

**PLAN COMMISSION
VILLAGE OF DEERFIELD
Minutes**

The Plan Commission of the Village of Deerfield called to order a Public Hearing at 7:30 P.M. on April 12, 2018 at the Village Hall, 850 Waukegan Road, Deerfield, Illinois.

Present were: Larry Berg, Chairman
 Al Bromberg
 Sean Forrest (arrived at 8:11 P.M.)
 Jennifer Goldstone
 Elaine Jacoby
 Justin Silva

Absent were: Stuart Shayman

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

Chairman Berg swore in all who plan to testify before the Commission.

Public Comment on a Non-Agenda Item

Andrew Marwick of 442 Kelburn commented that there is currently a shortage of housing in California and the state government is encouraging higher density housing along transit lines, which affects rezoning. These developments are being built in poorer areas and higher income residents are displacing low-income residents. Mr. Marwick stated that the state of California is seeking to strip municipalities of their zoning powers to encourage more of these housing developments. Mr. Marwick stated that he was recently in the Oakland area and observed that their commuter trains are packed so full that people cannot get on at stops. He stated that in Deerfield there is a lot of land with the potential for housing developments near Deerbrook Mall and Home Depot that are not near residential homes and are close to transit. Mr. Marwick stated that he hopes that the Plan Commission will strongly consider encouraging new housing in this area, as there are lots of demand for it with corporations like Walgreens and Caterpillar. He added that these developments would make Deerfield more attractive and increase property values. He hopes that the Village Board and the Plan Commission will take a serious look at his concerns.

PUBLIC HEARING

- (1) **Public Hearing: Request for Approval of a Residential Planned Unit Development (PUD) with Necessary Exceptions; a Rezoning of 464 and 502 Elm Street from R-3 Single Family Residential District to R-5 General Residence District; and an Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to Allow the Redevelopment of 464 and 502 Elm Street properties with Eight Single Family Detached Homes (Avanti Construction Group, Inc.)**

Chairman Berg asked for proof of publication from the petitioners. The petitioners provided the certified mailing receipts to the Commission. Mr. Ryckaert reported that the legal notice was published in the Deerfield Review on March 22, 2018.

Mike Viner, Attorney with Faegre Baker Daniels in Chicago addressed the Commission. He stated that the development team is requesting the rezoning of 464 and 502 Elm Street from R-3 Single Family Residential to R-5 General Residential. He stated that the application also includes a Planned Unit Development as well as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Viner introduced the petitioner Gene Revzin, President and Owner of Avanti Construction (owner of 464 and 502 Elm Street), Erik Johnson, Architect with Avanti Construction, Kevin Lewis, Civil Engineer with IG Consulting and Kerry Wolfe, Project Marketing Consultant and Realtor with At Properties.

Mr. Viner reported that the currently proposed plan is a modification of a plan that was presented to the Plan Commission last year. The original plan began as 14 townhomes on less than an acre and as the plan developed, additional land was purchased and the plans were modified to 10 homes; four townhomes, two sets of duplexes and two single-family homes. The current plan has a further reduced density of eight detached single-family homes.

Mr. Viner provided a summary of the variations requested. The petitioners are proposing 5,685 square feet per detached unit while the Zoning Ordinance requires 9,000 square feet per detached unit for single-family homes. The petitioner is proposing a lot coverage of 35% while the Zoning Ordinance requires not more than 30% of lot coverage. Lastly, the petitioner is also requesting perimeter setback exceptions. The proposed front yard setbacks are 14.5 feet to the building porch, 17.5 feet side yard setbacks, and 19 feet rear yard setbacks. The requires a 37 feet front yard setback and 25 foot side and rear yard setbacks. Mr. Viner stated that the petitioners believe that these exceptions are necessary to construct a more desirable, higher-end product to address market demand. They believe that the development trend in Deerfield and the north suburbs is higher density housing near transportation and downtown areas. They believe that this proposal is consistent with these trends. Mr. Viner commented that their proposed square footage per dwelling unit is higher than what was approved for the Taylor Junction development. In regards to lot coverage, although the requirement for a PUD is 30%, the R-5 zoning requirement is 35%, which is why they this exception request is reasonable.

Mr. Viner showed an image of the site highlighting other multi-family housing in the area. He stated that they feel it is a mixed area with single-family and multi-family housing as well as a school and municipal use buildings. They feel their proposed use is compatible with the mixed area.

Kevin Lewis addressed the Commission and provided an overview of the architecture. Mr. Lewis displayed the site plan pointing out four single-family dwellings on the north side and four on the south side with a central drive aisle and front perimeter setbacks of around 15 feet from Elm Street to the front porches with the rest of the perimeter setbacks varying from 17 to 25 feet. The first two homes face Elm Street as single-family residences and the rest will be back to back with a central courtyard creating a side or rear yard view from all homes. Mr. Lewis showed a rendering of different elevations. He stated that there would be two different styles of homes to give a neighborhood feel. The building heights are lower than previous plans to reduce the bulk and density and provides for a lower building profile.

Mr. Lewis showed another view pointing out that the second floor is stepped back to improve the building appearance. He showed the view looking into the rear unit from the courtyard, which is what a neighbor might see. He added that the homes could be built with or without a patio on top of the garage.

Mr. Lewis described the layout of the units. They are set up with garage and living areas on the first floor and a first-floor master suite. The second floor will have the other bedrooms, bathroom, and options for laundry room and study. Mr. Lewis showed additional elevation views of the homes. He stated that the second-floor bedrooms overlook the development's courtyard and other homes' garages.

Mr. Lewis provided an overview of the engineering plans. The proposed engineering is to address storm water management. Mr. Lewis stated that the interior courtyard is set up to drain all water from the homes and collect it in two areas. The storm water design will split the site down the middle. Half of the units' water is collected and drained to the east where there will be a below grade storm water detention chamber. This water will then be captured in the courtyard, restricted, and released on a time-controlled basis into the Elm Street sewer system. The other four units' water is collected into a storm sewer system on the west end of the site and collected into chambers. It will then be directed into the storm sewer system that heads to the north. Currently the site has no drainage in place and there is no detention on the property. In the natural overland flow route, water that is not soaked into the property currently drains to the southwest. The proposed storm water management plan captures all water in a storm event and puts it in a chamber system that then releases into storm sewers. Only in an unusual rain event would water flow on the overland flow route. Mr. Lewis added that he is fully confident that they will be improving the existing drainage conditions. He stated that Village engineering staff has reviewed the plans.

Kerry Wolfe, Project Marketing Consultant with At Properties addressed the Commission. He stated that the petitioners intend to build eight, single-family homes, each with 4 bedrooms, 2.5 baths and high-end finishes. They will offer two models ranging from 2,500 to 2,800 square feet and the starting price will be in the mid-600Ks. The target market includes the empty nester community, current Deerfield residents looking to downsize and seeking low-maintenance, affordable housing with first floor master bedrooms, new families attracted to Deerfield's schools and the close proximity to the downtown, and recently divorced parents looking for smaller, low-maintenance single-family homes. Mr. Wolfe stated that they believe there is significant demand for this type of housing and that there will be more developments like this coming forward. Mr. Wolfe presented other comparable developments in Northbrook, Glenview and Deerfield that have been successful.

Mr. Viner commented that the developer has been receptive to the comments and feedback of Village staff, the Plan Commission and the neighbors. In response to concerns about density, additional land was purchased, and the number of units was reduced from 14 to 8. Additionally, setbacks have widened, heights have lowered, and the design has gone from multi-family buildings to single-family homes as the plans developed. In addition, to address storm water drainage, the developers have created an engineered system on a challenging site. Mr. Viner reported that this concludes their presentation.

Commissioner Bromberg asked if the purchaser chooses from the two different styles of homes being offered and if all units could end up being the same. Mr. Wolfe replied that both styles will not necessarily be offered for every unit on the site, so they will not end up being all the same.

Commissioner Bromberg asked for more information on landscaping plans. Mr. Lewis replied that they will landscape the perimeter and that there are preliminary landscape plans at this time. He stated that they will screen the sides with landscaping which will not interfere with storm water management. He added that they will finalize landscape plans with Village staff

after approval. Commissioner Bromberg commented that a rendering showed some landscaping with trees around the perimeter and stated that he thinks this would help buffer the site from neighbors. He asked if the trees are in the plans or if they were pictured as an example. Mr. Lewis replied that this concept drawing is the preliminary landscape plan and he does not anticipate it changing. Conceptually they intend to have foundation plantings and perimeter screening plantings. Chairman Berg asked if the drawing is an accurate depiction of number and size of plantings. Mr. Lewis replied that it is an accurate representation of the concept being proposed. Mr. Ryckaert stated that the petitioners included a list of plantings in the application packet provided to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Silva asked if they plan to construct all units at the same time or wait until the units are purchased and build to suit so that buyers can select finishes. Mr. Wolfe replied that they plan to presell the units and then build to suit, so not all units will be built at the same time.

Commissioner Silva asked about size of the patios available. Mr. Wolfe replied that the patios will be 12 feet by 20 feet.

Commissioner Silva asked Village staff if the average front setback for the homes on this block includes the porches of the homes. Mr. Ryckaert replied that the average includes all existing structures and porches.

Chairman Berg asked the petitioners to elaborate on the recent meeting with the neighbors. Mr. Viner reported that the development team met with the neighbors on April 3. He stated that the neighbors preferred the single-family detached homes to multi-family, although there was some discussion on why the developer was doing it in this manner. He added that there were no new revelations at this meeting.

Mr. Revzin stated that they discussed the plans in detail with the immediately adjacent neighbors and the neighbors are happy the plans are for single-family homes even though they would prefer only two single-family homes. Mr. Revzin stated that this would be inconceivable, and they talked in detail about this and there were some different suggestions voiced by the neighbors. He stated that there was no resolution or clear-cut answer for several reasons, which is why they are still proposing the current plans. He stated that they believe this many single-family homes is the only thing that can be built on this property given all of the aspects of the construction market.

Chairman Berg opened public comment on this matter. Mr. Nakahara reported that the Village received public comment from neighbors via email and letters. Chairman Berg stated that it was indicated in some of the correspondence that neighbors were upset with the Village for operating in a way that may not be in the best interest of the neighbors. Chairman Berg stated that he needs to clarify that the neighbors are not here to fight the Village, that they are here to present their opinions, testimony and facts, and the Plan Commission will make a recommendation of what they believe will be the proper disposition on this matter. They will make a recommendation on this to the Village Board who will make a final decision. Chairman Berg stated that the Plan Commission will now listen to residents and then make a recommendation.

Wendy and Stan Olmen, 454 Elm Street, stated that they live just south of properties. Mr. Olmen stated that their single-family home will become an isolated dwelling if this development is approved. He commented that this would take a lot of value and spirit out of their home and it

is a big deal for them. Mr. Olmen stated that they moved to their home in 1983 and at that time it was a regular street with a neighborhood feel and they now feel this is going away. Mr. Olmen commented that although the petitioners' plans include single-family homes, it is still set up like townhomes and it is still a multi-dwelling development and the density is too high. Mrs. Olmen reiterated that she is against rezoning the site and believes it should remain R-3 to fit with the neighborhood. She added that she feels the developer is sugarcoating and misrepresenting the issues brought up at the neighborhood meeting. She stated that she feels opinions on landscaping and style are irrelevant because the plans are for an inappropriate number of structures in the middle of Elm Street and that is the real issue. She added that the developer said that reducing the number of structures is inconceivable and she believes this is because it is a financial hardship and the developer is seeking to make money at their expense. Mrs. Olmen stated that they are opposed to the proposed development.

Chairman Berg reported that they have copies of the plant list available and asked the petitioners to review the preliminary landscape plan. Mr. Viner stated that they will respond to comments or questions regarding the plant list, which includes shade trees, shrubs, and other plantings for ground cover as, described on the list in the packet. Commissioner Bromberg suggested that if this petition passes, the petitioners should come prepared to go through the landscape plan with the Village Board.

Bill Vaananen, 845 Brookside Lane, resides at the property to the northwest of the site. Mr. Vaananen shared pictures of the overhead view of the two properties and the adjacent properties. Aside from the adjacent Poplar Lanes Duplexes, the site is surrounded on all four sides by R-3 zoning. Mr. Vaananen stated that from the beginning they have been opposed to any rezoning in this area on Elm Street as have many other people on bordering streets in the neighborhood. He reported that several of them have had yard signs up for months to express their objection to any rezoning. Mr. Vaananen entered into evidence a petition opposing rezoning signed by 268 Deerfield residents, 150 from this neighborhood specifically. He commented that he feels there has been no trend of development this far south on Elm Street and no new townhomes since the 1980s. Mr. Vaananen commented that when Taylor Junction was approved, the Plan Commission said that R-5 rezoning was approved because the subject property was not in the middle of a family residential area and is located across the street from the Metra station. He commented that he disagrees with the petitioners in this case that their plans are compatible with the neighborhood and that he is against isolating the Olmen house. Mr. Vaananen stated that it does not matter that the homes in the plans are detached; it is still a multi-family development on R-5 zoned properties. He added that the petitioners are exceeding all setbacks, especially the front setback and the parking spaces in the middle totaling over 7,000 square feet of pavement make the homes pushed back and encroaching on the neighbors. He stated that he did the math and all paved surfaces in the proposal add up to 9,986 square feet which is the equivalent of 3.5 tennis courts. He added that drainage on the site drops seven feet from east to west. Mr. Vaananen commented that the overland flow route of water will cause the Sheppard Middle School parking lot to flood more. He stated that he is also concerned about snow removal and garbage and recycling and how the truck will enter to pick up 16 bins for the homes. Mr. Vaananen commented that he is opposed to this proposal for these reasons.

Linda Vaananen of 845 Brookside Lane commented that as the petitioner was talking, they discussed the modification of the previous plans from 14 units down to 12 then 10 and now 8. She commented that when the developers reduced the plans from 14 units to 12, they stated that the economics were teetering. She stated that the plans are now reduced from 10 to eight

units and the developer says this reduces the density, but eight single-family structures requires 9,000 square feet per unit, so as she sees it this makes the plans about 30% more dense based on square footage. And they are also exceeding the minimum land area per dwelling unit by 54%. The developers stated that they need to do this to make the development more desirable, but she does not see how eight homes on one acre could be desirable. She does not see it being desirable for Elm Street or the neighbors or the Village. Mrs. Vaananen stated that regarding lot coverage, not all open space is usable space and with parking and pavement, lot coverage is 45%. She stated that she is also opposed to the front setback as the homes will be right on top of the curb on Elm Street. Ms. Vaananen also questioned the use of the word courtyard by the developers, as it will be an impervious surface and not a yard. The views shown will be looking at a concrete courtyard. She added that she agrees that the overland flow route will cause more flooding in the Sheppard Middle School parking lot, which was recently repaved without engineering plans as she learned after contacting the school and the Park District. She commented that there will also be no room for trees around the perimeter as suggested. Ms. Vaananen stated that at the neighbor meeting there were suggestions made for less than eight structures, but the developer's response was that all he can do is eight structures. Ms. Vaananen stated that they also questioned the developer's experience in building PUDs such as this and they are not confident in his experience. Ms. Vaananen stated that the Zoning Ordinances are intended to protect the quality and attractive environment of neighborhoods and she does not see how this can be done with so many variances requested for things that do not meet the Ordinance requirements.

Carole Bland of 506 Cambridge Circle stated that she would like to address the overland flow storm water drainage. She stated that there is a seven-foot drop on the site and there will be more water than the developers are saying draining to the southwest corner. She commented that she already gets water in her yard from this drainage and she does not want more. Based on this, she does not see how this plan can be a good idea in good conscience. Ms. Bland commented that the Plan Commission had previously asked for an independent engineering report on storm water drainage, which was not received. She commented that the petitioner should not be allowed to move forward based on this.

Joseph Lokaj of 542 Elm Street stated that he agrees with all of the comments his neighbors have made. He commented that he does not trust that the developers will act in a way that is friendly to the neighborhood. He has lived there for 20 years and it is a stable community with stable home values. He commented that he has seen other redeveloped properties degenerate and that he is not confident that the building and sales of the project will execute in any way that is reasonable and that would not impact his property values.

Tom Howe of 465 Grove stated that this site creates a large amount of storm water drainage problems and he is extremely concerned about the water flow route and is not confident in the developers capture and release plan. He believes that the water will flow to the west no matter how the system works, and he is concerned about it.

Laurie Gunther of 638 Carol Lane stated that she would like to note the size and number of exceptions requested and the combined affect those will have on a parcel that is the minimum size for a PUD. Her concern is the effect this has for Deerfield on the perceptions of developers, current residents and potential future residents of Deerfield.

Allyson Scopelliti of 514 Elm Street stated that she resides directly north of the project, and she agrees with everything said by her neighbors. She commented that as she drives through

Deerfield she sees a lot of tear downs and rebuilds and that trend of new single-family homes seems to be something that people want. She does not feel there is a market for multi-family in their neighborhood and only R-3 zoned properties should be located there.

Stephen Manes of 870 Poplar Lane commented that he agrees with all public comment thus far.

Michael Sansweet 517 Elm Street stated that he has lived directly across the street from this site for over 20 years and that it is a neighborhood of single-family homes and this development would change the entire feel. He stated that safety is a major concern for him as there are no curbs and a sidewalk on one side that school students use. He is concerned about construction traffic on the street and developing this property with infrastructure. He stated that there was no mention of fences and the developers did not mention that basements are optional. He added that the street is very busy in the mornings and there is often a quarter mile back up caused by trains and buses. He stated that the plan is too dense, and he wants to keep it a single-family area and not have all of these additional homes on these properties.

Jim Luby of 515 Cambridge Circle stated that he lives in the back of the site and he gets a few inches of water on his grass after a heavy rain and he is concerned this development will make it worse. He commented that the petitioners stated that a market for the development is empty nesters, but he cannot see how people would want to live in a two-story house in their elder years. He stated that there could be two nice ranch houses on the two lots and he does not see how this development could be successful.

Amy Sanders 512 Cambridge Circle commented that this plan is not compatible with the existing single-family home neighborhood. She stated that the Village's Comprehensive Plan was created with public participation of residents, Village Board members and commissioners was the product of a yearlong effort. The Comprehensive Plan's vision is for stable residential neighborhoods. She commented that their neighborhood has small-town character and open spaces, which are the reasons, people move there. She stated that the plan proposed is not in line with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan and she is opposed to the rezoning as well as the requested variances, which undermine the Ordinances.

Casey Sanders of 512 Cambridge Circle commented that he agrees with everything said and that he is opposed the rezoning as well as the variances requested.

Ian Vaananen of 845 Brookside Lane stated that on March 20th he came home and remembered it was the first day of spring and went to his garage to get a bird feeder. He poured bird seed and placed it in the center of his backyard and watched as he studied, eyeing the bird feeder looking for a robin. He stated that this opportunity will soon cease to exist. He commented that if this development is approved, it will cause flooding and will wreak havoc and benefit only wealthy privileged members of society while being a hardship on the neighborhood. He stated that the developers are requesting rezoning to suit their needs and asking to bend the rules to squeeze every last dollar out of the project. He commented that target buyers are millennials, but he has trouble seeing that any millennial could afford this. He commented that his family is part of the middle class and works hard. He questions what kind of example this project sets if the developers are allowed to bend the rules to make money while others suffer. He commented that the development will have a great deal of pavement and make water travel in all directions. Trees will also be taken down and flooding will be more daunting. Mr. Vaananen stated that these trees absorb rainfall, prevent soil erosion, protect roots, reduce threat of flooding, and serve as a sanctuary for rabbits, birds and other wildlife. Without these

trees he stated that their yard would be smothered by dust and smog and the plans are far from what should be acceptable, and it shakes him to the core. He added that he is fearful pondering the proposed setbacks and catastrophe of construction. He stated that the neighborhood deserves better than reduced home values. Mr. Vaananen quoted Winston Churchill saying that "Victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror, victory however long and hard the road may be, for without victory there is no survival" Mr. Vaananen stated that he will not rest until he halts all efforts to destroy the land, the trees and the animals that inhabit them.

Mary Gardner of 532 Elm Street stated that she questions if curbs will be retrofitted on to Elm Street in the 500 to 400 block area. She knows the developer suggested curbs and this might inspire the Village to add curbs to the rest of the street. Mr. Ryckaert commented that this would be a major reconstruction of the street and the Village has no current plans. Mrs. Gardner commented that it would look unusual for this site to be the only property on the block with curbs. She commented that the developer mentioned they would build on demand and she would like more information on the timeline if there is a demand.

Shaun Raugstad stated that he grew up at 600 Elm Street and he is currently a realtor and wants to speak about property values. He stated that his family has lived in Deerfield for over 40 years and he grew up in one of Deerfield's original farmhouses. His home was located across the street from a lumberyard, which is now South Commons. They have a view of the downtown district and new condominium buildings from every window. They have watched a great deal of change, which they were reliant on as his father, was a project manager overseeing shops and restaurants in the downtown. Mr. Raugstad stated that he loves change, but for this proposal, the negatives far outweigh the positives. The precedent being set is that this density could be developed anywhere in Deerfield on a single lot. He stated that he has been a successful realtor for 15 years in the top 2% in sales in the region and he has shown thousands of homes. He stated that living near multi-family always reduces property values and he has seen the residual difficulties of selling as a result. He commented that neighbors are already having trouble selling because of rumors of a multi-family development. He stated that 550 Elm Street canceled their listing after price reductions and 434 Elm Street has been on the market for 252 days with \$65,000 in price reductions. He stated that if this development were approved there would be a stand-alone lot that would be so diminished in value it might never sell. He stated that he could not see how this proposal would not diminish or impair property values in the neighborhood.

Andrew Marwick of 442 Kelburn commented that he lives across the tracks in Coromandel and although it is close it is a completely different neighborhood and he does not see how this and other multi-family in the area can be used as a justification for neighborhood compatibility. Mr. Marwick stated that Coromandel is 350 condominiums and townhomes on 48 acres and has a lower density than this development would. He commented that when Coromandel was built, they were required to have a certain number of square feet for each size unit and in this proposal, there was no discussion of that and they are shoehorning it into a bad location and ignoring setback requirements. He commented that the proposal is not compatible with the existing neighborhood and he questions if other developers will try squeezing multi-family into small lots in Deerfield such as this. He added that this is not going to significantly impact housing stock in Deerfield and he would like to see proposals for developments of 1,000 to 2,000 units in the area near Waukegan and Pflingsten Road. He stated that there is no coherence to this type of zoning change and this is not a location where a PUD is intended. He stated that this project will have no benefit to the Village and will negatively impact neighbors.

Chairman Berg stated that this concludes public comment and invited closing remarks from the Petitioners.

Mr. Lewis stated that the development seeks to be a transitional zone in the change from single-family to multi-family and they believe there is a need for this in this location. He stated that developers do this by a process of a PUD and they select a team well versed in this process to guide them.

Mr. Lewis stated that he has heard the concerns about storm water management and he is confident that their storm water management plan will address this and be an improvement. He stated that they have worked with Village engineering staff on these plans and although they cannot solve the neighborhood drainage issues, they will meet all storm water drainage system requirements. He stated that as an engineer, his professional opinion is that they will not make it worse in any way.

Mr. Lewis commented that snow removal was previously discussed by the development team and there is sufficient space between the buildings for snow removal storage.

Mr. Viner stated that requesting variances is a normal part of development as zoning is not a one size fits all approach and parcels are unique. He stated that ordinances are never intended to address all projects and issues. Mr. Viner stated that he is a Deerfield resident and he feels strongly that this development is compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Revzin commented that he feels the comments got nasty and his integrity is being questioned. He stated that he has been a developer for 30 years and done several dozen single-family homes and has been involved in various types of construction throughout his career. He commented that there are records that can be inspected to prove this. He stated that he is not a liar and is not a wartime profiteer, he is a businessperson with ties to the community and he feels this proposal is in the line with the trend of the development in this area. He stated that as a professional he feels that the properties in the surrounding neighborhood have depreciated in value because it is a decaying neighborhood and home values will not be depreciated because of this development.

Commissioner Bromberg commented that the timeframe for construction shows 14 months and asked if this would be to build all homes. Mr. Lewis replied that the 14-month timeframe is to complete the infrastructure improvements, which will be done first for the entire site, and be functional before building the homes. After this is complete, the houses will go through the building permit process. They plan to start with building one home, but this could increase based on demand and sales. Mr. Revzin stated the given the nature of single-family construction, it is difficult to estimate how long construction will take as they are not townhouses with the same finishes and sold as is, they are build-to-suit. He stated that they estimate construction could take 14 months to two years depending on the speed of sales.

Chairman Berg asked for a motion to close the Public Hearing. He stated that the Plan Commission would now meet in an open workshop setting to consider their recommendation on this matter. He stated that a written recommendation would be made to the Village Board who will make the final binding decision on this matter. Commissioner Goldstone moved, seconded by Commissioner Silva to close the Public Hearing. Said motion passed with the following vote:

Ayes: Bromberg, Forrest, Goldstone, Jacoby, Silva, Berg (6)

Public Hearing
April 12, 2018
Page 10

Nays: None (0)

There being no further discussion, the Public Hearing adjourned at 9:23 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,
Laura Boll

**PLAN COMMISSION
VILLAGE OF DEERFIELD
Minutes**

The Plan Commission of the Village of Deerfield called to order a Workshop Meeting on April 12, 2018 at the Village Hall, 850 Waukegan Road, Deerfield, Illinois.

Present were: Larry Berg, Chairman
 Al Bromberg
 Sean Forrest
 Jennifer Goldstone
 Elaine Jacoby
 Justin Silva

Absent were: Stuart Shayman

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

WORKSHOP MEETING

(1a) Discussion of proposed 464-502 Elm Street Development

Commissioner Bromberg commented that there were issues brought up in emails from residents regarding traffic and safety although he is not concerned about this. He stated that he believes water drainage has been adequately addressed and there is little question that the plans will improve the drainage situation and will not make it any worse. He commented that he also does not believe that property values will be negatively affected. Commissioner Bromberg stated that he believes the two relevant issues are density and the requested variances for the setbacks. He commented that this project is very similar to Taylor Junction and is slightly less dense with similar setbacks. He commented that the Taylor Junction development does not look out of place or too close to the street and he felt it was an appropriate project. He added that this is clearly a trend in development as evidenced by several recent proposals. Commissioner Bromberg stated that he does not see any reason not to approve this application.

Commissioner Forrest commented that the petitioners' plans are a big improvement from the first iteration. He also agrees that flooding will not be made worse and will be an improvement. He stated that the issues are density and the setback variation requests, which are too many exceptions that will negatively impact the neighbors, specifically the perimeter setbacks and square footage per dwelling unit requirements. Due to this, he does not support this proposal.

Commissioner Goldstone stated that she agrees that drainage will improve. She stated that she is concerned that there is a great deal of concrete and not enough green space with no detailed landscaping plan. She is also concerned that the Olmen's would be isolated and she has an issue with this. However, she stated that she does believe that the developer has done a lot to address neighbor concerns since the original plan was proposed. She added that she does not have a problem with multi-family at this location on Elm Street. Commissioner Goldstone stated that she is unsure how she will vote.

Commissioner Jacoby stated that she takes each case on its own and this proposal is a different location than Taylor Junction. She commented that her issue is compatibility with the

neighborhood. She commented that this proposal is for too many single-family homes and not enough green space on this site and in this neighborhood. She added that the Comprehensive Plan is meant to guide developers. She stated that she is against rezoning this site, there are too many variances requested, and she is not in favor of this proposal.

Commissioner Silva stated that the developer has taken significant steps to change his plans to accommodate neighbors and he feels that drainage is addressed properly. In terms of compatibility, he stated that as a Plan Commissioner, he looks at to see if the standards for rezoning have been met. Based on this, he feels the PUD and the rezoning standards have been met. However, he does have concerns about the Olmen's property being surrounded by R-5 and he is not sure if that is proper planning. He stated that he is conflicted by this and not able to make a decision at this time.

Chairman Berg stated that he concurs with the Plan Commissioners. He commented that even though numbers are similar to Taylor Junction, he sees this as a different neighborhood. Taylor Junction was surrounded by R-4 and R-5 zoning, and he feels that it was an appropriate use and more compatible with the surrounding area than this project would be. He stated that this project is surrounded by R-3 zoning and that is a critical issue for him. He sees an adverse impact on the area for those who live in single-family homes. He stated that some PUD and rezoning standards have been met, although he is not convinced that all have been met. He commended the petitioner for making alterations to his plans, but he has difficulty supporting the petition.

Commissioner Bromberg stated that he does not have any question about the integrity or the ability of the developer, Chairman Berg agreed.

Commissioner Bromberg moved to approve a residential Planned Unit Development (PUD) with necessary exceptions; a rezoning of 464 and 502 Elm Street from R-3 Single Family Residential District to R-5 General Residence District; and an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to allow the redevelopment of 464 and 502 Elm Street properties with eight single family detached homes (Avanti Construction Group, Inc.). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Forrest. The motion failed with the following roll call:

Ayes: Bromberg, Silva (2)

Nays: Forrest, Goldstone, Jacoby, Berg (4)

Document Approval

Commissioner Bromberg stated that he emailed corrections to the minutes.

Designation of Representative for the next Board of Trustees Meeting

Several Commissioners agreed to attend the next Village Board Meeting.

Items from the Staff

Mr. Ryckaert reported on upcoming Plan Commission agenda items.

Workshop Meeting

April 12, 2018

Page 3

There being no further discussion, Commissioner Bromberg moved, seconded by Commissioner Silva to adjourn the Workshop Meeting at 9:48 P.M. Said motion passed with a unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,
Laura Boll