TWO! Sixteen additional parking spaces in addition to 8 two-car garages! This is basically a parking lot surrounded by 8 homes that are pushed back beyond the required perimeter limits. All of this squeezed onto just over 1 acre. Members of your own commission agreed at the recent pre-filing conference that density is still a serious concern.

This development will greatly impact our neighborhood, not only directly on Elm St, but also on Brookside Ln, Cambridge Circle and Grove Street. We believe that the density of the development is not in keeping with the general character of the area.

We are still also concerned how the additional traffic by this development would affect the safety of the area. A large number of students from the Junior High regularly use Elm Street as their exit path from school and to the downtown businesses.

Please consider the property rights of us, the dozens and dozens of neighborhood homeowners who have voiced our opposition, signed petitions, organized community informational gatherings, attended plan commission meetings in force, and remained vigil for months and months.

The builder has stated that he cannot build less than 8 homes on the property for fear of a financial loss. **Financial Hardship is NO REASON for the Village to waive the builder's obligations to conform to the limitations of our Village ordinances.**

Please help us turn down this proposal in its current form and demand that the builder scale back his project to fit within the margins established in our Village of Deerfield ordinances. That's why we have them. That's why we have you.

Thank you,

Neil & Joanna Hurley
906 Brookside Ln
Deerfield, IL 60015

April 5, 2018

To the Deerfield Plan Commission members,

Concerning the proposed development of 464/502 Elm Street by Avanti:

We want to state our opposition to the new plan for the development; we have lived on the north side of the property in question for 25 years. Two-story, single-family homes are an improvement and would be a welcome addition to our block, but ONLY if they were built within the established zoning parameters. At eight homes, this plan is so far over the required land use percentage and needs large variances on the boundaries, proving that it is much too dense for the parcel of land.

We are also concerned about a construction timeline and the real possibility of living next to a construction site for several years (if homes are built as they are sold). That might work in empty new development sites, but not between two single-family homes on an established block.

As it is, the properties in question are not being cared for in a considerate, responsible fashion, so that gives us pause as to how a construction site might be run and the impact that could have on all of us that border this area, for the long haul.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of our concerns, as well as those of many others around our neighborhood.

Joe & Allyson Scopelliti
514 Elm Street

From: Ed & Maria Uyehara
To: [Daniel Nakahara](#)
Subject: 464/502 Elm Street
Date: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:33:57 AM

Hi Dan

We are residents at 865 Brookside Lane that will be affected by Avanti's building plan on said properties.

Avanti's statement of building less than 8 homes for fear of financial loss will be the existing home owners loss if their plan is approved.

Why should they be given waivers on property variances that leads to high density at our expense.

We spent lots of money recently to have our back property filled & sodded to control flooding due to water coming down from the Elm street area.
Even with this, we still have flooding.

With Avanti's proposal our problem will be worse.

Thank you for your consideration,

Ed & Maria Uyehara