

CORRESPONDENCE FROM NEIGHBORS

Letters Received May 29, 2015 through June 19, 2015

Regarding Proposed Zion Woods Development

Email Received 06/02/15

First Name: Barbara

Last Name: Chandler

Address: 610 Robert York Ave. Unit 409

Phone: 847-374-1029

Comment: I am writing to express my absolute support of the affordable housing development at Zion Lutheran Evangelical Church. Deerfield is a wonderful community and we should be open to having residents of all economic levels living in and enjoying our community. A diverse community enriches life for everyone. I'm disappointed and ashamed that anyone is opposed to this plan.

Daniel Nakahara

From: claudine <seven_petals@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2015 7:35 PM
To: harrietrose@comcast.net; Mayor Harriet Rosenthal; bobbenton@prodigy.net; alfafoxtrot1@gmail.com; tapjester@yahoo.com; Robert.d.nadler@gmail.com; wws5@comcast.net; bjstruthers@bjsltd.net; dshapiro@danshapirolaw.com; Daniel Nakahara
Subject: Letter to the Trustees, Mayor, and Planning Commissioning Boards

Plan Commission Board, Trustees and Mayor of the Village of Deerfield
850 Waukegan Road
Deerfield, IL 60015

I have a few thoughts to share, and a few concerns that I would appreciate comment on at the next hearing.

First, I would like to share that my husband and I have lived in Deerfield since 2002 (13 years) and are raising four children in this great community. And that's what it is - a community.

We absolutely oppose a zoning change, which would increase the density, traffic congestion, drainage issues, and education cost to tax payers. A zoning change of this magnitude is unprecedented and for good reason.

1) My first question is, what is the full extent of building that is allowed by the PROPOSED zone? If the zoning is changed from and R1 to an R-5, what are the specific, factual differences defined between these two zones? What height building, what density, what setbacks are allowed by R-5? The community needs to understand these values. And, the reason being is, that once a new zone is granted, the Owner can build as high or as dense of a development as they would like, as long as they are within the zoning definition.

This would mean that even though the current proposal is for two-story buildings, if they are granted an R-5, and an R-5 allows a five story building, than legally the development could build that.

This also means that in 35-40 years from now, when the current building needs remodeling, additional stories can be added, or the building can be torn down and rebuilt even larger, WITHOUT a variance or any consideration from the community on traffic and education impact. Deerfield could someday end up with a much bigger development than what is currently being pitched - and they won't need to ask for anyone's permission at that point, as long as they are within the zoning requirement.

The decision to change the zoning, effects more than the immediate future or current development proposal, and the Village Board needs to consider the long term effects of increasing density, and needs to share with the community the largest of extents that could be developed under the new zoning.

2) Another concern I didn't hear discussed at the last pre-filing conference --- the Development company only has a 35 year lease. This is roughly an age when a building starts to need an overhaul of building systems --- roofing, siding, foundation maintenance --- So the development company has smartly planned to get out, just as the dedication and funding will be needed to keep the development from running into the ground. And they are getting out just in time to keep the profits of the younger aged buildings--- so who is left with the aged building? Who is managing what happens then? --- there are always good intentions for the first couple of years, and then what? Who ensures that tenants aren't accepted just to fill occupancies, regardless of the poor condition of an aged building? Who ensures that the building is maintained and that proper monies are spent doing so? Does the church have a savings plan to cover this if it falls back on their lap?

3) These hearing notification letters need to be sent to more than just the near-by neighbors. We researched a Tribune article from a while back that said the children from this Development would likely attend Caruso because there is less space at Shepherd for middle school. The Village has the responsibility to require the Petitioner to send letters about the hearings to ALL residents effected by this project - and that includes surrounding neighbors AS WELL as residents in any of the schools that would have additional students added, due to this project.

5) Some very vague numbers and information have been given regarding "the need for affordable housing in Deerfield". The Petitioner should be required to provide SPECIFICS on what is currently available in Deerfield, in terms of what is comparable to what they would be offering for rent. A little over a year ago, my husband and I were looking to temporarily rent, while our house was being remodeled. We found apartments in downtown Deerfield in the same price range that Development is offering --- \$1200 for 3 bedroom. (Two story apartments on Waukegan Rd, with a basement, 3 bedroom was asking \$1275 when we were looking). Others were less, for less bedrooms, and others more. The community and the BOARD should KNOW what the CURRENT number of apartments is that are currently rented, (or looking for renters) that are under \$1300/month. The answer isn't zero --- and there are places currently advertised for rent as I drove around this past month. Note, that this development will take business away from these

current Deerfield Owners that compete for renters. This topic has not been discussed and needs to be considered to be thorough in this process.

6) In the new development --- what will each unit pay in taxes per year? And, what does it cost to educate a child per year in a Deerfield school? So, for a unit that can house a family of 5 - what is the cost to educate three school children, and what are the taxes from that unit? Who pays for the gap? The Development company provided an estimate on how many children would be added to the schools. What if their estimate is significantly low, as a way to help pitch this? Has their number been verified by a third party. And, of this number - what percentage of these students have they allotted for special services? And what is the cost to educate a child with special needs versus one without? Have they included this in their assessment - or are they assuming that 100% of the children in the Development will not need any services, which is an incorrect assumption and the numbers need to be re-adjusted. At the next hearing, please have them present the tax dollar per unit type, and cost per child, and percentage receiving special services with that cost, and ultimately show how big the overall discrepancy is between the two. And, the Village Board needs to have a third party prepare same - we need our own due diligence, as the Development has their interests in mind, and we need to have Deerfield's interest in mind.

I have neighbors that already complain that their child who has an IEP, already doesn't see the school speech therapist enough now. What happens to the resources for the current kids if the specialists are spread too thin with more cases? Spend more money to hire more specialists, or decreases current services?

Has the Village Board laid out a line item in their financial plan to fill in that gap? Do the residents pay for this gap? The church will make money off the lease. The Development Company will make money off of the rent (they are the ones that need the density to make their profit work, and then they leave when the building is aged). And, the residents pay for the increased education costs, the inconvenience of traffic congestion, drainage issues, and loss of housing value for nearby residents. The economics don't add up.

7) The church has stated that it wants to do a good deed by this project. What sacrifice are they putting forth in this deal? They are receiving money from leasing the land, which is better than leaving it as nothing. So they will make money. What is it costing them? Or is it just costing the Village in education dollars and infrastructure, and neighbors loss of property value and the inconvenience of more traffic, etc? I'd like to know if there is information regarding what the church is giving for its good cause (other than earning money on land just sitting there). Please have them address this question at the next hearing. If they are sacrificing something, it would be beneficial for them to let the community know what skin they have in this.

8) Statistically, affordable housing projects degrade over time. They start out with good intentions, but then the original persons who were passionate about the project are no longer around, and as buildings age, and costs go up, the issues that come from DENSITY start to increase exponentially. This property was zoned for single family for a reason --- even initially the drainage and traffic issues will increase. And as the building ages, and the Development company has made its money, more issues will compound on top of the initial ones. There are so many facets of this project that do not make long time sense, and it's adding cost and congestion and at so many levels. --- There is cost and congestion associated with drainage, schooling, traffic, buildings to maintain, and so on. The issue isn't having affordable housing on this property - it's the DENSITY of the affordable housing that brings so many long terms costs and problems that get more difficult to fix over time. Affordable housing that isn't "packed in" and isn't segregated into a dense population off on its own location will have much greater success.

Approving a project that increases traffic, costs, and density doesn't make sense. Every community, village, city, town struggles and works hard to fight the issues that come with density. Why bring this on? Why add traffic? Why add education costs and tax burden? Why add drainage issues? Municipalities all over work to avoid these problems --- problems that cost and cost over and over again and are a burden.

WE DO NOT SUPPORT A CHANGE IN ZONING, AND WILL NOT SUPPORT ANYONE WHO VOTES TO CHANGE ZONING THAT WOULD INCREASE DENSITY.

Other opportunities for this land:

1) Leave the current property zoning AS IS. Let the development property propose a single family affordable housing layout for consideration. A change in zoning is unprecedented, and for good reason.

2) If the increased density is to be considered - **ONLY** allow it to be **zoned for senior living**. This eliminates the education cost, provides an opportunity for seniors who have lived in Deerfield their entire lives to live near their family and community with much lower taxes, reduces traffic at rush and working hours, and creates opportunity for ministry to a community that is often over-looked.

Thank you for your time in considering the concerns of the Deerfield residents, and for your service to our community. We rely on the Board to protect our community and make decisions that positively impact the community for a long time to come.

The Harig's