MEMORANDUM

TO: Plan Commission

FROM: Jeff Ryckaert, Principal Planner and Dan Nakahara, Planner

DATE: June 22, 2018

RE: Public Hearing on the request for a Residential Planned Unit Development (PUD) with Necessary Exceptions; a Rezoning of 10 Deerfield Road from R-1 Single Family Residential District to R-5 General Residence District; and an Amendment to the Village’s Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map to designate the subject property’s land use as Multi-Family Residential, to be changed from its current Institutional use designation to allow the Redevelopment of 10 Deerfield Road to permit a workforce housing development on the subject property (Zion Lutheran Church, Brinshore Development LLC, and Housing Opportunity Development Corporation)

Subject Property

The subject property consists of Zion Lutheran Church at 10 Deerfield Road. The subject property is zoned R-1 Single Family Development and is developed with a church building, parking lot, and parsonage. Places of worship are a Special Use in the R-1 zoning district. The subject property is 8.85 acres in size.

Surrounding Land Use and Zoning

North: R-2 Single Family Residential District, single-family homes
South (across Deerfield Road): R-1 and R-2 Single Family Residential District, single family homes including Elysian Way 7-lot subdivision
East: (across the Middle Fork of the West Branch of the Chicago River in Highland Park): R-5 Single Family Residential – Moderate Density & R-6 Single Family – Medium Density Zoning district, single-family homes
West: R-1 Single Family Residential District, single-family homes

Proposed Plan

The petitioner’s plan is for 25 units in two, 2-story buildings. Half the project will be marketed as workforce housing and will be targeted to people who work in the area but cannot afford to live in Deerfield. The other half will be available for people with a disability who can live independently. The development will be known as Zion Woods.

The density of the proposed development is 2.82 units per gross acre (25 units/8.85 total acres = 2.82 units per acre). The Deerfield Zoning Ordinance definition of density
is the average number of persons, families or dwelling units per unit of area. The Residential PUD provisions use gross area of the site. The Zoning Ordinance defines gross area as the total area of all property to be included in an application for a planned unit development, excluding any property in the right of way. There is no existing or proposed right of way on the subject property. The Deerfield Comprehensive Plan refers to density as the number of dwelling units per net acre of land. However, net is not defined in the Comprehensive Plan, but its general meaning is what is left after certain deductions or allowances have been made. To calculate the net acre of the proposed development, the storm water detention basins (detention basin: 32,546 s.f. and compensatory storage: 31,362 s.f.) and the existing impervious area for the existing church (59,370 s.f.) was subtracted from the total acreage. The proposed density per net acres is 4.15 units (25 units/6.02 total net acres = 4.15 units per acre) per net acre.

The unit mix will consist of 13- one-bedroom units, 7- two-bedroom units, and 5- three bedroom units. The unit sizes will ranges from 620 sf for a one-bedroom apartment to 1,120 sf for a 3-bedroom apartment. Unit amenities will include in-unit washer/dryer, hard-wired internet, energy efficient appliances, and vinyl plank wood flooring. Unit interiors will have a focus on energy-efficiency, water conservation, and a healthy interior living environment. Materials will be of recycled content where possible and finishes will be low or no-VOC, and be durable and easily maintainable. The project will be designed to achieve the Enterprise Green Communities certification, which includes using sustainable features such as: Energy Star certification, Energy Star appliances, low-flow water fixtures, high efficiency lighting, native landscaping, environmentally preferable flooring, and operating a smoke-free building.

The petitioner’s plans indicate project amenities will include a management office, tot lot, secure bicycle storage, community garden plots for all residents, and a picnic area. The petitioner’s plans indicate that at least ten (10) percent of the units will be made accessible for tenants with physical disabilities. The petitioners’ materials include floor plans for each level.

The building elevation drawings show that the building façade will consist of masonry, fiber cement siding, aluminum-clad wood windows with stone sills, asphalt shingle roof, board and batten entry ways. The AC condenser units will be screened with an opaque fence enclosure and the trash and recycling enclosure will be composed a brick exterior to match the residential structures and a wood and metal gate.

The site plan indicates there will be a total of 112 at grade parking spaces that will be serve the proposed apartment buildings and the church.
The proposed development seeks to provide an affordable residential option targeted for Deerfield and the workforce currently in Deerfield. The petitioner’s material indicate that nearly half of current renters and over 35% of current homeowners in Deerfield pay more than they can afford for housing (based on federal guidelines). The range of rents will vary but the majority of the rents at the proposed development will range from $760/month for a one-bedroom unit to $1,050/month for a three-bedroom unit as indicated in the Affordable Rental for Deerfield Residents section of the petitioner’s material. The petitioner has indicated this development will allow those residents with ties to the community to remain in Deerfield in spite of changes to their financial situation, which may result as a: change of career; marital status; or medical issues. They have also indicated this housing will also be attractive to recent college graduates in the early stages of their careers who may have grown up in Deerfield and would like to stay close to family as they explore various career environments. The proposed development also seeks to provide high quality housing near employment centers that are appropriately priced to meet the needs of local workers. The proposed development will have supportive housing targeted for people with a variety of disabilities who are able to live independently. The petitioner’s material indicate that management will link with social service agencies that will provide support services to aide residents with their day to day activities as needed.

The petitioner’s material indicates that the proposed Zion Woods development will make land that was formerly tax-exempt into a taxable property by taxing the improvements that are constructed. The property will pay taxes as required by the County.

Village Staff has asked the petitioners for a detailed written description of the proposed use at this location. Please see the petitioner’s written materials for more detailed information on the plans for the proposed development.

**Storm Water Management**

The site has a variety of flood conditions as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). To overcome these significant conditions, the developer has employed several strategies. There will be no new construction within the floodway. The existing parsonage currently sits in the floodway and will be removed as part of this development, and will improve the floodway condition of the property. The proposed development will have a compensatory storage basin at the north end of the site to replace the volume of water within the flood plain that will be displaced by the proposed building and site improvements. The petitioner has indicated that the depth of the proposed compensatory storage basin will be approximately 4 feet and will stay dry for most of the year unless the river breaches its banks. The site will also be served by a new storm drainage system of catch basins and piping to collect storm water to a new
detention basin at the south end of the site. The petitioner’s material indicates the depth of the proposed detention basin will be approximately 4 feet and will have water in it during a 100-year storm event but the water will drain within 48-72 hours.

The storm water management areas will be naturally landscaped with appropriate vegetation to create natural wildlife habitats. The remainder of the site will be landscaped with drought-tolerant, native landscaping and grasses. The storm water management area will feature an overlook created at the south end of the property with a walking path.

The Village of Deerfield Engineering Department has reviewed the preliminary site plan (dated 6/21/2018) for the proposed development at 10 Deerfield Road with respect to the engineering requirements for the site. The letter notes that flood plain areas can be filled as long as compensatory storage is provided as the rate of 1.2:1. The regulatory floodway can be infringed upon, but not filled, under consent of certain regulatory agencies (US Army Corps, Lake County SMC, FEMA). To implement the currently proposed plan the developer must engage these agencies and obtain the proper documentation before the Village of Deerfield Engineering Department will approve construction on the site. The process includes obtaining a CLOMR-F, LOMR-F, approval from the US COE, and approval from Lake County. The memorandum also concludes that at the preliminary stage, site engineering can achieve approval. Attached is a memorandum dated June 21, 2018 from the Village Engineering Department.

Utilities

The June 21, 2018 memorandum from the Village Engineering Department also notes that with respect to utilities, the submittal appears, in concept, to be in line with the Village requirements. The proposed development will be served by the Deerfield water system for both water and fire protection. Two new fire hydrants will be installed as part of the development. The proposed development will connect directly to the existing sanitary sewer line that runs immediately east of the proposed buildings. Gas and electric service are available to the site. Storm water was explained in the Storm Water Management section above.

Landscaping

As part of a preliminary development plan, the petitioners are required to provide a landscaping plan for the subject property. There is an existing tree line along the north, east, and a portion of the west property line. The petitioner’s plans indicate that they will provide shade trees around the storm water detention facility and compensatory storage facility as well as to the north of the building. The detention and compensatory storage facility will be landscaped with a grass seed mix and natural
plantings. The plans also indicate that evergreens, shade trees, and meadow grasses will be planted on a landscaped berm (ranging 4 feet to 6 feet in height) at the west property line. A variety of landscaping will be provided around the perimeter of the building consisting of ornamental trees, shade trees and shrub plantings and the unpaved areas of the subject property will have lawn grass. Please see sheet L-1.0 and L-2.0 of the petitioner’s booklet for their landscape plans and planting palette.

**Landscaping of Parking Lot**

The petitioners would be required to provide permanent screening at least 5 feet high adjacent to the parking areas consisting of a planted earth berm, or densely planted evergreens, shrubs, trees, or a combination of both. The petitioners have provided this required screening of the parking lot as shown on the landscape plan (landscaping provided on top of a 4 to 6 foot high berm). The petitioner’s landscape plan shows this screening consists of evergreen, shade and ornamental trees and shrub plantings.

**Tree Preservation**

The Village’s tree ordinance applies to residentially zoned properties. Any tree over 8 inches in diameter at 4 ½ feet above the ground is considered to be a protected tree. The petitioners would be required to replace (mitigate) the protected trees they remove. The amount of tree replacement is dependent upon the species and condition of the trees to be removed as outlined in the Village’s tree manual. The trees to be removed are shown with an “X” on the Tree Preservation Plan, LT-1.0. The petitioner’s tree plan preservation plan indicates that the total caliper inches of tree mitigation under the preliminary plan for the site is 282 inches (approximately 37 trees to be removed) and the petitioner proposes to replace 284 caliper inches with 81 new trees.

**Lighting**

The parking lot will be lit with nine, 20-foot tall bronze poles with a single fixture. Light fixtures will shield light sources and light will not spill onto adjacent residential properties. Residential scaled security and convenience lighting will be near the entries and all light fixtures will have a similar finish to the parking lot lighting.

**Signage**

The petitioner is proposing install an externally illuminated, two-sided monument sign at the east side of the main driveway. The sign will be 3’-8” tall and 7’-4” long and have the Zion Woods text with a logo. The ground sign consist of brick masonry with a cast stone base and cap with a metal Zion Woods logo. The text Zion Woods will be in metal.
There is an existing ground sign for the church on the west side of the main driveway that will remain.

**Vehicular Access**

Access to the development will be from the existing access point on Deerfield Road. The Zion Driveway is a two-lane private driveway that provides access to the Zion Lutheran Church. Although there is no stop sign currently provided, the driveway operates as a stop controlled approach. The driveway is a full access driveway.

A single lane drive that runs along the west side of the church and parallel to the west property line functions as a service road. The service road is approximately 11’ wide and can only serve one vehicle in either direction.

The petitioners have provided a traffic impact study conducted by V3 dated April 10, 2015 and updated June 4, 2018. Pages 4 through 8 of the report describe the existing roadway conditions and traffic volumes on nearby roadways. Manual vehicle counts were initially conducted Thursday, March 26, 2015 at the intersections of Deerfield Road and Heather Road/Carlisle Avenue and Deerfield Road and Zion Driveway. The weekday morning peak period counts occurred from 7:00 am to 9:00 am and the weekday evening peak period counts occurred from 4:00 pm to 6:00 pm.

Updated traffic counts were conducted on Tuesday, June 5, 2018 at the signalized intersection of Deerfield Road and Heather Road/Carlisle Avenue, and the unsignalized intersections on Deerfield Road at Villas Court and Carriage Way/Evergreen Way. Three count periods were collected to capture the weekday morning, school, and pm peak hours. The count did not include the Zion Lutheran Driveway, but it is assumed that daytime operations at the facility have not changed since the 2015 counts.

Figure 5 on page 9 shows the existing peak traffic volumes. Table 1 on page 10 indicates the projected peak hour trip generation for the proposed Zion Woods development, and Figure 6 on page 13 shows the projected directional distribution of the traffic generated by the proposed Zion Woods development. Figure 8 on page 15 shows the future traffic volumes, which includes both traffic generated by the proposed Zion Woods apartment development and the traffic volumes that are estimated for the year 2024. The petitioners have conducted a level of service delay study at the Deerfield Road and Heather Road/Carlisle Avenue signalized intersection and the unsignalized intersection of Deerfield Road and Zion Driveway, Villas Court, and Carriage Way/Evergreen Way. Table 3 (intersection of Deerfield Road and Heather Road/Carlisle Avenue) on page 17 indicates that there are no anticipated level of service concerns in the future with project conditions at that intersection. Table 4
(intersection of Deerfield Road and Zion Driveway, Villas Court, and Carriage Way/Evergreen Way.) on page 18 indicates that although delay increases slightly in background condition but there are no anticipated level of service concerns in the future with project conditions at this intersection. The traffic impact study points out that the existing roadway system will handle the additional traffic generated from this development that both intersections will operate at an acceptable level of service with the additional development trips.

The results of the traffic analysis concluded that the existing roadway system will handle the additional traffic generated by the proposed development. Both the signalized intersection of Deerfield Road and Heather Road/Carlisle Avenue and the unsignalized intersections on Deerfield Road at the Zion Driveway, Villas Court, and Carriage Way/Evergreen Way operate at an acceptable level of service with the addition of development trips and no roadway improvements are needed on Deerfield Road as a result of the proposed development. The traffic analysis also concluded that the addition of the proposed apartments will have a negligible effect on Sunday operations at the intersection of Deerfield Road and Zion Driveway or within the church and apartment parking lots.

**Public Transportation**

Currently, Pace bus operates fixed bus routes along Deerfield Road and provides weekday and Saturday service between Highland Park and Northbrook. This route provides service to the Metra UP-North Line Highland Park Station, Metra Milwaukee District-North Line Deerfield Station, Deerbrook Shopping Center, Northbrook Court and Crossroads Shopping Center. The Metra UP-North Line Highland Park Station is located east of the proposed development while the Metra Milwaukee District-North Line Deerfield Station is approximately one mile to the west of the proposed development. The nearest Pace bus stops are provided at the southwest corner of Deerfield Road at Carlisle Avenue and the northeast corner of Deerfield Road and Heather Road. There is also a pace bus stop at the southwest corner of Deerfield Road and Evergreen Way in Highland Park.

**Deerfield Road Regional Bike Route**

A few years ago, Deerfield Road was designated a regional bike corridor by the Northwest Municipal Conference. Also, the south side of Deerfield Road is part of Deerfield's designated bike route in the Village's Comprehensive Plan (see attached). The Zoning Ordinance requires that, where appropriate, all major development projects have to provide for bicycle storage, safe and smooth internal circulation, and connections to adjacent developments and bike paths. The development has paths that lead to the Deerfield Road sidewalk. Secured bike storage is provided inside the
building for the proposed development. There are existing pedestrian cross walks on
the north, west and south legs of the Deerfield Road and Heather Road/Carlisle Avenue
signalized intersection.

**Deerfield Road Reconstruction Project**

The Deerfield Road reconstruction project was completed in early 2017. The scope of
work involved a full reconstruction of the roadway, traffic signal reconstruction, water
main replacement, storm/sanitary sewer replacement, and an improved sidewalk along
the south side of Deerfield Road. The underground gas main upgrade occurred in
2014. In 2015, above grade work was done for ComEd, AT&T and Comcast.

The Village of Deerfield Road was the owner of Deerfield Road but the Village handed
ownership over to Lake County in June of 2018. Now that the jurisdiction of Deerfield
Road is handed over to Lake County, the Village retains permitting authority and
general maintenance (plowing, minor repairs, etc.). The County is responsible for
traffic signal maintenance and for capital improvements going forward.

**Workforce Housing**

Workforce housing is affordable housing for middle-income people who will fill
jobs in fields as diverse as teaching, law enforcement and health care, especially
at entry-level salaries.

Workforce housing helps people live near their workplaces so they enjoy reduced
commuting times and transportation costs. Workforce housing may help local
employers attract and retain the people who maintain the health of the business
sector, keep the community safe, and who teach at our schools. Providing
adequate affordable housing for people so they do not have to expend huge
portions of their income on housing or spend hours commuting to their jobs is a
challenge facing many communities across the United States.

The current language in the Comprehensive Plan indicates that the Village is open to
affordable housing if the opportunity exists to provide some affordable housing in the
Village. Since the inclusion of the affordable housing section in the Village’s
Comprehensive Plan, the Village has had very few opportunities to provide affordable
housing in the Village.

Background on the past discussions of workforce housing by the Village is on the
Village’s website. To review background information on this issue, please go to
Government→ Departments → Community Development → Planning Division →
Workforce Housing
3.3 HOUSING

The purpose of this element of Deerfield’s Comprehensive Plan is to document the present and future housing needs within the Village of Deerfield, including affordable and special needs housing. The condition of the local housing stock has been considered in developing the strategies, programs, and other actions to address Deerfield’s housing needs, and provide current and future residents with a range of housing options.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Given the full development of the Village and the derogation of local land use planning and zoning powers provided by the Affordable Housing Planning and Appeal Act, 310 ILCS 67/1, et seq. (the "Act"), it is determined that compliance with the Act is impractical and not in the best interests of the Village; therefore, pursuant to its home rule powers, the Affordable Housing Planning and Appeal Act, 310 ILCS 67/1, et seq., will not apply within the Village of Deerfield and shall be superseded within the Village by the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan of the Village of Deerfield.

The Village recognizes the need for affordable housing within the Village and the region in which the Village is located and will give due consideration to those needs and to the opportunity to accommodate new affordable housing options within the Village when opportunities are presented to develop or redevelop significant parcels for residential uses in the Village of Deerfield. The enforcement of federal and state fair housing laws shall be and remain a priority for the Village.
**Goal:** Maintain the variety of the existing housing stock and supplement it in suitable locations with safe, well-constructed housing of a density*, scale* and character compatible with adjacent housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help maintain the desirability of Village neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Encourage maintenance of the existing housing stock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endeavor to increase the variety in the housing stock, so that there will be types and prices of housing to satisfy the needs and preferences of a wider variety of residents, while maintaining the single-family dwelling as the basic form of housing unit in the Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect residential areas from incompatible uses through effective land use controls, proper screening and buffering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain streets, parkway trees, sidewalks, street lighting and other community facilities in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage good architectural and site design, individuality and character in new housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Term defined in the Glossary.
Amendment to Comprehensive Plan

The petitioners will need to amend to the Village’s Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map to designate the subject property’s land use as Multi-Family Residential Use from Institutional Use. The Village’s Future Land Use Map is attached for the area in question.

Rezoning

The subject property is currently zoned R-1 Residential District. Houses of Worship are a special use in the R-1 Single Family District. The petitioners are requesting the rezoning of the property to R-5 General Residence District. The Rezoning standards are below. The petitioners have provided written responses to the rezoning standards in their submittals.

Rezoning Standards

Article 13.10-D Findings

Where the purpose and effect of the proposed amendment is to change the zoning classification of particular property, the Plan Commission shall make findings based upon the evidence presented to it in each specific case with respect to the following matters:

- **Existing Uses** - Existing uses of property within the general area of the property in question.
- **Current Zoning in Area** - The Zoning classification of property within the general area of the property in question.
- **Suitability of Present Zoning** - The suitability of the property in question for the uses permitted under the existing zoning classification and the proposed classification.
- **Trend of Development** - The trend of development, if any, in the general area of the property in question, including changes, if any, which may have taken place since the day the property in question was placed in its present zoning classification.

Residential Planned Unit Development (PUD)

The petitioners will also need approval of a Residential Planned Unit Development in the R-5 General Residence District. R-5 is the Village’s multiple family zoning district and it is the only zoning district where a residential PUD is allowed. The property will be developed as one PUD with the church building being a part of the new PUD. The
church and the apartment development will share vehicular access points, parking, open space and the storm water facility. The petitioner is seeking approval of a preliminary development plan for a residential planned unit development. PUDs are done in two steps. If the preliminary development plan is approved, the petitioners will be coming back to the Plan Commission and Village Board for approval of the final development plan. The Planned Unit Development (PUD) standards are below. The petitioners have provided written responses to the Planned Unit Development standards in their submittals.

Article 12.09-D,2,c Findings

A Planned Unit Development shall not be recommended for approval unless the Plan commission shall find the following:

- **Effect on Community** - That the proposed Planned Unit Development will not be significantly or materially detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety or general welfare of the community. This shall include consideration of the impact of the development upon physical development, tax base, and economic well-being of the Village.
- **Effect on the Neighborhood** - That the proposed Planned Unit Development will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted nor will it diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.
- **Effect on Development of Surrounding Property** - That the proposed Planned Unit Development will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property.
- **Adequacy of Utilities and Facilities** - That the applicant has demonstrated that adequate sewer and water, access roads, drainage and other necessary facilities are present or will be provided.
- **Adequacy of Ingress and Egress** - That the applicant has demonstrated that adequate means of ingress and egress designed to handle the traffic contemplated are present or will be provided.
- **Conformity to Regulations** - That the proposed Planned Unit Development meets all the regulations of this Ordinance except as such regulations may in each instance be modified by the Board of Trustees.

**Residential Planned Unit Development Requirements:**

**Minimum Size of Site**

Required: A minimum gross area of one (1) acre.
Provided: The subject property is 8.85 acres in size.
Minimum Land Area Per Dwelling Unit

Required: In a Residential PUD in the R-5 General Residence District, the following land area per dwelling unit is to be provided:
3,500 square feet for each three-bedroom unit in multi-family structures.
3,000 square feet for each two-bedroom unit in multi-family structures.
2,500 square feet for each unit with one or no bedrooms in multi-family structures.

13-one bedroom, 7-two bedroom units, and 5-three bedroom units are proposed, for a total of 25 units in the proposed development.

1 br: 13 units x 2,500 s.f. of land area for each 1 br. Unit = 32,500 s.f.
2 br: 7 units x 3,000 s.f. of land area for each 2 br. unit = 21,000 s.f.
3 br: 5 units x 3,500 s.f. of land area for each 3 br. unit = 17,500 s.f.

Total land area required: 71,000 s.f. of land area (32,500 s.f. + 21,000 s.f. + 17,500 s.f. = 71,000 s.f.) is required based on the mix of units in the proposed development = 1.63 acres of land area required (71,000/43,560 = 1.63 acres) and 8.85 acres is provided for the entire PUD site.

Minimum Lot Area and Lot Width

No minimum lot area or minimum lot width shall be required for a Residential PUD.

Minimum Setbacks

The following minimum setbacks shall be provided and maintained in a Residential Planned Unit Development in the R-5 General Residence District:

Between Street and Buildings

Public Rights-of-Way

Required: For a public street, buildings shall be set back from the property line not less than 25 feet plus 1 foot for each 1 foot by which the building exceeds 30 feet in height. There will be no public streets in this development.

Between Buildings

Required: The setback of the buildings and structures within the site must take due consideration of public safety especially with regard to fire hazards, traffic site lines, and access for emergency equipment.
The Deerfield Bannockburn Fire Protection District has reviewed and submitted a letter dated June 4, 2018 that the site is approved the plans for emergency vehicle accessibility.

**Perimeter Setback**

Required: A yard of not less than 25 feet, plus one (1) foot for each one (1) foot by which the building exceeds thirty (30) feet in height, shall be provided and maintained along the exterior boundaries of the Residential PUD. This perimeter yard shall be kept free of buildings and parking and shall be maintained in landscaping. The height of the proposed apartment building will be 33.10 feet. This height will determine the required perimeter setback. Therefore, a 29 foot minimum perimeter setback is required (25 minimum, plus an additional 4 feet equals 29 feet required perimeter setback).

Provided: The proposed apartment building will be approximately 499’ from the north property line and approximately 85’ from the east property line. The existing church building is approximately 202.5’ feet from the south property line. The proposed apartment building is 364’ from the south property line. In the west perimeter setback, a single lane service road area is approximately 13’ from the west property line and the church building is approximately 25.5’ from the west property line. Both of these existing items are located in the west perimeter PUD setback. An exception would be required to allow the existing structures to be located in the west perimeter setbacks of this PUD development as shown on the plan.

**Maximum Lot Coverage**

Required: The total ground area occupied by all principal and accessory buildings shall not exceed thirty (30) percent of the gross area of the site.

Provided: The petitioner’s plan indicates that the lot coverage is 7 percent.

**Minimum Usable Open Space**

Required: Not less than 20% of the gross area of a Residential PUD shall be devoted to permanent usable open space. The Zoning Ordinance defines usable open space as an area of land or water, or a combination of land and water, which may include complimentary structures and improvements within the site, excluding space devoted to parking, designed and intended for common use and enjoyment.
Provided: The petitioner's plan indicates that 63 percent of the site is open space when, the storm water detention facility and compensatory storage facility is excluded.

Building Height

The maximum allowable building height in the R-5 Multi-Family Zoning District is 35 feet. The Zoning Ordinance defines height as the vertical distance as measured from the pre-development grade for a property, to the highest point of the coping of a mansard roof or a flat roof, to the highest point of a hipped roof, to the highest gable of a pitched roof, to the ridge of the gable or hip roof, or to the highest point of a turret or ornamental tower, whichever point is higher.

Provided: The apartment building is 33.10 feet from the pre-development grade to the top of the building.

Parking

Required for the apartment building: Efficiency and one (1) bedroom units are to provide one and one-half (1-1/2) parking spaces for each dwelling unit, and two (2) or more bedroom units are to provide two (2) parking spaces for each dwelling unit.

1 br: 13 units x 1.5 parking spaces for each 1 br. Unit = 19.5 spaces
2 br: 7 units x 2 parking spaces for each 2 br. unit = 14 spaces
3 br: 5 units x 2 parking spaces for each 3 br. unit = 10 spaces
Total Required for proposed apartment building= 43.5 spaces

Required for places of worship: One (1) parking space for each 4 seats

264 seats in the church /1 parking space for every 4 seats = 66 spaces

Based on the mix of units in the development and the church, a total of 110 parking spaces would be required (43.5+66=109.5).

Provided: 112 parking surface spaces in the parking lot total for both uses (including 10 accessible spaces)

Size of parking stalls and aisle width, and curbing

Required: Perpendicular (90 degree) parking spaces must be a minimum of 9 feet wide by 19 feet in depth. A minimum aisle width of 24 feet is also required for perpendicular spaces. The Zoning Ordinance requires continuous permanent curbing for the parking lots between all landscaping areas and adjacent parking lot.
Provided: 9 feet wide by 19.5 feet in depth with a 24-foot two-way aisle width, including curbing.

**Lighting**

Required: The Zoning Ordinance requires that all exterior lighting be directed away from adjoining highways, streets, and properties and not spill over the property line.

Provided: The parking lot will be lit with nine, 20ft. tall bronze poles with a single fixture. Light fixtures will shield light sources and light will not spill onto adjacent residential properties. Residential scaled security and convenience lighting will be near the entries and all light fixtures will have a similar finish to the parking lot lighting. The petitioner has submitted a photometric study, which indicates that the lighting will be zero at the property lines.

**Signage - Identification Entry Signs**

**Number and content**

Allowed: Not more than one (1) identification entry sign at each entrance into the PUD. Such sign shall indicate only the name of the development and an identifying symbol of the development.

Proposed: One ground sign is proposed for Zion Woods at the entrance off of Deerfield Road. An exception is required because there is an existing ground sign for the Zion Lutheran Church, which will remain.

**Type:**

Allowed: May be either monument signs or lettering mounted on a decorative wall.

Proposed: The petitioner is proposing install an externally illuminated monument sign at the east side of the main driveway. The sign will be 3’ tall and 7’-4” long and have the Zion Woods text with a logo. The ground sign consist of brick masonry with a cast stone base and cap with a metal Zion Woods logo. The text Zion Woods will be in metal.
Area:

Allowed: No more than one face. The gross surface area of the sign face shall not exceed 27 square feet per face. The sign is measured by determining the area of the smallest single rectangle, which encompasses all of the lettering, and does not include the sign base.

Proposed: 22 (3.0’ tall by 7.33’ long = 21.99) square feet per face, for a total of 44 square feet. An exception is needed for two (2) sign faces and the total square footage of the ground sign.

Location:

Allowed: On the same zoning lot as the principal use and in any required yard but no closer than 25 feet from any property line.

Proposed: Approximately 28 feet from the property line.

Lighting:

Allowed: Externally illuminated only and constructed with timer so that the hours of lighting maybe adjusted as appropriate.

Proposed: Externally illuminated.

Fire District

The petitioner has submitted a letter dated June 4, 2018 from the Deerfield Bannockburn Fire Protection District that the site plan for the 25-unit development is approved for emergency vehicle accessibility.

Impact Fees

If the project is approved, the developer will be required to pay impact fees to the Village that are required by the Village’s impact fee ordinance. Based on the 13-one bedroom units, 7-two bedroom units, and 5-three bedroom units an impact fee of $190,149.60 is required.

$ 5,888.87 (per 1 bedroom apartment) X 13 = $ 76,555.33
$ 7,058.48 (per 2 bedroom apartment) X 7 = $49,409.38
$12,836.98 (per 3 bedroom apartment) X 5 = $64,184.89
Total Impact Fee = $190,149.60
Property Impact Analysis

The petitioner engaged Teska Associates, Inc. to analyze the impact on property values as measured by recent sales of homes and assessed values of properties surrounding other nearby affordable housing developments. The Property Impact Analysis dated June 5, 2018 looks at two fundamental questions: 1.) Is there evidence that homes closer to existing affordable housing are valued less than properties further away as measured by recent sales?; and 2.) Is there evidence that for-sale homes closer to existing affordable housing have lower assessed values than comparable homes further away from the sites?

The studies key findings included that there are significant physical buffers surrounding the proposed development that would minimize any potential impact on the market value of neighboring properties; the site is currently church-owned, has an existing residential building on the site and is tax exempt. A new affordable housing development will pay property taxes to support local government services; there is no evidence that home sale prices are lower for properties near existing affordable housing developments compared to those further away. In all cases, prices of homes close to the affordable housing developments were equal to or greater than properties further away. The analysis also noted that prices varied much more based on other characteristics such as age and housing condition. The analysis also found no evidence that the assessed value of properties near existing affordable housing developments are lower than those further away. Therefore, the study found, there has been no reduction in property taxes generated by homes nearby affordable housing developments compared with taxes generated by homes further away. Furthermore, land value varied far less than building values in the determination of total assessed value.

Sidewalks

The existing sidewalks located in the Village right-of-way along Deerfield Road will remain.

Development Code

The Development Code requires that a developer submit, as part of the Planned Unit Development Preliminary Development Plan, a proposed plan which will detail those improvements which an owner or developer proposes to be public or private. The preliminary improvement plan must also detail how these requests vary from the requirements of the Development Code.

All the improvements in this development are proposed to be private, unless the Village Engineering Department recommends that a utility be public, such as the water mains
in the development. The property owner will be responsible for the maintenance of the private improvements in the development.

**Preliminary Plat of Resubdivision**

The petitioners are not proposing to subdivide the property. Sometimes planned unit developments choose to subdivide to create a lot for each building and a common outlot. Sometimes planned unit developments do not subdivide as is the case with the proposed Zion Woods development.

**Prefiling Conference Minutes**

The prefiling conference minutes from the July 27, 2017, and the May 14, 2015 meetings are attached for project background purposes.
Memorandum
Public Works & Engineering Department

To: Jeff Ryckaert  cc: Tyler Dickinson
   Principal Planner  John Guccione

From: Robert Phillips, P.E.
       Acting Director of Public Works and Engineering

Date: June 21, 2018

Subject: 10 Deerfield Road (Zion Church Development)
          Preliminary Engineering Analysis

Scenario:

The Zion Lutheran Church is planning to redevelop the property located at 10 Deerfield Road. According to the most recent FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map the property lies within the Special Flood Hazard Area Zone AE (100 year flood-plain) and the regulatory floodway. The design engineer has prepared a preliminary set of site plans that appear to address the aforementioned conditions and are in line with the Village’s requirements for utilities.

Preliminary Engineering:

Though the site plans are preliminary at this time it appears that all engineering requirements can be met. Flood plain areas can be filled as long as compensatory storage is provided as the rate of 1.2:1. The regulatory floodway can be infringed upon, but not filled, under consent of certain regulatory agencies (US Army Corps, Lake County SMC, FEMA). To implement the currently proposed plan the developer must engage these agencies and obtain the proper documentation before the Village of Deerfield Engineering Department will approve construction on the site. The process includes obtaining a CLOMR-F, LOMR-F, approval from the US COE, and approval from Lake County.

The Engineering Department has also reviewed the preliminary submittal with respect to utilities. The submittal appears, in concept, to be in line with the our requirements. Field verification of the Village water main, connection points, and valve locations is required before approval of plans. The Engineer is encouraged to contact the Village to schedule a field meeting for utility review.

Conclusion:

This site is unique and very uncommon due to the involvement of floodplain/floodway. Though the floodplain/floodway issues must be addressed, they do not appear to be insurmountable. It would appear, at the preliminary stage, that site engineering can achieve approval.
The Plan Commission of the Village of Deerfield called to order a Workshop Meeting at 7:30 P.M. on July 27, 2017 at the Village Hall, 850 Waukegan Road, Deerfield, Illinois.

Present were: Larry Berg, Chairman
Al Bromberg
Elaine Jacoby
Stuart Shayman

Absent were: Sean Forrest
Jim Moyer

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

Chairman Berg explained that this is a workshop meeting at which the Commission generally does not entertain comments from the public. However, an exception will be made given the interest in the agenda item. Chairman Berg stated that after the petitioners speak, interested individuals will be allowed three minutes each to speak. He asked for no repetitive testimony. He added that when this agenda item holds a public hearing, public notices will be sent and the public is invited to speak and share their opinions at this meeting.

Public Comment on a Non-Agenda Item

Andrew Marwick of 442 Kelburn addressed the Commission. He shared that he encourages the Village to form a commission to study rezoning the area around the Lake Cook Metra station. He stated that the number of people around the station is increasing with Caterpillar headquarters. He added that he feels there is a lot of potential in this area with no residential close by. He feels that the Village needs start a commission to look at rezoning this area and determine limits for height, density, and others. He commented that he thinks the Village will see proposals like tonight’s agenda item coming to that area if it is rezoned. Chairman Berg thanked Mr. Marwick for his comments.

(1) Prefiling Conference for rezoning, amendment to the comprehensive plan, and a residential planned unit development (PUD) to permit a workforce housing development at 10 Deerfield Road (Zion Lutheran Church, Brinshore Development LLC, and Housing Opportunity Development Corporation)

Chairman Berg explained that tonight no vote will be taken by the Commission as it is not a public hearing. After the public hearing is held, the Commission will take a vote. The Plan Commission does not make binding decisions. They vote on a recommendation that will be made to the Village Board and then the Board votes to make a decision.

Chairman Berg swore in all speakers who plan to address the Commission.

Petitioner David Brint of Brinshore addressed the Commission. He began by stating that he and his team look forward to the Commission’s feedback and insight on this project that they have spent a great deal of time on along with Eckenhoff Saunders Architects, their engineers and
landscape architect. He stated that they were here several years ago with a proposal and after studying the site and talking to neighbors, they are now before the Commission to present the project with many of the concerns they heard addressed and incorporated into the development. They are proposing a 25-unit project with buildings with one and two stories under 33 feet in height. There will be 13 units of workforce housing and 12 special needs units. There will be 15 one bedroom units, 17 two bedroom units and 3 three bedroom units. There will also be a community garden, playground and grill area, walking trails, extensive landscaping and other things to make it nice for the people who live there.

Mr. Brint stated that they have met with the immediate neighbors and have had productive meetings. However they cannot do everything the neighbors would like. They have reduced the proposed development from 48 units to 25 units and moved the buildings further away from the nearest single family homes. Traffic will be greatly diminished with 12 of the units being special needs units which will have no cars. Storm water retention will be addressed by putting in 1.5 times the required amount of runoff storage. The development team also looked at the economic impact of the project.

Architect Matt Wylie addressed the Commission. He stated that he will talk about the building and site design, organization, setbacks, layout, and size. He showed the revised site plan and pointed out the church and buildings one and two. He stated that the parsonage is removed as part of this project as that house is in the floodway. The site plan includes an extension of the existing parking lot. Mr. Wylie stated that the plan used to have three buildings that extended all the way behind 935 Heather Road. With revisions to the plan, setback changes have been quite drastic and are now 511 feet from the north and 200 feet from the street. He showed an image with setbacks from each property on Heather. He stated that building two which is the largest is approximately 147 feet from the west property line and even further from the adjacent residential building. The buildings are located to stay out of the flood plain line. He pointed out the storm water detention basin along Deerfield Road that is intended to manage water. It will be landscaped with natural plantings to be visually appealing and be an animal habitat. He added that revisions also relocated the playground and picnic area to the east side of the access drive so that children will not be crossing the driveway to use it and it will also be further away from the adjoining neighbors. They also moved the community gardens to be immediately behind the parking and Zion church building.

Mr. Wylie stated that there are currently dense plantings on the west boundary. That buffer will be enhanced with a berm and plantings, and engineering improvements to address water on the property. He showed floor plans of the buildings pointing out that it was originally a full two story building and was updated to make it similar to the neighbors' homes. There are now one story sections and a two story section. Building one has a three bedroom unit which will be used by Zion church, as well as a management office. The property management company who will be used also for this project currently manages One Deerfield Place and will have a presence on site. Building two is similar but does not have the larger apartment or management office and therefore has a smaller footprint. Mr. Wylie went on that the building elevations are under the permitted zoning height and do not need a variation. Measurements were taken from pre-development grade and the buildings will be shorter relative to the grade as seen out the back of the homes on Heather. The building materials are a combination of brick and cement siding, which will have the appearance of wood but will be lower maintenance and fire resistant. Chairman Berg asked that the sample materials be shared with all meeting attendees. Mr. Wylie stated that there has been no final brick or siding color selection made.
He went on that the buildings will have full fire sprinkler systems as well as audio and visual security systems. They have worked with the fire department and determined that the proposed development will comply with their needs to provide services. The police department also did not give any indication that providing services would be a problem although they do not issue a formal letter.

Mr. Wylie stated that the waste and recycling corrals were on the west side in the original plan and have now been moved to east side of parking in response to neighbor comments. This area will also be constructed out of the same materials as the building.

Engineer Laura Shafer addressed the Commission and summarized the storm water and flood plain plan, utilities, and the interface with the road improvements that were just completed. She showed an image of the property’s existing conditions and stated that the new development does not intend to do anything in the floodway. She showed the 100 year flood plain, which just occurred and was typical for these conditions. She then showed the 500 year flood plain, which is not seen very often. She pointed out that in a 100-year storm, the development would not be in the flood plain and in the 500-year storm, the parking may be under water. She added that to achieve this, they need to provide storage and that for every amount of space filled in, they must provide water storage for 1.2 times that, increasing water storage by 20% which will get portions of the property out of the flood plain. The proposed water storage basin location has been revised from the first presentation but will still be downhill from all neighboring properties.

Commissioner Bromberg asked Ms. Shafer to explain how the water storage facility works. Ms. Shafer showed an image of the proposed storage basin and explained that when the river starts to flood from common zero to 10 year storms, the basin will not take water from these storms. For any larger storms beyond that, there is a natural break in the berm and the water will come up and channel over to the compensatory storage basin. On a usual day it will be dry and look like a prairie. When it is full after a large storm and needs to drain, the structure will convey the water through a pipe and catch basin and will discharge to the detention facility, which is also a dry basin when there is no rain, it is not a pond. This basin then discharges to a storm sewer and into the river. Ms. Shafer stated that they recognize that the plan discharges to a river that is sometimes high and there will be times that it cannot discharge, so they have increased the size of the detention facility to accommodate this. The basin can hold water until the river goes down and will slowly discharge.

Commissioner Bromberg asked how this plan compares to conditions on the property today. Ms. Shafer replied that right now conditions are that when water rises it spills onto the site. Water will still spill over, but the project will change the grades and direct water to go into the compensatory storm basin. Commissioner Jacoby confirmed that right now when it floods water stays there. Ms. Shafer replied yes, but that this plan will be building in new drainage.

Commissioner Shayman asked about the elevations relative to the 100 year and 500 year flood plains. Ms. Shafer replied that the elevation is approximately 655 feet through the property but ranges slightly; it is two feet above the base flood elevations. Commissioner Shayman asked about the 500 year flood plain elevations. Ms. Shafer replied that she would have to go check to see what the 500 year flood building elevations would be.

Ms. Shafer then reviewed utilities. Their plan proposes to put in a water main to connect to Deerfield Road so that in the case of a water main break residents will still have water. She shared that they tried to coordinate this before Deerfield Road was repaved but were
unsuccessful. The existing pipe is a six inch service pipe and they are proposing an 8 inch service pipe. They will have to connect the pipe and then patch and fix the street.

Ms. Shafer then reviewed the traffic study. At the peak hour, they estimate that there would be a slight increase in traffic but traffic counts at the intersections to the east and west of the development on Deerfield Road will remain unchanged. Commissioner Bromberg asked if the assumption is that the units for disabled will not be driving. Ms. Shafer replied they use Pace or have cars that drive them, but not all at the same time and they do not anticipate these units to impact traffic. Chairman Berg asked Ms. Shafer to discuss whether there are conflicts with church services. Ms. Shafer replied that there are Sunday services at 9:30 and 11:30 and the peak number of vehicles leaving the development at a time will be about 80. They anticipate the residential to add about 13 cars an hour at peak time. She stated that there is adequate parking for church goers and residents at the same time.

Commissioner Shayman asked about holidays. Ms. Shafer replied that they gave no special consideration for holidays. Commissioner Shayman suggested that they look into this and have the information at the public hearing.

Commissioner Bromberg asked if there is a left turn lane into the property heading eastbound. Ms. Shafer replied that there is and that there are no changes proposed to this. Chairman Berg asked if there are traffic counts for Deerfield Road on peak hours and Sundays nearest to the development. Ms. Shafer replied that the counts were 876 in the peak morning hours of 7-9 A.M. going west and 1229 at the peak evening hours of 4-6 P.M.

Mr. Brint announced that this concludes their presentation and asked if there are other questions or feedback from the Commission. Commissioner Shayman asked to discuss the berm on the west side including how high it will be and what plantings will be there compared to what is there now. Mr. Wylie showed the site plan and showed where the berm runs. The berm ranges from three to four feet high; it is an improvement that is not there now to manage water on the site. Commissioner Shayman commented that currently the water all drains west to east. Ms. Shafer stated that the engineering is such that there is an overland flow in the berm and in a large storm if it pools, there will now be an active way to get the water out. Commissioner Jacoby suggested bringing photos of this to the public hearing. Mr. Wylie added that the berm provides some additional privacy for neighboring residents. He also stated that the berm will remove some existing plants and they will then plant evergreens and other native plantings to preserve the view of residents.

Commissioner Jacoby asked if each unit is assigned a parking space. Mr. Brint replied that units are not assigned spaces. There are 112 parking spaces which is strong in terms of how many are required. He added that given the change in the intended market, there is a mixture of people who likely will be parking at a lesser rate. The 112 count is what the ordinance requires, but does not account for the fact that disabled residents may never take advantage of the parking.

Commissioner Jacoby asked about existing plantings and prairie areas. Mr. Wylie replied that some of this will be left as is but some will change as there will be elevation changes between the development and the neighbors. Commissioner Shayman asked if in discussions with neighbors they indicated if they wanted a fence. Mr. Wylie replied that a fence did not come up but that they could do this if it is preferable. However, preserving the current landscape is the direction they went to be mutually beneficial to all property owners.
Commissioner Bromberg asked about the residents that would move into the development. He asked what the qualifications are for the half workforce housing. Mr. Brint replied that there is a limit to household income to qualify for workforce housing. He added that the other half is housing for individuals with a disability; physical or mental. These residents receive support services from outside agencies. Commissioner Bromberg asked who decides who is eligible for the disabled housing. Mr. Brint replied that the State as well as their service provider determines this. Chairman Berg inquired who the service provider is. Mr. Brint replied that it will likely be Thresholds.

Commissioner Bromberg asked about the difference between accessible and adaptable units. Mr. Brint clarified that all first floor units are accessible for wheelchairs. An accessible unit has everything for someone who is living there and is wheelchair bound. An adaptable unit can be adapted and changed to be an accessible unit. To do this, light switch heights are changed as well as making bathrooms handicapped accessible and other things. Commissioner Bromberg inquired what the units sensory impairment individuals meant. Mr. Brint replied that units for people who are visually impaired have an auditory emergency alert system, and units for auditory impaired have a visual alert system.

Commissioner Bromberg commented that he thinks neighbors will be concerned about how the development will impact their property values. He inquired as to if they have any testimony that addresses this. Mr. Brint replied that they will have this information ready for the public hearing. He added that there are numerous studies from around the country that have looked at values of homes before and after a neighboring development such as this is added. There are studies that show long-term impacts. Chairman Berg commented that it would help to see local data on this topic versus from around the country.

Chairman Berg asked for more information about the property management. Mr. Brint replied that the company already manages another nearby property at 1 Deerfield Place and they will have a physical presence on site although not full time. The Zion church apartment also provides residents on site who will have eyes on the property.

Commissioner Bromberg asked if the church would continue to own the property. Mr. Brint replied that yes, the church will still own the land and lease it.

Chairman Berg asked if the land will be tax exempt and the improvements taxed. Mr. Brint stated that it is their understanding that they will be taxed and they plan to be responsible for the taxes.

Chairman Berg reiterated that public comment is usually not a component of a workshop meeting but in light of the interest in this topic the Commission is allowing limited public comment. Speakers are limited to three minutes, and he asked that speaking not be repetitive.

Sharon Kessel of 834 Smoke Tree Road addressed the Commission. She reported that she has lived there for 39 years and been a realtor in Deerfield for 30 years. She stated that she finds that when she has a buyer looking at homes they like to live in a home that is not on top of the toll way, not on top of the Edens, not looking out at train tracks, and in a single-family community. She finds that buyers do not want to be looking at multi-unit developments. She feels this development will have a negative impact on the single family homes adjacent to it, especially because there is no other multifamily nearby.
Norval Brown, Pastor of Christ United Methodist Church at 600 Deerfield Road addressed the Commission. He reported that he is speaking in support of the petitioners. He shared a story called Grandfather’s Bowl. The story was about a family who ate together and the elderly grandfather spilled and made messes at the table because of his shaking due to health issues. The mother and father became irritated with the mess and set up a small table in the corner of the room for the grandfather to eat at where he would eat out of a wooden bowl. He sat and ate there alone at meal times. One evening the father noticed his child making a bowl and the child said he made it for his father to eat out of when he was old. This struck the father, and the grandfather then came back to eat at the family table and the mess no longer bothered the mother and father. Mr. Brown stated that this is a story about people who are living on the margins and are made to live on the margins. He believes this development on the Zion grounds, is a way to bring them in to live in the mainstream. He encouraged all to be in favor of affordable housing, as housing is a right to all human beings.

Charlene Quint of 18080 Pond Ridge Circle addressed the Commission. She stated that she speaks on behalf of A Safe Place, a domestic violence organization for women in Lake County. She helped start the Lake Forest support group and serves the surrounding communities including women in Deerfield. She is here to support affordable housing in Deerfield and applaud Zion church for their efforts. She stated that as a former regent at Trinity International University where she served as an adjunct professor, affordable housing is one of the biggest hurdles that graduate and seminary students face. And a Trinity student would be a blessing to have as a neighbor. She shared that she was a corporate attorney, and after being forced to flee own home in Lake Forest in 2012 due to domestic abuse, she now helps women and children escape abusive marriages. She shared statistics and stated that 35% of women in Deerfield will at some point in their lives be a victim of domestic violence, meaning all in the room know someone affected whether they have revealed it or not. And this also means everyone knows someone who is an abuser as well. They are doctors and lawyers and clergy and because of their status in affluent communities they believe normal rules do not apply to them. She stated that the women in her support group are the most lovely women and are from this area. Affordable housing would be great for these women and for their neighbors.

Steve Jackson of 932 Fountain View addressed the Commission. He stated that he has lived in Deerfield for 50 years. He stated that he has seen two worthwhile developments accrue, 1 Deerfield Place and The Fountains. He also commented that the Patty Turner Center took years to gain acceptance in Deerfield and in the beginning residents of The Fountains were afraid it would be a nuisance and now it has proved to be anything but. As a resident, he appreciates when he sees a project that comes along that serves an important need and is well thought out and monitored. Mr. Jackson stated that he is a Baha’i member and a quote of the son of the founder of their faith relates to how we get along with others. The quote says “see no strangers, rather see all men as friends, for love and unity come hard when you fix your gaze on others.”

Harriet Dart of 1057 Camille Ave. addressed the Commission. She has lived in Deerfield for over 50 years. She stated that she wants to speak to the character of Deerfield having raised kids, been a business owner, and having taken care of special needs individuals. She added that she is now growing old and is wondering if she might be able to stay in the community she has lived in for so long. She stated that the opportunity to have a place like this with housing for people who help clean the streets and maintain houses is an important aspect. She stated that our children going to school with these people is an important part of their education that you cannot really measure. And that it is important to meet people who are not in your own circle. She supports the project.
Richard Sachs of 510 Brierhill Road, addressed the Commission. He stated that he has enjoyed growing up and raising children in Deerfield. He understands that the church would like to monetize the property and do good. But when you are doing good at the same time that you are doing harm to others, it is not a good balance. He stated the regarding property values, he has spoken to a couple who put their house up for sale and can’t sell it because of this possible development. He stated that when you see this possible project compared to quite street, buyers will not buy here. He feels that this property should not be rezoned. He added that the Deerfield police said they would not allow ingress and egress from a different project on Deerfield Road due to the blind corner, and now this is being considered. He added that he is certain there will be an accident there and the police will have to recount what they said. He stated that the issue at hand is not affordable housing but finding the appropriate location. He feels this proposal is not right for this location.

Lawrence Marks of 3506 Western in Highland Park addressed the Commission. He stated that he is a rental tenant with CPAH (Community Partners for Affordable Housing) along with his four children in Hyacinth Place Highland Park property. He is here to speak about the profound affect that affordable housing has had on him and his family. He shared that his wife was battled bipolar and alcoholism and within three years they lost their house and filed for bankruptcy. After his wife became detached, he turned all of his energy to keeping his kids’ lives stable. While he was underemployed they rented and eventually couldn’t afford that any longer. He then discovered CPAH and affordable housing opportunities out there for people who did not want to be forced to leave their communities due to hardships. He was surprised to discover he could qualify and keep his kids in their school and with their friends and family. They have now been in their home for three years and it is the family’s anchor. He asked that all please support affordable housing programs.

Melissa Juarez from the Center for Enriched Living at 280 Saunders Rd. in Riverwoods addressed the Commission. She stated that her agency provides social activities, recreation, employment and life enrichment for children, teens and adults with disabilities including autism Down’s syndrome and more. They serve residents within a 15 mile radius and plenty come from Deerfield. They have great relationships with families and schools. At the Center they use three key words; include, achieve, enjoy. By supporting this development, she feels it can help people be fully included in the community, achieve personal success, and enjoy living independently.

Maureen Darnaby of 905 Heather Road addressed the Commission. She stated that she has met with the church a number of times since January 2016 and feels that she is being portrayed as she is not. She stated that she has purchased her property and invested in Deerfield knowing that the church property behind her home was zoned R-1 and does not want this to be rezoned to R-5. She feels this would be spot zoning and is unheard of in Deerfield. She asked that everyone remember that we are all friends and neighbors and when you look at a development like this, imagine a change his dramatic behind your own home.

Josh Weiss of 965 Heather addressed the Commission. He thanked the Commission for their public service. He stated that the scale and density of this project is out of character with the neighborhood and would negatively impact many properties. His house has been on the market for three weeks and all potential buyers have asked about this development. He stated that it has already impacted property values and he finds this very unfair and unreasonable. He asked the Commission to consider this carefully.
Alex Shkurenko 670 Carriage Way addressed the Commission. He began by saying that he is thankful for the opportunity to voice concerns over this. He commented on the traffic analysis, stating that it is not only residential traffic that would be impacted but also construction traffic so soon after the recently resurfaced Deerfield Road. He also stated that relative to storm water, he wants to make sure that the water basins would not create any additional mosquito hazard. He commented that regarding taxes, he would like to see the net effect on taxes that this development would have if neighboring home values are lowered in value. He would also like to ensure that the experience of the builders is relevant to this project. He would like to see a builder with more experience in North Shore communities.

Joanne Rosenberg of NAMI Lake County addressed the Commission. She stated that NAMI supports people with mental illness. She attested that Thresholds is an excellent organization in terms of providing support and assessing who is able to manage living independently. She stated that people with many different types of disabilities may live independently in this building. They would receive whatever supports they needed, physically and emotionally. The experience of people integrating into the community is very important. She added that these people are all of our family members, children, parents, sisters and brothers and co-workers. She stated that there is a large percentage of people who experience needs to get services and housing that needs to be affordable. Affordable housing allows people to remain near their families. She offered to answer any questions about mental illness or supports offered.

Jonathan Dien of 915 Heather Road addressed the Commission. He thanked the Commissioners for the opportunity to speak and thanked Dan Nakahara who has helpful in sharing information. He stated that he moved here three years ago and invested his time and energy to move his family to a neighborhood where they always wanted to live. He commented that it struck him that this development is what they left the city to get away from. They moved to someplace quite with homes that were similar in size and density. He added that while the plans and renderings are beautiful, in reality it’s a city block. He stated that he bought into a community based on a commitment that the Village of Deerfield made to him. He did his homework and asked questions, and the possibility of a development like this was not there based on zoning. He is not in favor of breaking the promise he feels the Village of Deerfield made to him and his family. He asked that the Commissioners consider this as they make their decision.

Christopher Canning of 1000 Skokie Blvd. in Wilmette addressed the Commission. He stated that he is an attorney representing Jerry Saltarelli of 935 Heather. He stated that having been a former Village official, he hopes the Commissioners take their responsibility seriously. He stated that they have not heard much information from the petitioners on how this project meets the standards of review. He asked the Commissioners to keep these standards of review in mind and ask questions relative to them.

Amy Mayber of 365 Carriage Way addressed the Commission. She stated that she supports workforce housing in Deerfield and also supports Thresholds and battered women's rights. However, these are not the issues at hand. She stated that the only issue before them is whether or not this proposal makes sense on this property. She stated that the Commissioners are bound by the statue, zoning ordinances, and standards of review. She added that they have fiduciary obligations and must consider these things as the church tries to monetize their property. She stated that she is glad that the church met with the Heather neighbors, but they did not meet with them on Carriage Way. She feels that this proposal on this property does not make sense. She added that the petitioners should do a traffic study that does not take place on
the Friday before spring break. She encouraged the Commissioners to complete their fiduciary responsibilities.

Andy Stein of 970 Heather addressed the Commission. He stated that he and his wife and kids bought their home six years ago. He saw the vacant land and did his homework to learn the zoning and the Village’s Comprehensive Plan. He stated that it is the Village’s responsibility to plan for future land use of vacant land and they determined that this land would be zoned for institutions for religious use and private schools. He stated that if rezoned, this would create a slippery slope and impact the sanctity of what homeowners are buying in Deerfield. He asked that the Commissioners please take the proposal seriously as it has a serious impact on families who make investments into the community and into their homes. He asked why affordable housing was not brought up with other recent apartment developments. He asked if there is a commission to study housing for disabled and affordable housing to enable this and bring it to the community. He added that this proposal is classic spot zoning and that he and his neighbors will band together and will continue to fight for the rights of property owners.

Andrew Marwick of 442 Kelburn addressed the Commission. He stated that he spoke about Woodview and AMLI apartments when 240 units were approved for independent living, with no mention of affordable housing. He agreed that the issue is whether this project is right on this site regardless of the type of housing. He commented that this site is on a flood plain and the first floor units would be under water as well as cars. He added that many mature trees will also be cut down and this is not a good location for these reasons. Additionally it is not close to public transit and not a walkable area especially in the winter.

Chairman Berg thanked the petitioners and all members of the public who spoke. He stated that all of the feedback will help the Commission determine what is best for the community.

Mr. Nakahara stated that letters sent to the Village regarding this petition were forwarded to the Plan Commissioners as well as the developer and posted on the Village website.

Chairman Berg stated that the public hearing will likely take place on August 24 or sometime in September. Mr. Sachs commented that August 24 is a difficult time with summer travel and asked that they consider September when more residents will be in town. Chairman Berg asked the petitioners to take this into account and work with staff on the date. He added that all legal notices will be provided by statute.

There was no further discussion and the Workshop Meeting was concluded at 9:15 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Laura Boll
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FUTURE LAND USE CATEGORIES
(MAP INDICATES UPDATES THROUGH MAY 23, 2017)

- **Single-Family Residential** - Areas that contain or are appropriate for single-family residential development.
- **Two-Family Residential** - Areas intended to accommodate a mix of single-family and two-family development.
- **Multi-Family Residential** - Areas that contain townhouse developments, condominiums or other large multi-family buildings.
- **Retail Services** - Areas intended to accommodate consumer-oriented retail services and commercial uses. Within the Village Center this land use category may include mixed-use developments with residential above the ground floor.
- **Hotel** - An establishment that provides lodging and services for travelers and other paying guests.
- **Office/Research** - Areas intended to accommodate various types of office uses.
- **Light Industrial** - A wide variety of employment-oriented land uses are included under this land use category such as: light manufacturing uses, warehousing, distribution, data processing/telecommunications and related office uses.
- **Public** - This category identifies the major public uses including schools, Village facilities, library, and post office.
- **Institutional** - Identifies quasi-public facilities in the Village, including private schools and places of worship.
- **Transportation/Parking/Utilities** - This land use category includes commuter rail facilities, commuter parking and utilities.
- **Open Space** - Both public and private open space is included in this land use category. Major land owners include the Village, the Deerfield Park District and Briarwood Country Club.

VILLAGE CENTER

FIGURE 3.1 UPDATED: FUTURE LAND USE MAP
3.2 FUTURE LAND USE

Deerfield’s pattern of land use is not expected to change significantly over the next 20 to 25 years. A comparison of Figure 3.1: Future Land Use Plan and Figure 2.1: Existing Land Use Map shows only a few instances where change is anticipated. For the most part, such change involves new development on the few remaining vacant parcels, and accommodating anticipated future expansion of parks and other public uses.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT/REDEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

It is important to anticipate the future needs of the Village and its residents. Periodically, the Village should review all long-range projections as well as current trends. Those reviews should be used as the basis for formulating plans for meeting anticipated needs and for reviewing development and redevelopment proposals.

There are very few parcels of land within Deerfield or within Deerfield’s Planning Jurisdiction that are undeveloped. Most of those parcels have previously received approval from the Village for some type of development but the development has not as yet taken place. In some cases that approved development may not be as desirable as it once was from the Village’s or the property owner’s viewpoint. Opportunities to consider and evaluate alternative developments for such undeveloped parcels should be undertaken with care. Proposals for the redevelopment of areas of the Village that have reached the stage in their economic lives where their redevelopment is possible should not adversely impact the surrounding areas and the Village as a whole.

The Village should be continually seeking to maintain a safe, livable, and beautiful environment. As development and redevelopment proposals are presented to the Village, they should be critically evaluated.
**Goal** Guide future growth within Deerfield’s Planning Jurisdiction so that public facilities and amenities can be effectively and economically provided, and that such growth does not adversely change the village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carefully consider proposals for development or redevelopment of development sites.</td>
<td>Consider approval of development and redevelopment plans when the uses and structures proposed have been planned so that they will be suitable for the area in which they are to be located and they are not a substantial adverse impact to surrounding properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider approval of development or redevelopment proposals when the Village is satisfied that parking demand and the traffic generated by the project will not cause undue burdens to surrounding properties or the Village as a whole.</td>
<td>Direct developments and redevelopments to include pedestrian facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that the development or redevelopment can be adequately provided with utilities and other Village services without creating an undue burden on those utilities and services.</td>
<td>Require that the impact of any development on the Village’s schools, parks, library, fire department and the Village itself has been adequately addressed through land donations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 HOUSING

The purpose of this element of Deerfield’s Comprehensive Plan is to document the present and future housing needs within the Village of Deerfield, including affordable and special needs housing. The condition of the local housing stock has been considered in developing the strategies, programs, and other actions to address Deerfield’s housing needs, and provide current and future residents with a range of housing options.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Given the full development of the Village and the derogation of local land use planning and zoning powers provided by the Affordable Housing Planning and Appeal Act, 310 ILCS 67/1, et seq. (the “Act”), it is determined that compliance with the Act is impractical and not in the best interests of the Village; therefore, pursuant to its home rule powers, the Affordable Housing Planning and Appeal Act, 310 ILCS 67/1, et seq., will not apply within the Village of Deerfield and shall be superseded within the Village by the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan of the Village of Deerfield.

The Village recognizes the need for affordable housing within the Village and the region in which the Village is located and will give due consideration to those needs and to the opportunity to accommodate new affordable housing options within the Village when opportunities are presented to develop or redevelop significant parcels for residential uses in the Village of Deerfield. The enforcement of federal and state fair housing laws shall be and remain a priority for the Village.
**Goal**: Maintain the variety of the existing housing stock and supplement it in suitable locations with safe, well-constructed housing of a density*, scale* and character compatible with adjacent housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help maintain the desirability of Village neighborhoods.</td>
<td>Encourage maintenance of the existing housing stock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endeavor to increase the variety in the housing stock, so that there will be types and prices of housing to satisfy the needs and preferences of a wider variety of residents, while maintaining the single-family dwelling as the basic form of housing unit in the Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protect residential areas from incompatible uses through effective land use controls, proper screening and buffering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain streets, parkway trees, sidewalks, street lighting and other community facilities in good condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage good architectural and site design, individuality and character in new housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodate new housing in a manner that does not adversely impact the residential character of the Village.</td>
<td>Encourage only those developments which conform to the Land Use Map and which are thoughtfully designed with respect to traffic generation, traffic patterns, topographical and drainage conditions and small scale* of existing developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apply Deerfield's impact fee ordinance to residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage redevelopment that is designed to be compatible with adjacent developments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Term defined in the Glossary.
6. GLOSSARY

**Density** – The number of dwelling units per net acre of land.

**Density, High** – Eleven or more dwelling units per net acre of land.

**Density, Low** – Less than five dwelling units per net acre of land.

**Density, Medium** – Five or more, but less than eleven dwelling units per net acre of land.

**Goals** describe, in general terms, broad aims, desired end situations, or ideals for achievement. A goal is typically broad and long-range.

**Objectives** are more specific than goals and generally represent an expanded description of a particular aspect of a goal or a more precise desired end situation.

**Planned Unit Development (PUD)** – An area of minimum size, as specified by the Zoning Ordinance, to be planned, developed, operated and maintained as a single entity under unified ownership or control, containing one or more principal buildings to accommodate one or more Permitted Uses or Special Uses as allowed by the underlying zoning district provisions, and appurtenant common areas and other accessory uses incidental to the principal uses as controlled by the underlying zoning district provisions.

**Policies** are specific strategies intended to achieve the Plan’s goals and objectives and ultimately the community vision over the Comprehensive Plan’s planning horizon.

**Scale** – A composite term which means the relative size of development (in acres), the size, mass, and height of individual buildings or groups of buildings, the density of development, and the ratio of land occupied by buildings to open areas. The “scale” of development in Deerfield, as referred to in this document, is “small” as compared to other developed suburbs in the area.
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ZION LUTHERAN CHURCH
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 prefiling 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 prefiling 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 prefiling 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 prefiling 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 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 appropriate 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. Keonig 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 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. Exiting 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 the 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 the 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 that 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. Shafer 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 there 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 17th 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 suit 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 will abut 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 Parmecek, 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 Arbough, 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 prefiling conference. The level of detail that is being asked comes at the public hearing. Chairman Pro Tem Oppenheim reiterated the purpose of a prefiling 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 23rd Plan Commission meeting.

There being no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Daniel Nakahara