

PLAN COMMISSION  
VILLAGE OF DEERFIELD

The Plan Commission of the Village of Deerfield held a Workshop Meeting at 7:30 P.M. on May 14, 2015 at the Village Hall, 850 Waukegan Road, Deerfield, Illinois.

Mr. Ryckaert asked for roll call and noted that there is a quorum. He asked for a motion for a Chairman Pro Tem. Commissioner Bromberg motioned to have Commissioner Oppenheim be Chairman ProTem for meeting. Commissioner Berg seconded the motion.

Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim called the meeting to order.

Present were: Mary Oppenheim, Chairman Pro Tem  
Larry Berg  
Alan Bromberg  
Elaine Jacoby  
Mary Oppenheim  
Stuart Shayman

Absent were: Jim Moyer

Also present: Jeff Ryckaert, Principal Planner  
Dan Nakahara, Associate Planner

Public Comment on a Non-Agenda Item

No public comment

Chairman Pro-Tem Oppenheim began the meeting by explaining the purpose of a pre-filing conference and the land use issues which would be presented in this meeting. The land issues are a re-zoning, an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and a residential planned unit development (PUD) to permit a workforce housing development at 10 Deerfield Road.

Chairman Pro-Tem Oppenheim explained that this pre-filing conference is the first step in this land use process. She clarified that the Plan Commission does not make a decision on the petition during a pre-filing conference meeting. She noted that due to the interest in this subject the meeting was being televised and streamed live on the Village's website. The broadcast of the meeting would also be available to view on the Village website after the meeting. Chairman Pro-Tem Oppenheim explained that the pre-filing conference is for the petitioner to get feedback from the Plan Commission in preparation for a formal proposal at a public hearing. She noted that the petitioner is required to notify its neighbors within 500 feet of the subject property due to the request for a height variation. Chairman Pro Tem also commented that all plans, correspondence and staff memos regarding this development would be available on the Village's website. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim explained the land use process going

forward and noted that the Plan Commission is a recommending body and the final approval will come from the Village Board of Trustees.

Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim gave some background on the petition by noting that a proposal was discussed in principle in a Committee of the Whole meeting in December 2014. At that point the Village Board agreed the proposal was worth pursuing but it did not approve any plans. Since then the developer has worked with Village engineering staff to see if this was a viable plan before it went to the design phase. The plans for this proposal were sent to the Plan Commission last Friday, and last Friday was the first time the Commission was able to review the plan as well as any correspondence that was sent to the Plan Commission as of 4:00 pm. today (May 14). The Village of Deerfield does endorse workforce housing in its Comprehensive Plan. She noted that currently 4% of the housing stock in Deerfield is affordable. She went on to say that the purpose of the pre-filing conference was not to debate the development, but rather to look at the land use issues for this particular proposal.

Steve Friedland, attorney, introduced the proposed the 48-unit residential development, Zion Woods at 10 Deerfield Road. He introduced the development team consisting of Zion Lutheran Church, Brinshore Development, and the Housing Opportunity Development Corporation (HODC). Mr. Friedland introduced Pastor David Kylo and Sue Lindsley, Zion Lutheran Church, David Brint and Dawni Freeman, Brinshore Development, Richard Koenig and Rachel Hoteling, HODC, Matt Wylie & Mark Purrucci, Eckenhauf Saunders Architects, Barb Rosborough, Rosborough Partners, Laura Schafer and Ryan Hoffer, V3. The team rose to be sworn in.

David Brint, Brinshore Development, noted that they have built 50 developments similar to what is being proposed and commented that they all have been successful. He also commented that affordable housing is their specialty. Mr. Brint referenced similar developments on his visual presentation.

Richard Koenig, Executive Director, HODC, stated that HODC is a non-profit organization dedicated to creating affordable housing in the northern suburbs. HODC has been around since 1983 and they have done 20 developments in the northern suburbs including some small homes in Deerfield and act as the property manager in the senior housing development in Deerfield, One Deerfield Place. He noted that they will begin construction on a similar 13-unit development on Monday, May 18, 2015.

Matt Wylie, architect, Eckenhoff Saunders Architects, commented that his firm, established in 1983, has worked in a variety of markets such as healthcare, housing, education and other institutions. Some of their work includes Highland Park Hospital, Glenbrook and Evanston Hospital.

Pastor David Kylo, pastor of Zion Lutheran Church noted that their mission, like those of other houses of worship, is to help people recognize the gifts of God and to use those gifts for self and others. Pastor Kylo noted that they own just over 8 acres and they have the opportunity to show love and care for others by providing affordable housing.

Why now? Pastor Kylo commented that Zion Lutheran Evangelical Church believe that they can do more than just reside in a church on this property. The idea to provide affordable housing was one that came internally and not externally. A committee was formed to consider options of what to do with the property. One option was to sell off the land and purchase another house of worship property in the area. This attempt was unsuccessful. Zion decided to keep their land and consider options with what they could do with their property. Pastor Kylo noted that they feel very much a part of the community and looked for the right group when they decided to provide affordable housing knowing what was at stake for themselves and their neighbors. He commented that they wanted to work, through God's hands, in the best possible way with the greatest stewardship of work. This venture they chose is to build affordable housing for those people who work in our community and for those who want to live in our wonderful community. These are service people who have difficulty paying for a place to live in Deerfield. He continued that they feel led by the Lord to be good stewards hoping to see this project go forward. This project will not be for transients, indigent, homeless, subsidized or section 8 housing rather it is for affordable housing. Pastor Kylo commented that the church believes in this community and it is the church's mission to serve not only their church community but also the community beyond the church walls. Pastor Kylo noted that they have worked hard to be a faith community and want to show other's what they believe. Pastor Kylo respectfully requested that the Plan Commission consider their proposal.

Dawni Freeman, Vice President, Senior Development Manager, Brinshore Development, explained that their proposed project Zion Woods is a 48 unit residential housing development with three identical 2-story, 16 unit buildings. There will be a mix of 1 bedroom (12 units), 2 bedroom (24 units) and 3 bedroom (12 units) apartments. The units range in size from 680 to 1,125 square feet. The unit amenities will focus on energy efficiency and have in-unit washer and dryer facilities. The development will be designed to achieve the Enterprise Green Community Certification which is like LEED Certification for affordable housing projects. Brinshore builds the majority of their projects with Enterprise Green Community Certification. The amenities for the project will include a community room, on-site management office, playground, bicycle parking, garden plots for residents, picnic area and walking trails around naturally landscaped storm water facilities.

Mr. Koenig summarized a market study which outlined the demand for affordable housing in this area. He noted that the average purchase price for a home is nearly \$500K, the annual average income is over \$120K, however there are a number of families living in Deerfield that pay too much in housing costs. The standard is that people should not pay more than 30% of their annual income for housing costs at any particular price point. According to statistics, nearly half of the renters and nearly 35% of homeowners in Deerfield pay too much in housing for all types. Commissioner Bromberg asked where these statistics come from. Mr. Koenig noted that the statistics came from 2010 Census data. Mr. Koenig also commented that based on the income levels nearly 1,100 current Deerfield households would qualify (based on their income level) for housing in the proposed development. Also, there are currently 11,000 jobs in

Deerfield and the surrounding area in which their income would qualify the workers for the housing in the proposed development. He added that nearly a third of the jobs are retail and essential jobs in Deerfield with 70% of those workers commuting from over 10 miles away and 25% of those workers commuting from over 25 miles away. Mr. Koenig noted that this may not seem like a far commute but it is a lot for someone not making a large income. He also commented that there are many advantages and benefits to workers living in appropriately priced housing in the community that they work in.

Mr. Koenig stated that the financing used to provide the proposed units at their price points have strict income maximums. The incomes for this development are based on the median income in the Chicago metropolitan area. The median income for a family of 4 in the Chicago metropolitan area is \$76K a year. There are income limits based on the family size that restrict who can live in this development. Mr. Koenig referenced a one-person household would have an income limit of \$32K, two-person household-\$36K, three-person household – less than \$40K and a four-person household less than \$45K. Rents for a 1 bedroom would be \$600-\$700, 2 bedrooms would be \$700-\$800 and 3 bedrooms would be \$900-1000 per month. Mr. Koenig noted that the average rent in Deerfield is approximately \$1,700 per month which would demand an income of \$67K a year based on the rent being 30% of income. He commented that they are creating an opportunity for those who would otherwise not be able to live in a good housing in an area with good schools, services and job opportunities. Potential renters of this development could be seniors on fixed incomes who already live here, grew up here and want to stay, people who have gone through career changes, marital changes, medical changes, recent college graduates who grew up in the area, or disabled people (units will be accessible) on a limited income. As mentioned earlier, this development will be for essential workers who work in the community.

Commissioner Shayman asked what would happen to renters if their situation changes and they exceed the income limits. Mr. Koenig commented that potential workers go through an extensive application process including a background check. He noted that income levels are based on 60% of the Chicago metropolitan area median income, and once a renter exceeds 100% of the median income (based on the Chicago metropolitan area) the rent structure changes and the renter will begin to pay rents closer to market rate levels. Commissioner Bromberg asked if renters have to submit tax return information each year. Mr. Koenig noted that the potential renters go through an income qualifying process and income is checked from paystubs and bank statements. Commissioner Bromberg asked if there is a maximum limit on how many people are allowed in each unit. Mr. Koenig noted that the maximum is based on local codes, in this case based on Deerfield Municipal Code the maximum allowed is 2 people per bedroom in an apartment unit.

Mr. Friedland stated that they will be requesting a zoning amendment from R-1 to R-5 zoning with a request for a Planned Unit Development (PUD), a request to amend the Comprehensive Plan to multi-family use and a request for a 2-lot subdivision of the property with the church and the residential component being its own parcels. The subdivision would be for the PUD, but for financial and other purposes the residential

development would have to be its own separate parcel. Mr. Friedland also noted that as a PUD, the proposed development will be requesting variation for a building height of 38' (35' required maximum in a PUD) and for a structure being in the perimeter setback (in this case any structure within 33 ft of the property line). Mr. Friedland noted that they will also be requesting a 2 faced sign on the property which will need approval from the Plan Commission. Commissioner Berg asked if the church was the only structure in the perimeter setback and if the church would own both properties if it is subdivided. Mr. Friedland commented that the church was the only building structure in the perimeter setback and stated that the church would own both properties. He added that there would be a ground lease for the residential component.

Dawni Freeman summarized the background of the development noting that a conceptual plan was presented to the Committee of the Whole on December 15, 2014 with three different site plans with three different configurations of buildings. Based on feedback from that meeting the petitioner came up with a site plan that was presented to a group of Zion Lutheran Church's neighbors on February 23, 2015. The petitioner gathered a lot of feedback from the neighbor meeting and attempted to incorporate those concerns into their current site plan. Ms. Freeman noted that they intend to have future meetings with the residents to continue to address concerns as the development evolves throughout this process.

The main areas of concerns that the petitioner has heard have dealt with where the buildings were located on the site, landscaping and buffering, parking configuration, traffic generated from the development, storm water management, overall density, long term property management of the development, taxes, and the impact that the development will have on the school district. Ms. Freeman noted that they have worked hard to address these concerns. She noted that they have moved the building as far east as they are able without impeding on an existing sewer line on the property. The petitioner is not building in the flood way providing a much greater buffer with the homes on Heather Road. The picnic area was moved farther to the east on the site, the parking area has been reconfigured and enlarged and they have heightened the landscape buffer to provide more screening and privacy for the neighbors as well as the residents. A traffic and parking study was done by V3 to address the traffic and parking concerns and the petitioner has engaged V3 to handle the engineering of the site. The petitioner has been working with the Village Engineering department and planning staff to come up with a come up with engineering solutions to manage the storm water on site in a cost effective way that makes sense for everyone. The Engineering Department has come up with a topographic survey of the site and the river. The survey measures the river bank height and the depth of the river. The petitioner has evaluated the number of units being proposed on the site but consider 6 units per acre (under what is allowed in the R-5 zoning district) are reasonable for the site. The petitioner decided to keep the originally proposed unit mix and noted that reducing the size of the development does not further the mission of the church. She added that reducing the number of units will not make it financially feasible to have on-site management on the property. Ms. Freeman commented that having on-site management is very important to Brinshore's development philosophy.

The petitioner has hired Jim Watts, Leasing and Management who will be the third party property management provider. This company does the majority of the Brinshore development portfolio, have been in business for 35 years and currently lease over 4,000 units. There will be a full-time person to manage the property on-site. In regards to the maximum occupants in a unit, Ms. Freeman noted that that they manage their properties very carefully and with the type of financing that they will be using the units will be extensively inspected. She also noted that there are a variety of options available to ensure the maximum occupancy limit is enforced.

Ms. Freeman stated that the proposed development will be subject to pay property taxes and will be taxed in Lake County. As part of the submission for a public hearing the petitioner will include a tax impact report to note the impact that they will have on the community and show that they will be paying their share in taxes.

Ms. Freeman commented that there has been a lot of concern on how this development will impact the schools. She noted that they do not know how many children will be in their development, but they do know that the children will be spread among all grade levels and with twelve 1-bedroom units they do not believe it will impact the schools. She added that they have consulted with the superintendents of both Deerfield School Districts 109 and 113 and they have ensured the petitioner that the schools are not overcrowded nor are they at capacity. Ms. Freeman commented that they have written documentation from both superintendents to this effect and noted that Superintendent of District 113 commented that Deerfield High School has a student capacity of 2,200 and current enrollment is 1,626 students. Both superintendents expressed support this project. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim noted that for the Public Hearing the petitioner should include in their submittal written documentation to that effect from the school superintendents.

Ms. Freeman stated that this development will pay property taxes to all the taxing bodies including the school districts as well as the Villages impact fees required of all development in the Village. The impact fees benefit the schools, park district, library and the fire protection district. Ms. Freeman commented that they are trying to address the concerns from their first community meeting and they intend to continue to have community meetings throughout the public process.

Peter Reinhofer, Civil Engineer, V3 Companies, noted his 17 years traffic evaluation experience. Brinshore has retained V3 Companies to conduct a traffic impact study on the local road networks for the proposed housing development on the Zion Lutheran Church property. V3 followed all typical industry standards for traffic studies, trip generation, trip rate, as well as Village of Deerfield and IDOT analysis criteria. Existing traffic data was conducted at the Deerfield Road/Heather Road intersection and the existing church driveway on March 26, 2015. Mr. Reinhofer noted that they made sure that all the traffic counts were conducted while all of the schools were in session. Current daily traffic on Deerfield Road according to IDOT is 22,400 vehicles per day. Mr. Reinhofer commented that typically a roadway like Deerfield Road can

accommodate 30,000 to 35,000 vehicles per day. Peak hour data was collected from 7:00AM to 9:00AM and from 4:00PM – 6:00PM to collect commuter traffic along Deerfield Road, Heather Road and the existing church driveway. Existing conditions and future projections were evaluated for 5 years into the future (without the proposed development) and calculated the amount of trips generated by the 48 units being proposed in the development. The study calculated that 24 new trips per hour would be generated in the morning between 7:00AM-9:00AM and 30 new trips per hour between the hours of 4:00PM-6:00PM would be generated in the evening. The trips would be evenly distributed (east of site and west of site). When the new trips generated were added to the future volumes of traffic, the proposed development will be adding 13 new trips on Deerfield Road in the morning east of the site, and 16 vehicle trips east of the site in the evening. Mr. Reinhofer also noted that an existing Pace bus route along Deerfield Road travels between the Deerfield and the Highland Park Metra Stations providing transportation opportunities for residents.

Mr. Reinhofer commented that after analyzing the future trip generation and the future traffic volumes on Deerfield Road, the existing roadway system will be able to handle the additional traffic generated by this development. The signalized intersection of Deerfield Road and Heather Road and the unsignalized intersection of Deerfield Road and Zion Church driveway will operate at an acceptable rate of service with the addition of the development trips. Mr. Reinhofer commented that the Deerfield Road/Heather Road signalized light is an actuated signalized light which means that the more cars traveling along Deerfield Road will trigger more green time needed for Deerfield Road and actually slightly decrease the delays on Deerfield Road. The minor traffic movements on Heather and Carlisle Road will get less green time than Deerfield Road and delays will actually increase for these traffic movements.

Mr. Reinhofer noted that there were comments regarding the curve along Deerfield Road and the site does meet industry standards for stopping sight distance meaning there is adequate distance for a car going west to stop if a car pulls out of the Zion Church driveway. Mr. Reinhofer did receive traffic reports (2012 to current) from the Deerfield Police Department on this stretch of Deerfield Road and there were no traffic accidents from the Zion driveway or the intersections to the east. Mr. Reinhofer commented that they will request traffic data from Highland Park to determine if there where traffic accidents east of the site. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim asked if it was possible to assess the impact of this development on the access points to the east specifically, Carriage Way and a few driveways that come out of developments in Highland Park on the north side of the road. Mr. Reinhofer commented that typically for a development of this size and with the number of trips generated they would look at just the subject driveway to make sure that vehicles could go in and out of the development safely. In this case, V3 included the signalized intersection to identify the impact of this development would have. The study area can be extended to include other intersections. Mr. Reinhofer commented that a study area of a development of this size would not have an extended study area is because it is not generating a lot of traffic. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim would also like to see what the parking and

traffic impact would be on Sundays for the congregants going into and out of the site along with the residents.

Commissioner Shayman asked how long it will take for a vehicle to turn left out of the property. Mr. Reinhofer noted that it would be approximately 19 seconds during both the morning and evening peak hours and entering eastbound into the site would be approximately 10-12 seconds of average delay for the average vehicle.

Laura Schafer, Project Manager, V3 Companies summarized the engineering of the site. She explained that the flood way area on the site will not be touched and nothing will be built in the flood way nor will they change the characteristics of the river or the flood way. The 100 year flood plain makes up most of the property and the proposed buildings will be built in the eastern area of the site. There will be a storm water detention area at the south east portion of the site and they will follow Village and County regulations make sure that any additional volume of water that is generated from the hard areas on the site will be slowed down and released from the site at a controlled rate that won't cause flooding. Ms. Schafer noted that because they are raising a part of the area in the flood plain to build their buildings they will have a compensatory storage facility at the north end of the property. They will be providing a 120% of the volume of water for each foot in the flood plain that they will be filling.

Commissioner Jacoby asked how deep the basin would be. Ms. Schafer noted that they will be approximately 6 feet deep but on your every day basis the facilities are not designed to be a wet pond but more of a naturalized area. Ms. Schafer explained that the intent of a detention facility is to slow down the water on the site, catch it and release it at a controlled rate as required by the county and the Village. She commented that compensatory storage provides an area for water to go in the flood plain when an area in the flood plain is being built up. Building the compensatory storage facility and building in the flood plain will bring the area that the building is being built in, out of the flood plain. This will require a remap of the area through a letter of map revision with FEMA. Ms. Schafer commented that they will provide more storage than what will be filled in the flood plain. She reiterated that they are not changing the elevation just moving where the water would flood the site.

Commissioner Bromberg asked if the facility to the north would be wet. Ms. Schafer commented that the basin will hold water for 24-72 hours and draw down depending on the storm event, but would not typically sit there for any length of time. Commissioner Jacoby asked if this will have an affect on the river. Ms. Shaffer commented that this should not affect the river because they are not building in the flood way.

Commissioner Berg asked if the flood zone will be amended with the result of this work and will it add any new flood plain. Ms. Schafer stated that they will go through the county and FEMA to get a letter of map revision so that the buildings are out of the flood plain. She added that they will not be adding any new flood plain but moving the flood plain on the site. She clarified that the compensatory storage facility will be in the flood plain. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim asked what the slope would be for the detention



basin and the compensatory storage facility. Ms. Shaffer commented that the slope will be a 4:1 or 5:1 slope (4 or 5 feet for every one foot slope) and they have tried to pull the area back so there is no immediate drop in depth. The slope would not be terraced but done with soil. Commissioner Shayman asked if the compensatory storage facility will back up to the neighbors to the northeast. Ms. Schafer noted that the compensatory storage will back up to the neighboring lots to the west, but did not have the exact measurement of distance. Commissioner Shayman asked how this will affect the neighboring properties and flooding. Ms. Schafer noted that they are not changing any grade to the neighboring properties to the west. She commented that most of the properties flow from the west to the east and actually flows onto the Zion property. The development will not block any of the neighbors flow and the petitioner will have to figure out a way to convey the water coming onto the Zion property from the west. Drainage characteristics will not be changed to the properties to the north as well. Ms. Schafer commented that if water flows on to the Zion property it will continue to flow onto the Zion property. Ms. Schafer explained the drainage of the compensatory storage facility. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim asked how long it would take to construct the detention basin and compensatory storage facility. Ms. Schafer commented that it would probably take a couple of months depending on the weather and the staging of the project.

Ms. Schafer went through the other utilities to the site noting that each building will have a sanitary connection and the water line will be looped on the site. She also commented that they would be coordinating with the Village on the future reconstruction of Deerfield Road as to minimally impact any of those new improvements by coordinating the tie-ins to the water main and the location of the driveway.

Mr. Wylie went through the parking requirements noting that the required parking for the church and the residential uses are 156 required parking spaces. The site will have 159 parking spaces, 10 of which will be accessible spaces.

Mr. Wylie commented that the existing lot is surface draining and as part of the detention improvements to the south of the site there will be catch basins and piping that will get the water straight away without having to drain all the way across the property.

Mr. Wylie described the architecture of the building commenting that this development is what has evolved from the meeting with the trustees and the neighbors. There will be three structures, each approximately 160 feet in length with the exception of the south building which has the management office, bike room community room and small storage space. The buildings have been pushed as far east on the site as possible without going into the floodway. He noted that this was how the homes to the east of the subject property were most likely built out of the floodway. The buildings will be near the parking lot with sidewalks on either side of the parking lot. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim asked if there was any thought of having pervious paving to improve of the drainage of the site. Mr. Wylie commented that the funding mechanisms for this site made it difficult them to afford pervious paving.

There will be a small playground for younger children and picnic areas with grills and fire pit that will be relocated from the north end of the site. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim commented that the service drive was in the perimeter setback and whether or not the service drive is necessary. Mr. Wylie commented that there has been no discussion to remove the service drive. In the past the service drive has served as some relief to exit the property due to the parking configuration. The service drive is used to deliver caskets but is not heavily used. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim noted that they may want to consider removing this road as it is in the perimeter setback, it is more impervious surface and by removing the road it may provide more screening for the neighbors. Staff noted the turnaround of the new parking lot is also in the perimeter setback. Mr. Wylie noted that the sidewalk portion of the turnaround is 31' from the west property line making it in the setback. They may be able to move the turnaround so that it is out of the setback.

Mr. Wylie went through the building floor plans noting that the floor plans are essentially identical with the exception of the south building having the management office, bike and general storage. Each floor of the buildings will 8 units with a mixture of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units. The buildings have a shift in the building wall to break up the massing of the building and simulate a residential scale. Commissioner Shayman asked how many units are accessible. Mr. Wylie noted that 10% of the units are required to be accessible but there are other levels of accessibility in the other units. Mr. Wylie went through the other levels of accessibility noting that there may be a need for these types of units as they were identified in their summary. There will be some units that will be designed for a person who have sight or hearing disability. The balance of the units will all have several elements of universal design. The buildings will have a gabled roof similar to the adjacent homes on Heather Road. Mr. Wylie noted that they are trying to fit their building the best that they can into the surrounding area.

Mr. Wylie presented the building elevations noting that the front entry of the building will be 33 feet high to the ridge of the roof. As discussed earlier, Village ordinance measures the height of a building from the predevelopment grade and the property slopes down to the east. From the east, the property is taller thus requiring a height variation. The building envelope is face brick, no maintenance fiber cement siding which is more durable and easier to maintain. The roof will be asphalt shingle. There will be a little board and batten siding at the entryways as an accent. Commissioner Jacoby asked how many people will be working in the management office. The petitioner indicated that there would be one person working in the management office. Mr. Wylie also commented that final placement of the air conditioning units has not been determined but they are looking at different options. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim suggested that they consider the east side of the building to cut down on noise to the neighbors to the west. Mr. Wylie pointed out that the proposed buildings will have similar building elements as the existing church. Mr. Wylie displayed a northwest aerial view of the site and the proposed buildings noting that they intend to have the public enjoy the site with a possible public overlook of the native plantings in the detention area and a proposed gravel trail along the east side of the property. Mr. Wylie

displayed the color palate being proposed for the buildings showing the cohesiveness with the existing church building and the residential scale of the building. They will be proposing the lighting, light shielding and photometric detail for the public hearing. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim noted that the timing of the lighting will need to be specified for the public hearing. Building lighting will be for resident security and convenience.

Mark Purrucci, architect, Eckenhoff Saunders Architects, presented on life safety and fire protection. The building will be compliant with building code requirements, be fully sprinkled and have smoke detectors. He noted that the Deerfield Fire Department has reviewed the site plan and has issued a letter commenting that they have no initial problems with their plan but require that the building be fully sprinkled and have a smoke detection system. He indicated the locations of the fire hydrants on the site. The site has been approved for emergency vehicle accessibility. The Deerfield Police Department has reviewed the plan and do not have any initial comments at this time. The Police Department did not have any policing concerns and mentioned that this project will be similar to other residential areas that they already police. Mr. Purrucci indicated that refuse and recycling will be serviced through two trash enclosures on the site. The enclosures will be fully enclosed and match the proposed buildings materials. Residents will bring their trash and recycling to the trash enclosures. There will not be any trash compactors. Commissioner Shayman asked if there will be garbage disposals. Mr. Purrucci did not think so but will confirm that this will be the case.

Mr. Purrucci noted that their proposed signage will be located 25 feet from the south property line and is being proposed for the east side of the entry drive. The proposed double faced sign will have a total sign face of 54 square feet (27 square foot on each sign face) and be externally illuminated. The lighting source for the sign is intended to be screened with vegetation and landscaping. The sign will be larger than the allowed 27 square foot maximum and require a variation. The petitioner felt that this development would be best served with a sign that was perpendicular to Deerfield Road to allow the sign to have adequate visibility for drivers along Deerfield Road. The existing church sign will remain on the west side of the entry drive.

Barbara Rosborough, landscape architect, Rosborough Partners, presented the schematic concept landscape plan for the site. The landscape plan at this time consists of a plant palate rather than specific types and sizes. The grounds around the church and memorial garden will remain the same. The site is looked at in four different areas; basic foundation plantings with low shrubs and perennials and trees to accent the architecture, outdoor seating areas, small tot play area and the fire pit area. The second area is the view from Deerfield area which will consist of low perennials and grasses. The drive way and parking lot will have ornamental trees on either side that will cut the sight line of the long parking lot and hide the buildings from the street. The third area is the screening of the west side. The woods will mostly remain with the exception of a few dead trees that will be removed. The existing landscape provides year round screening but this area will be enhanced will additional evergreen plants and trees and ornamental grasses. The last area is the detention areas which will have a

mix of grasses and ornamental blooming native plants which would attract birds and butterflies. Ms. Rosborough displayed examples of what this area could look like in season. Commissioner Bromberg asked if there is any fencing on the property and if there is any fencing anticipated for the site. Mr. Wylie noted that there is some metal fencing on west property line from Deerfield Road but the fencing does not continue the entire west property line and there noted some fencing at the north property line. The petitioner is not proposing to put up any fencing. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim noted that starting this summer the river bank will be cleared out of debris so there may be a need for more landscape screening along the east property line.

Commissioner Shayman asked what was the philosophy of having a whole building of affordable housing rather than having the affordable component distributed among mixed housing. Mr. Brint commented that the cost to build affordable housing is greater than the underlying economics so there are different types of subsidies that comes from the state. Market rate housing has to pay for itself since those subsidies are not available to that type of housing. In this case, there is an opportunity for affordable housing as opposed to indigent poor in which rent subsidies would come along with it. This population will be a homogenous and have a work requirement. For financial and policy reasons the petitioner chose to make the entire development affordable. In addition this was the priority of the church. Commissioner Shayman asked if there were any issues of this being a unique development in the Village and being identified as workforce housing and not so integrated in the Village. Mr. Brint noted that in their experience, over time well designed, well maintained housing flows into the community and no one knows the difference. This has been the case with their developments in all the cities that they have worked in. In their experience once a project is built and identified as workforce housing it is not viewed as anything different and that is why they use good materials and landscaping to create a good environment.

#### Public Comment

Tim Shanley, 808 Heather Road, questioned the accuracy traffic and storm water studies. He asked if there are government agencies that can review these studies. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim noted that firms that are hired by the petitioners are professionals. Mr. Shanley believes that an independent study is something that must be considered. Mr. Shanley also noted that the Comprehensive Plan states that the "housing must be of density, scale and character compatible of adjacent housing". Mr. Shanley does not think that the proposed development is compatible with the adjacent neighborhood. Mr. Shanley questioned how this project can even be considered.

Rabbi Isaac Serotta, 507 Warwick, Rabbi of Lakeside Congregation in Highland Park, and past president of the Southeast Lake County Clergy Association, supports the plan. He has been working for many years to try to get affordable housing in Deerfield and had often been told that there is no place in Deerfield where this can happen. He feels that this is a place where it can happen thanks to Zion Lutheran Church. He commended the Plan Commission with their efforts and hopes this plan can go forward.

Sam Mendelson, 1135 Prairie Avenue, graduated from Deerfield High School in 2011. He is excited about this project. He noted this project reflects the values of Deerfield. He commented that ultimately our actions are a reflection of our values and our values are a reflection of who we are. He feels the values in the community are inclusivity, caring and equality. He believes that this project should be held to the same scrutiny as any project and does not require extra scrutiny just because it is affordable housing. He believes that a project like this would allow he and his peers to live in Deerfield. He feels that this project reflects the values of inclusiveness and equality. Having affordable housing is a need in the Deerfield community.

Jeff Rothbart worked on the Elysian Way Subdivision (45 Deerfield Road) project. He feels the density is misstated. Netting out the church property and the flood way, the property is approximately 4.9 acres which would bring the density to 12 units per acre which is 6 times the density of the Elysian Way development and 125% more dense than the Taylor Junction development. He believes this is too dense and for attached housing. He would support a density of 5 units per net acre of developable land and not the gross acres. Mr. Rothbart commented that he doesn't think the storage and drainage in the flood way works and he would require the petitioner to get CLOMR (Conditional Letter of Map Revision) and or LOMR (Letter of Map Revision) from FEMA before they are allowed to come back for the public hearing. He noted that without the CLOMR and LOMR they are not allowed to build this project. He does not think the engineering works and the project is too dense.

Bill Owen, 885 Heather Road, 38 year resident and property owner abutting to the Zion Lutheran Church property. He is not opposed to low income housing but he wants the housing to comply with the Comprehensive Plan and the zoning code which has been in effect for decades. He and his neighbors have relied upon the zoning code and Comprehensive Plan when they purchased their homes. Mr. Owen objects to the plan as it is a strict departure from the Comprehensive Plan and how it will affect their property values. Mr. Owen is a supporter of low income housing and noted that his father was the president of a large, low income housing project in Indiana. Mr. Owen reiterated that his issue is not low income housing, but the conformity to the Deerfield Comprehensive Plan which he and his neighbors have relied upon when they made the most significant purchase of their lives in buying their homes. He commented that the project should be left to the voters in a referendum.

Gerry Saltarelli, 935 Heather, lives in the property that is 31 feet from the turnaround at the north end of the proposed parking lot. He noted that the issue is not low income housing but the integrity of Deerfield's zoning classification. Mr. Saltarelli noted that the Zion property has been zoned R-1 the entire 65 years that the church as owned the property and the 35 years he has lived next to the property. He noted that they knew that the property could be developed under the R-1 zoning, but never developed as it is now being proposed. He does not think that the development will be properly screened now or in the future from their homes and they will be subject to the commotion, noise and light from this high density property. He stated that the issue is not affordable housing, but this development on a tiny piece of property next to high value homes.

Richard Sachs, 510 Brierhill Road, raised two children in Deerfield. Mr. Sachs held up his \$37,946 property tax bill and noted that current Deerfield residents are in need of affordable housing. Mr. Sachs commented that he lives on the 17<sup>th</sup> hole of the Briarwood Golf Course and if the Plan Commission does not believe in the sanctity of the zoning ordinance then he should be worried that someday someone is going to build a high density development next to his property. He commented that if people can't believe in the zoning (ordinance) then no one will want to move to Deerfield. He believes the residents on Heather Road will be irreparably (net worth) damaged. He commented that the bend in Deerfield Road at this site is a blind turn. If this development goes to the Village Board of Trustees and it is approved, he feels those trustees will not want to seek re-election.

Jonathan Dien, 915 Heather Road, purchased his home a year ago. This is a home not a house, their dream home but now he feels that this has all changed. He noted it is not that they don't believe in the promise of what Zion Lutheran Church is doing, but this development is calling into question everything they have moved away from in the city being the noise, traffic congestion and the flooding. He feels this is what they will be experiencing once again. Mr. Dien hopes the Plan Commission is empathetic to understanding the investment that he and his neighbors have made especially since this is a long term investment for them. He noted that the images (from the presentation) that the developer has displayed is not reality and no one knows what will be there. He commented that this is a herculean effort with the flood plain and invited the Plan Commission to his home to see what he is talking about.

Kathy Schweighart, 140 Manor Drive, 35 year resident, is concerned for her grandchildren that go to school in Deerfield. She stated that the schools already have a challenge to face in finding classrooms for full-day kindergarten. It is her understanding that Kipling Elementary and Walden Elementary are at or near capacity. She requests that there be an independent study done on the impact this development will have on the schools. She commented that the petitioner indicated that there will be many Deerfield residents that will benefit from this development and many who work in Deerfield that could live in this development. Her question to the petitioner is if future tenants of the development will be required to be current renters in Deerfield or already have jobs in Deerfield.

Stevan Schweighart, 140 Manor Drive, has a problem with the Village notification process. He feels that the process is a fiasco. He is disturbed that he just found about this development the past week through an independent flyer that was distributed. He feels that he was not properly notified and has called the mayor. Mr. Ryckaert stated the petition is in a workshop meeting and early in the process. Mr. Schweighart felt that it is too late and he should have already been notified.

Maureen Darnaby, 905 Heather Road, moved to Deerfield 23 years ago as a single parent. She commented that anyone faced with the prospect that their home's property value will go down an estimated 25% would fight to protect it. She is not anti-workforce

housing or anti-diversity. She purchased her home with the knowledge that zoning regulations exist to protect residents. She noted that there are areas in Deerfield that would be more adequately suited for such a development. She would like to know that her single largest investment will be protected by the Village under the conditions of which it was purchased.

Josh Weiss, 965 Heather Road, moved here a year ago with his wife and 6,3,1 year old children. His home is adjacent to the compensatory storage facility and he fears for his children's safety. He noted stories of children's deaths with this type of basin. He commented that the developers are claiming that these open areas are useful areas but these basins are dangerous. These basins have pollutants and carcinogens from all the plants and runoff in the area. He noted that the proposed bike path is in close proximity of the steep river bank and detention basin in the flood way. He feels that this seems extreme on so many levels. He also commented that the children in this development will have 3 feet of space to wait for their bus. Is the bus going to pick them up on Deerfield Road and will they wait near the south detention basin or north toward the large compensatory storage basin or east near the steep banks of the river? He purchased his home a year ago and has put everything into it- he feels that his property values will be going down and he doesn't feel that this is justified. He hopes all of these issues will be addressed because he feels these are extreme measures for developers to fill their pockets and get out.

Gerry Horn, 1150 Heather, longtime resident and surgeon, feels that his quality of life in Deerfield has been deteriorating since he has lived here but tries to make the best of it. He feels Deerfield is still a good place to live. It takes him two lights to make a left turn onto Waukegan Road off of Deerfield Road in the mornings and sometimes over 20 minutes to get from Half Day Road to Deerfield Road during rush hour. He mentioned other problem traffic areas on Waukegan Road and Lake Cook Road. He feels affordable housing is wonderful; he noted that the developer built a wonderful 15 unit development in Glenview. Why can't that density be done here? He would like to see a compromise. He does not think the traffic study is accurate especially since the traffic counts were taken 2 days before spring break (for Deerfield schools) and a lot of families leave for spring break. He noted that the traffic study should extend to include all the areas impacted by the proposed development referring to Article 12.09 C in the Deerfield Zoning Ordinance. He would like to see a compromise and have a 15 unit development built instead of what is being proposed.

Mark Daniels, attorney, Daniels Law Office, in Oakbrook Terrace, IL. Mr. Daniels has been practicing law for 20 years and has been retained by Alan and Jean Chapman (1065 Heather Road) to contest the development. He will call Village attorneys to let them know he will be involved with this proposed development. Mr. Daniels noted a vast experience in zoning litigation including arguing cases in Illinois Supreme Court. He believes changing the zoning from R-1 to R-5 should not be done in this case. Mr. Daniels has represented houses of worship and notes that this is not a religious issue but a zoning issue, density issue, and an issue with the massing of the building. He hopes there will be plenty of time to learn about this project and that the Plan

Commission will take a step back to review all of the information. Mr. Daniels commented and encouraged that an independent traffic be done and reviewed by the Village.

Jacki Parmeczek, 728 Fox Hunt Trail, 22 year resident, commented that most of the concerns have been articulated well. She feels that that this development is the wrong development for this area. The images, renderings and data does not reflect the true condition of this property and the neighborhood. The traffic numbers don't reflect reality and believes the development will have a large impact on traffic. She urges the Plan Commission to consider the voices of the community and the existing home owners and to not ignore the existing zoning laws that have been put in place.

Juanita Wreckerlin, 1233 Linden Avenue, resident since 1969 and member of Zion Lutheran Church has raised three children in Deerfield and supports the project. She realizes that that the people who have been working on the development have spent a lot of time on it. She feels that it will not change the property values, but instead enhance the community, the surrounding area, the people in the development and the people who will be coming to the development. She realizes that there may be some concerns that will need to be addressed so that people will be more comfortable, but noted that we are a community that reaches out and will benefit from this project. We are creating an opportunity for others and pointed out that One Deerfield Place did not affect the community in a negative way.

Julia Arbaugh, 836 Holmes Avenue, member of the community and 25 year resident, supports the project and commented that Mrs. Wreckerlin articulated her views and she agrees with her comments.

Karl Arbugh, 836 Holmes Avenue, feels that this development is a wonderful thing for people who work in our community to live in our community and a good thing for their children can go to our schools. He is sympathetic to the people who feel they will be affected directly and understands their concerns. He hopes the concerns and impact would not be nearly as great as they are anticipating. On a whole, he thinks this development will be a healthy thing for our community and the many people who would benefit from this development. He hopes there will be a balanced conclusion.

Wendy Yura, 8 E. St. Andrews Lane, lives in Deer Run and raised three children in Deerfield. When they bought their home they had a thirteen month old child and they live near a detention area. They did not know what that meant at the time but commented that Village has been wonderful through it all in maintaining these areas. She would like to know who will maintain these areas when the roots from all of the trees clog up the drains. She commented that her detention basin has swelled up to 15 feet deep at times and nothing has ever happened, but something very serious could have happened if it were not maintained properly. She is concerned for the residents that are near the detention basin since they are larger and deeper than what is near her house. She feels that the safety issues and school issues have to be addressed.



Barry Metzger, 735 Smoke Tree Road, lives in Kings Cove and is concerned about the traffic patterns. He noted a comment by the developer about market rate rents and would like to know what percentage of rents have become market rate at their other properties.

Lisa Winston, 985 Heather Road, raised three children in Deerfield and moved to their current address on Heather 5 years ago. When they purchased their home their understanding was that the zoning would remain the same. The detention pond will have a big effect on her home as well as amount of people in the proposed development. She feels that her property will be used as a cut-through for children catching the school bus on Heather Road. She noted that the majority of the people on Heather Road is not opposed to affordable housing but against any change in zoning. Her hope is that the Village will stand behind the existing zoning. She hopes that the Plan Commission will realize what her and her neighbors are going through and what it would be like if their homes were to back up to this development.

Lisa Zebovitz, 10 Edgewood Court, backs up to Lake Cook Road and lives near the luxury apartment complex (AMLI) that is being constructed. She never anticipated that Lake Cook Road would be widened or that her house would shake from all the large trucks that go by. She commented that there were a lot of things that she never anticipated but these things happen in life. Mrs. Zebovitz moved to Deerfield from Oak Park and didn't realize the how the population was comprised. She referenced the lack of racial diversity noting that the affordable housing development is critical to the diversity of our community. She noted an integrated housing development that was proposed in Deerfield in the 1960s was unsuccessful and strongly hopes that this will not be the legacy of Deerfield. She feels that there is a need for diversity in the Deerfield community and that there should be a study that was done that they can reference on how this multi-family development will impact single family homes.

Gail Byck, 1246 Dartmouth Lane, understands the neighbors' concerns (flooding, traffic, property values). The way she became aware of this development was from an email that is circulating that has numerous references to "those people" who will live in the housing development, "those people's" kids who will need more services, "those people" who are prone to violence, and "those people" who will not maintain this property. This email made her upset and got her involved in this development. She is in favor of affordable and workforce housing, she is in favor of people who work in and near Deerfield in lower paying jobs who can live affordably in our community and take advantage of the benefits that Deerfield has to offer. She commented that these reasons are the same reasons we have all have moved here; great schools, great parks, great recreation, transportation, etc. She feels that the developer has done a great job of trying to present their development and hopes there is a way to bring this development to our community and show that we are an open and welcoming community.

Howard Rosenblum, 140 Milstone Road, would like to know if Village has considered an independent study to show the impact that this development will have on schools, traffic

and property values. The developer has done their studies, but there is no mention as to if the Village has done any studies. Is there any consideration that the Village will conduct these studies? Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim noted that typically the studies are done the experts in their field. She has no personal knowledge of the Village doing studies on the school districts. The school districts would have the expertise to tell us what their capacity is. Mr. Ryckaert noted that that the developer will have to do a fiscal impact study like what was done for the AMLI and Woodview apartments. The Plan Commission will review and ask pertinent questions. However on the traffic study, if the Plan Commission questions the validity of that traffic study, the Plan Commission can order an independent study be done which would be paid for by the applicant. The Village would select the traffic consultant. This provision is in the Plan Commission's Rules of Procedure. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim noted that the impact fee analysis is done by outside experts as well. Mr. Rosenblum asked how property values are studied. Mr. Ryckaert noted that a real estate appraiser could be retained and the Plan Commission will ask questions of the study and findings. Mr. Rosenblum asked how the developer did not know how many children were going to be in this development, but did know how the children would be distributed among all grade levels. Mr. Rosenblum also wanted to know how the developer determined the need for workforce housing in Deerfield or if this is based purely on speculation. He is not against housing teachers, waiters or waitresses, but feels that this is not the correct plan for the area. If this were single family homes that would be great, putting buildings in this area is not proper for this area. Mr. Rosenblum wanted to know if there would be designated eastbound left turn lane into the development on Deerfield Road. He also wanted information on what happens to the property after the 35 year lease ends. Who will manage the property? Pastor Kylo commented that the property would go back to the church after the lease is over.

Douglas Noren, 90 Sequoia Lane, thanked the neighbors on Heather Road for organizing and getting the word out otherwise he would not have known about the property. He would like to get evidence from the schools that there will not be any impact on the schools. He feels that this development is too dense for the area nor do the standards fit in this area. In his opinion, this would be a complete rewrite of the zoning ordinance for this development and an exercise of power to have this done. He asked how this can this be done according to the current zoning ordinance. Commissioner Pro Tem Oppenheim noted that at the time of the public hearing there will be more specifics. There are criteria that the Plan Commission will review when deciding on this development. All the things that were presented tonight are on a checklist on whether or not this project would be permissible under these standards. The standards are in the packet that was submitted to the Plan Commission (which was available on-line). She noted that it is unusual for specifics of a plan to be asked during a pre-filing conference. The level of detail that is being asked comes at the public hearing. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim reiterated the purpose of a pre-filing conference and what would happen at the public hearing. She reminded the audience that this is the first step of the public process. Mr. Rosenblum noted that he heard a lot of statements but not a lot of evidence. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim commented

that this is a big project and that there is a lot to be considered. There will be more specifics to come at a public hearing.

Commissioner Berg addressed the comments made by the public concerning the lack of notice. Commissioner Berg noted that this is not a secret proceeding. When there is a public hearing there are specific notice requirements not only for this municipality but for every municipality. Tonight's meeting is a workshop although public comment is welcomed, it is unusual to get this kind of turnout for a workshop meeting. The intent of the workshop is for the petitioner to address the Plan Commission and for the Plan Commission to let the petitioner know what their concerns are. Commissioner Berg reiterated that they welcome public comment however, this is not an official public hearing. The fact that notice was not sent out for this meeting is completely consistent with the law. For the public hearing, the 500 feet notice (due to height variation) will be complied with. A comment was made from the public that he was not properly notified. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim noted that all of the information from this meeting (including this meeting) and any information will be available on the Village's website.

Steve Altshel, 615 Wicklow Road, commented that when the Elysian Way project was being considered there was ingress and egress would not be allowed from the existing driveway on Deerfield Road. Residents were concerned with the new drive that was being proposed on Carlisle Avenue. He noted that existing drive on Deerfield Road was not allowed for 7 lot subdivision because the County and local police department would not entertain the use of the drive due to vehicular traffic. He noted that the Plan Commission needs to realize the implication of allowing traffic flow from this development. He also noted that the service road also raises concern for traffic at the intersection of Deerfield Road and Heather Road/Carlisle Avenue.

Ross Levin, 615 Brierhill Road, noted that the school bus drop off for his children on Deerfield is not safe and has talked with Deerfield police about his concerns. He noted that the traffic study for this does not add up especially if there will be more traffic from this development. He has not heard that anyone has any real experience on affordable housing projects. He does not have firsthand experience with affordable housing project but he has watched developers and redevelopers pickup projects like this down the line. He commented that when the developer leaves who will be enforcing the tenant requirements on who will be living in the development. These types of development are difficult to manage and deal with. He would advise the Plan Commission to look at the financing of the project and what the developer have invested in this project. The residents have a lot to lose in this development. He also commented that the teachers were ready to strike last year and so he is not sure how this will help the situation. He feels that there is a sense of shock and betrayal amongst residents and the developer should have been told that this property could not be rezoned.

Paul Peisis, 370 Carriage Way, 30+ year resident, feels that as the development has moved from concept with the trustees to the workshop (meeting) there has been a conflict in how this has been handled. He feels that the residents will be handpicked

and that is not diversity. He also feels that by doing this his emotions are being minimized. He feels that if we really want diversity there are a lot of opportunities without taking a parcel of land. Mr. Peisis's property abuts up to the creek and the creek has been a nightmare. He noted that when the detention area overflows the flooding is uncontrollable, cars cannot get through and children's lives are in jeopardy and his house floods. He questions who are the independents that can look at these studies. He is disturbed by how the Village can put the residents in a position by moving the land (flood plain) and not feel that an independent study is needed not only to look out for safety, but also how it will impact the existing residents. He has worked as a health provider in Cabrini Green and when it was taken down there were other options to take care of the people. He takes offense to the term "those people" because he worked with them. He feels that there are other options to take with a compromised piece of land that is appropriately zoned rather than change the zoning.

Anne Renger, 870 Evergreen Way, Highland Park, moved to her current address a year ago but has lived in Highland Park since 1971. She lived by low income, low impact housing at her prior residence in Highland Park. She is concerned about the traffic. When she pulls out of her street to make a left on Deerfield Road going east it takes a long time to make the turn to get to the expressway. She lives across the street from Kings Cove. She needs the signalized light to the west and east of her driveway to turn red for her to make that left turn and it is a very short window. She is concerned that the increase in vehicles from this development, which will be between the two signalized lights, will make it very difficult to make that left turn. She believes low income or workforce housing is a good thing at that location, but it should also be low impact housing. She has walked the Zion property and it is wet all the time. She would appreciate it if the Highland Park residents that live nearby would be notified as well.

Seth Silverman, lives a few blocks from Heather Road, He has three children at Kipling elementary school and one will be at full-day kindergarten next year in which he will have to pay \$2,600 for full day kindergarten. He would like to know if the people who live in this development will they be responsible for this payment if their children go to full day kindergarten.

Ted Repshultz Jr., commented that his father chaired the Commission that decided whether to allow the park district to occupy the land that was proposed for mixed housing. When he graduated from Deerfield High School in 1978 they had 2,400 students in a much smaller building that it currently has. He does not think that the students in this development will have much impact on the high school. The high school has a much larger building than when he was there in 1978. Many years ago, Zion Lutheran Church was to be the hub for the Lutheran church on the Northshore. He noted that it did not happen perhaps because of the cold shoulder and black eye that Deerfield gave itself when it didn't explore or allow for mixed housing. He feels that this well planned development should be considered; it will not overcrowd or overpopulate the schools.

Lisa Zebovitz, 10 Edgewood Court, asked if the same things were considered when the luxury apartments were being considered such as the crowding of the schools and the traffic. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim explained that the Plan Commission was told that those developments were not targeted to households with children. Traffic was a very big concern as well as pedestrian access. She commented that the Plan Commission considers all of these types of development with the same set of criteria.

Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim asked if there was any other public comment. There being no further public comment, she paraphrased the concerns that she felt was important for the petitioner to address for the public hearing:

Safety around the detention areas.

Proximity of detention areas to neighboring properties.

Maintenance of the detention areas.

Whether or not there has been any consideration of restricting the tenants to only Deerfield residents or whether it will only be pitched to Deerfield residents.

Long range plan for the development.

What is the history (from their other developments) of units going from affordable to market rate units.

Evidence on the impact to property values.

Commissioner Bromberg added: Criteria for the Planned Unit Development and the rezoning.

Commissioner Shayman added: Is the proposed unit density absolute?

Commissioner Jacoby added: Provide written information from the school districts.

Mr. Ryckaert added: Extending the traffic study to go further east on Deerfield Road, parking demand on weekends especially Sundays, and is the service drive necessary.

### **Document Approval**

The Plan Commission approved report and recommendations and minutes from the April 23<sup>rd</sup> Plan Commission meeting.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,  
Daniel Nakahara