

Public Comment
On
Proposed Bridge Industrial Development

June 2, 2023 - June 9, 2023

Daniel Van Dusen

From: len.bland@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, June 2, 2023 3:29 PM
To: Plan Commission Comment
Cc: Daniel Nakahara, AICP; Daniel Van Dusen
Subject: [PUBLIC COMMENT] Bridge/Baxter Development

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

To: Deerfield Planning Commission

I am a 33-year resident on 506 Cambridge Circle in Deerfield. I strongly oppose the redevelopment of the Baxter property into a distribution/logistics company.

My company, Nano Gas Environmental, improves sustainability for water treatment and reduces the use of hazardous chemicals.

The Deerfield Village Board approved a *Climate Action Report* on June 6, 2022, with a declared written objective to “reduce overall greenhouse gas emissions by 45% and *reduce transportation emissions by 55% by 2030.*” This proposed warehouse complex will result in the exact opposite of this goal!

A recent article in the Sun Times detailed the harm these warehouses cause: " these diesel plumes (from warehouses/freight terminals like Bridge is proposing} carry a host of potential health threats to the public, including low birth rates, respiratory illnesses, even dementia." [Nearly 2 million in Illinois live near warehouses shrouded by truck pollution.](#)

I implore you to vote no on this proposal. Do not expose Deerfield residents to the harm these warehouses cause.

Thanks,

Len Bland
847-317-0656

Daniel Van Dusen

From: Jorge Hernandez <worriedcitizens01@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 2, 2023 4:05 PM
To: Plan Commission Comment
Cc: Daniel Nakahara, AICP; Daniel Van Dusen
Subject: [PUBLIC COMMENT] Resident says No to Bridge's plans & Annexation

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Deerfield is the great Villiage we moved into and respectfully ask you to DENY the Bridge plans and any petition to allow annexation. Reasons include but are not limited to:

1. Important: the Deerfield 294 interchange is NOT a full one. Trucks will be turning around in neighborhoods or the school;

2. While there is a crossing guard,

There are THREE schools in this ok area where trucks where be crossing after getting off at Lake Cook given it's a full interchange.

3. Please share this with all Staff & Commissioners.

4. Let the corporate faculty sit vacant and attract a new company.... Like Horizon drugs.

Leo Lazar
Deerfield Resident

Daniel Van Dusen

From: NASCRAG <nascrag@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 3, 2023 5:59 PM
To: Plan Commission Comment
Cc: Daniel Nakahara, AICP; Daniel Van Dusen
Subject: [PUBLIC COMMENT] No to Bridge/Baxter proposal

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear members of the Planning Committee,

I am a long time resident of Deerfield residing at 506 Cambridge Circle and am strongly against the Bridge/Baxter development proposal.

The resulting pollution and harmful health effects of warehouses like Bridge proposes have been widely documented. The highly respected Consumer Reports team recently published a study demonstrated the terrible consequences of building a warehouse in a residential neighborhood: <https://rb.gy/0nw91>. They are so alarmed by the large warehouse trend that they have started a petition demanding that Amazon clean up its act: <https://act.consumerreports.org/TOYIlqb>.

The State of New Jersey, faced with an overwhelming number of warehouse distribution-type facilities, has adopted a guideline policy on what should be considered before building, particularly near populated areas. A key statement from the guidelines reads as follows: "Mitigate and avoid conflicts with other uses, sensitive populations, and receptors by locating large warehouses away from residential areas/neighborhoods, downtown commercial/retail areas and main streets, schools, daycare centers, places of worship, hospitals, overburdened communities, scenic corridors, and historic districts, important public and civic outdoor spaces, and recreational facilities." The Bridge proposal violates every one of these tenants.

How could Deerfield possibly consider becoming home to the 11th largest warehouse/freight terminal facility in the country? This is the opposite of what Deerfield claims to be about. Even the new vehicle stickers stress Deerfield's commitment to preserving the climate.

Please vote no on this terrible proposal!

..

Regards,
Carole Bland



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Daniel Van Dusen

From: Harry Steindler <hsteindler@michaelsilver.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 3, 2023 12:33 AM
To: Plan Commission Comment
Cc: Mayor Dan Shapiro; Trustee Elaine Jacoby; Trustee Bob Benton; Trustee Larry Berg; Trustee Mary Oppenheim; Trustee Mary Oppenheim; rmetts-childers@deerfield.il.us; Harry Steindler; Harry Steindler; Daniel Nakahara, AICP; Daniel Van Dusen
Subject: [PUBLIC COMMENT] A few things to note

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Commissioners, Trustees and Mayor Shapiro,

- In their current, recently posted comments regarding engaging with the public, in response to queries from the May 11th plan commission meeting, Bridge continues to ignore the fact that their facility will be less than 500 feet from homes in Clavinia (750 feet from my home). The property itself is less than 500 feet from my home, less than 400 feet from homes on We-Go Trail and Forsythia. Although their own expert admitted that whatever emissions are generated from the facility will be blown by the wind directly at Clavinia, Bridge only seems to think that Thorngate is of concern (or maybe they don't even know we exist). Obviously, due to their HOA, Thorngate residents have been able to develop an organized response to this misplaced development, and obviously, that is Bridge's only concern. They have shown no concern or even recognition of our Clavinia neighborhood or other Deerfield neighborhoods.
- In the following email excerpt from the Village to Bridge, the following truck trip information is discussed. Seeing the new study from the traffic engineer that will be presented on June 8th, I now see where the numbers referred to in this email come from – they come from the expectations of a Land Use Code 150 warehouse. However, in their presentation on May 11th Bridge seemed to have purposely understated even their own faulty estimate by 2/3rds. At the May 11th hearing, Bridge stated that they expect an average of **300 trips in and out per day (600 total trips)** – 1/3 of the 1,800 trips discussed in the following excerpt from a February email. Never mind that the more likely number of trips (given that use codes 155 or 156 are much more likely) will be a multiple of (2, 3, 4 times?) 1,800. Where else has Bridge attempted to mislead us? From the February email from Nakahara (Village of Deerfield) to Hauser:
 - ***Hi Mark, I have a question on the Traffic Impact Study for the proposed development on the Baxter property. On page 5 of the TIS under Traffic Evaluation, first bullet point: The proposed warehouse development will only generate approximately 159 and 162 trips during the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours, respectively, and 1,818 trips daily.***
 - **1818 trips vs. 600 – and that for warehouse usage that doesn't at all approximate the true expected use of this property!! Seriously?**
- In their April 4th letter distributed to my Clavinia neighbors and me, Bridge says,
 - *“ . . . and a recreational facility with a full-size indoor soccer field, an indoor baseball field and 6 outdoor pickleball courts. The Deerfield Park district has expressed a high level of interest in leasing the recreational facility, which has been designed to meet their needs. Bridge is excited for the opportunity to bring this property into the Village of Deerfield and redevelop it for multiple uses including a much-needed recreational facility”*

- I've now seen numerous emails between Bridge and the Village, stretching back to January 2023 quoting the outlandish rental the Park District would have been asked to pay for the above facility (well more than \$2.5 million annually, likely closer to \$8 million per year including operating costs). **I cannot possibly imagine that as of April 4th our Park District had any intention to rent this facility.** This was an, at best, misleading ploy by Bridge to play to the desires of young families in our town. I find this despicable. Perhaps "misleading ploy" is being too kind. A contact with the Park District has intimated that the Park District never had interest in renting this dreamed up recreational facility. Misleading at best, or maybe, again, I am being too kind.
- We don't need thousands of additional trucks in our neighborhoods. We don't need one additional baseball field – sadly, our current fields are too often unoccupied. We don't need one more soccer field. We certainly can find a better place for six pickle ball courts. It certainly doesn't seem that Bridge has promised that these will be turf fields. Bridge has shown themselves to be disingenuous at best.

When I was on the board of Deerfield Youth Baseball and Softball Association (DYBA), first softball and then baseball pushed to build their travel programs to the extreme detriment of our house / community program. People insisted that we had to do this, that that was where the world was headed. Doing so did, to a great degree, decimate our community programs. I recently ran into the main driver behind the early 2000s efforts that nearly destroyed our girls' softball program in the cause of being more competitive, like other communities. We were sitting in neighboring chairs at Otero's barbe shop. This person said to me that his biggest regret was pushing Deerfield to follow the lead of other towns – to follow what looked to be the trend of the world. He wishes he could turn back time, and he regrets that he can't. His actions and other's actions then helped to decimate DYBA softball and to some extent baseball. He realizes and regrets what he did and he realizes you can't put the genie back in the bottle. Hundreds, if not thousands of girls and boys have lost out. Our community has lost out. **Building 1.2 million square feet of high volume truck / warehouse facility will be something we can't reverse. Thousands of truck trips a day – and yes, many of those will be rolling down Lake Cook to 41, turning down Wilmot, down Waukegan, getting stuck under the Deerfield viaduct or doing U-turns at Wilmot and Deerfield. Like happened today, driving past our kids crossing the street to go to South Park and Wilmot Schools, riding their bikes to Caruso. Polluting emissions will increase (laughing in the face of our Village's stated environmental efforts), leading to asthma and worse. And we'll be teaming with a developer who doesn't seem to care about playing fair. Please vote no, stop this monstrosity before you can't. I don't want to see what you have to say to me when we run into each other at Otero's a few years down the line.**

Sincerely,

Harry

Harry Steindler, CPA

Partner

hsteindler@michaelsilver.com

Main: 847.982.0333

Direct: 847.213.2106

Cell: 312.968.0123

[Send Me Files Securely Through Share Safe](#)



Headquarters – Mailing Address

9 Parkway North, Suite 300, Deerfield, IL 60015

www.michaelsilver.com



The content of this electronic transmission and any attached files may contain privileged and confidential information. This information is only intended for the viewing or use of the recipient(s) addressed to above. If you are not the intended recipient, or if this transmission is sent to you in error, please notify us immediately.

Daniel Van Dusen

From: Harry Steindler <hsteindler@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 3, 2023 3:35 PM
To: Kent Street
Cc: Harry Steindler; Plan Commission Comment; Mayor Dan Shapiro; Trustee Elaine Jacoby; Trustee Bob Benton; Trustee Larry Berg; Trustee Mary Oppenheim; rmetts-childers@deerfield.il.us; Daniel Nakahara, AICP; Daniel Van Dusen
Subject: [PUBLIC COMMENT] Re: A few things to note

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

You're welcome Kent. This development has no place in Deerfield. I implore the staff, Mayor and board to begin working with developers and city planners to find alternatives that truly bring value to our town.

Enjoy this beautiful weekend!

Harry

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 3, 2023, at 1:28 PM, Kent Street <kstreet@deerfield.il.us> wrote:

Mr. Steindler- thank you for your input on this important matter and for including the Plan Commission as it is the Village body considering the proposal at this time.

Thank you again,
Kent

Kent Street

Village Manager | [Village of Deerfield](#)
850 Waukegan Rd | Deerfield, IL 60015
[3.jpg](#) 847.719.7401

Follow Us: [2.jpg](#)<[0.jpg](#)><[1.jpg](#)>

From: Harry Steindler <hsteindler@michaelsilver.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 3, 2023 12:32:59 AM
To: Plan Commission Comment <plancommissioncomment@deerfield.il.us>
Cc: Mayor Dan Shapiro <dshapiro@deerfield.il.us>; Trustee Elaine Jacoby <ejacoby@deerfield.il.us>; Trustee Bob Benton <rbenton@deerfield.il.us>; Trustee Larry Berg <lberg@deerfield.il.us>; Trustee Mary Oppenheim <moppenheim@deerfield.il.us>; Trustee Mary Oppenheim <moppenheim@deerfield.il.us>; rmetts-childers@deerfield.il.us <rmetts-childers@deerfield.il.us>;

Subject: A few things to note

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Commissioners, Trustees and Mayor Shapiro,

- In their current, recently posted comments regarding engaging with the public, in response to queries from the May 11th plan commission meeting, Bridge continues to ignore the fact that their facility will be less than 500 feet from homes in Clavinia (750 feet from my home). The property itself is less than 500 feet from my home, less than 400 feet from homes on We-Go Trail and Forsythia. Although their own expert admitted that whatever emissions are generated from the facility will be blown by the wind directly at Clavinia, Bridge only seems to think that Thorngate is of concern (or maybe they don't even know we exist). Obviously, due to their HOA, Thorngate residents have been able to develop an organized response to this misplaced development, and obviously, that is Bridge's only concern. They have shown no concern or even recognition of our Clavinia neighborhood or other Deerfield neighborhoods.
- In the following email excerpt from the Village to Bridge, the following truck trip information is discussed. Seeing the new study from the traffic engineer that will be presented on June 8th, I now see where the numbers referred to in this email come from – they come from the expectations of a Land Use Code 150 warehouse. However, in their presentation on May 11th Bridge seemed to have purposely understated even their own faulty estimate by 2/3rds. At the May 11th hearing, Bridge stated that they expect an average of **300 trips in and out per day (600 total trips)** – 1/3 of the 1,800 trips discussed in the following excerpt from a February email. Never mind that the more likely number of trips (given that use codes 155 or 156 are much more likely) will be a multiple of (2, 3, 4 times?) 1,800. Where else has Bridge attempted to mislead us? From the February email from Nakahara (Village of Deerfield) to Hauser:
 - ***Hi Mark, I have a question on the Traffic Impact Study for the proposed development on the Baxter property. On page 5 of the TIS under Traffic Evaluation, first bullet point: The proposed warehouse development will only generate approximately 159 and 162 trips during the weekday morning and weekday evening peak hours, respectively, and 1,818 trips daily.***
 - **1818 trips vs. 600 – and that for warehouse usage that doesn't at all approximate the true expected use of this property!! Seriously?**
- In their April 4th letter distributed to my Clavinia neighbors and me, Bridge says,
 - “. . . and a recreational facility with a full-size indoor soccer field, an indoor baseball field and 6 outdoor pickleball courts. The Deerfield Park district has expressed a high level of interest in leasing the recreational facility, which has been designed to meet their needs. Bridge is excited for the opportunity to bring this property into the Village of Deerfield and redevelop it for multiple uses including a much-needed recreational facility”
 - I've now seen numerous emails between Bridge and the Village, stretching back to January 2023 quoting the outlandish rental the Park District would have been asked to pay for the above facility (well more than \$2.5 million annually, likely

closer to \$8 million per year including operating costs). **I cannot possibly imagine that as of April 4th our Park District had any intention to rent this facility.** This was an, at best, misleading ploy by Bridge to play to the desires of young families in our town. I find this despicable. Perhaps “misleading ploy” is being too kind. A contact with the Park District has intimated that the Park District never had interest in renting this dreamed up recreational facility. Misleading at best, or maybe, again, I am being too kind.

- We don't need thousands of additional trucks in our neighborhoods. We don't need one additional baseball field – sadly, our current fields are too often unoccupied. We don't need one more soccer field. We certainly can find a better place for six pickle ball courts. It certainly doesn't seem that Bridge has promised that these will be turf fields. Bridge has shown themselves to be disingenuous at best.

When I was on the board of Deerfield Youth Baseball and Softball Association (DYBA), first softball and then baseball pushed to build their travel programs to the extreme detriment of our house / community program. People insisted that we had to do this, that that was where the world was headed. Doing so did, to a great degree, decimate our community programs. I recently ran into the main driver behind the early 2000s efforts that nearly destroyed our girls' softball program in the cause of being more competitive, like other communities. We were sitting in neighboring chairs at Otero's barbe shop. This person said to me that his biggest regret was pushing Deerfield to follow the lead of other towns – to follow what looked to be the trend of the world. He wishes he could turn back time, and he regrets that he can't. His actions and other's actions then helped to decimate DYBA softball and to some extent baseball. He realizes and regrets what he did and he realizes you can't put the genie back in the bottle. Hundreds, if not thousands of girls and boys have lost out. Our community has lost out. **Building 1.2 million square feet of high volume truck / warehouse facility will be something we can't reverse. Thousands of truck trips a day – and yes, many of those will be rolling down Lake Cook to 41, turning down Wilmot, down Waukegan, getting stuck under the Deerfield viaduct or doing U-turns at Wilmot and Deerfield. Like happened today, driving past our kids crossing the street to go to South Park and Wilmot Schools, riding their bikes to Caruso. Polluting emissions will increase (laughing in the face of our Village's stated environmental efforts), leading to asthma and worse. And we'll be teaming with a developer who doesn't seem to care about playing fair. Please vote no, stop this monstrosity before you can't. I don't want to see what you have to say to me when we run into each other at Otero's a few years down the line.**

Sincerely,

Harry

Harry Steindler, CPA

Partner

hsteindler@michaelsilver.com

Main: 847.982.0333

Direct: 847.213.2106

Cell: 312.968.0123

[Send Me Files Securely Through Share Safe](#)

<image001.png>

Headquarters – Mailing Address

9 Parkway North, Suite 300, Deerfield, IL 60015

www.michaelsilver.com

<image002.png>

<image003.png>

<image004.png>

The content of this electronic transmission and any attached files may contain privileged and confidential information. This information is only intended for the viewing or use of the recipient(s) addressed to above. If you are not the intended recipient, or if this transmission is sent to you in error, please notify us immediately.

Daniel Van Dusen

From: David Altman <davidaltman@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, June 5, 2023 8:28 AM
To: Plan Commission Comment
Cc: Daniel Nakahara, AICP; Daniel Van Dusen
Subject: [PUBLIC COMMENT] Deerfield Bridge development

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

I'm a resident of Deerfield and I do not oppose this new development. I do NOT think that it will have the negative effects feared by some of my neighbors. Indeed, I think it will contribute to Deerfield, particularly by helping its tax base. We need that.

Sent from my iPhone

Daniel Van Dusen

From: Mark Blumenthal <mjblumenthal@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, June 5, 2023 2:43 PM
To: Plan Commission Comment
Cc: Jeffery Ryckaert, AICP; Daniel Nakahara, AICP; Daniel Van Dusen
Subject: [PUBLIC COMMENT] Baxter-Bridge

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

To Deerfield Village Planning Commission,

I would like to know why Bridge never presented a **feasibility study**. I am a retired CPA and have worked with real estate developers my entire career. I have never seen a proposed project this large that did not go through a robust due diligence process that would always include a **feasibility study**.

If this project goes bankrupt this will become an economic problem for Deerfield and the promised real estate tax dream dollars will go poof!

All speculative real estate developers think their projects will succeed, but as we all know that is not true. If Bridge had already leased up the project to strong national tenants, then this would not be a speculative project and the economic risk to Deerfield would be reduced.

Why is Bridge unable to get tenants for this project preconstruction or even disclose potential tenants that have expressed strong interest? Is it because the **Allstate property is a better location** and is part of an industrial park? What impact does the new Freight Terminal off of Commercial Avenue in Northbrook have on the Bridge project?

A feasibility study would evaluate all of the competition in the Chicago area, look at the North Shore Deerfield location, make judgements about demand for an additional Freight Terminal, ability to staff the Freight Terminal, impact on traffic and pollution in a residential community, and other issues that are critical to helping Bridge and Deerfield decide if this project at this location makes **economic sense**. A feasibility study would also have:

- rejected the Bridge Traffic study and would not have been able to use it in their report,
- told Bridge not to promise Deerfield new jobs as the vast majority of Deerfield residents would not be interested in the low paying jobs at the Freight Terminal or the construction jobs to build the facility,
- told Bridge that the Deerfield Park district did not have the funds to lease the indoor recreational facility (they could have just asked anyone who lives in Deerfield) and prevented the embarrassment to Bridge at the May 11 meeting,
- then, told Bridge that a responsible parent would not have their children play in an open field in the middle of a Freight Terminal breathing in the fumes from diesel trucks and risk their lives getting out of their cars or chasing a ball in the parking lot (they could have just asked any mature parent who knows that a child is smaller than a truck),
- told Bridge that most of Deerfield is located EAST of the Baxter site and that the fact that the air pollution from the Freight Terminal blows EAST is not good for the schools, parks, and residents of Deerfield,
- told Bridge that as an **educated community** the residents of Deerfield and all the surrounding communities would not accept their unsubstantiated economic forecasts and promises about traffic, pollution, safety, and that this Freight Terminal **does not belong in a family focused "Bedroom Community."**

There are other potential uses for the Baxter property that would be welcomed by the entire community. Bridge is not an advisor to Deerfield and should not be telling Deerfield that it is either the Freight Terminal or nothing. We all know this is not true.

Thank you for reading this email.

Respectively,

Mark Blumenthal

Daniel Van Dusen

From: Allen Guon <allen.guon@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 5, 2023 11:27 AM
To: Plan Commission Comment
Cc: Jacalyn Guon; jgoldstone@hhslegal.com; Daniel Nakahara, AICP; Daniel Van Dusen
Subject: [PUBLIC COMMENT] OPPOSED to proposed Bridge Industrial Development of Baxter

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Planning Commission:

I am unable to attend the June 8th public hearing due to a prior commitment, but as a resident of Deerfield, I wanted to express my objection to the proposed Bridge Industrial Development of Baxter.

The proposed industrial use of a massive, 24/7 industrial trucking warehouse with at least 600+ truck trips a day, 4,200+ trips a week (and that candidly is a conservative figure and likely to be much higher once fully leased), in a luxury residential community (Deerfield) is an entirely inappropriate use for the property. In addition to all the publicly stated reasons to reject this proposal (noise pollution, air pollution, thousands of trucks driving through our Village a week, etc.), as further evidence of the 24/7 industrial warehouse proposal's absurdity, in the 120 years since Deerfield was incorporated in 1903, not once has any city planning document included such an industrial use in Deerfield and the reason is obvious - because it is inconsistent with Deerfield as family-friendly, luxury community.

The community has been speaking loudly and firmly since this proposed project has come to light, which is a demand for the Planning Commission and Village Board to vote **NO** Bridge's proposal for the re-development of the Baxter site into an industrial trucking warehouse. This project will adversely affect all of Deerfield.

Thank you,

Allen Guon
Woodland Park, Deerfield

Daniel Van Dusen

From: Randi Mayer <mclawr1@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, June 5, 2023 9:49 AM
To: Plan Commission Comment
Cc: Daniel Nakahara, AICP; Daniel Van Dusen
Subject: [PUBLIC COMMENT] Audio visual availability

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Will any audiovisual equipment be available for Thursday evening's meeting at DHS? Please advise immediately. I sent this message over a week ago and never received a response. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

Daniel Van Dusen

From: helen chung <helen_s_chung@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 6, 2023 9:32 PM
To: Plan Commission Comment
Cc: Daniel Nakahara, AICP; Daniel Van Dusen
Subject: [PUBLIC COMMENT] Opposition to Baxter/Bridge Development Proposal

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Chair Bromberg and esteemed members of the Plan Commission,
My name is Helen Chung and I am a 17 year resident of Deerfield. I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Bridge manufacturing and shipping warehouse project at the old Baxter campus. From the initial presentation of this proposal to the Planning Commission to the latest meeting at DHS on May 11, it is clear that this proposal brings more harm than good to our town. With no current local, county or state level policy guidance on the construction of such industrial sites near residential communities, I urge the Planning Commission as well as the Village Trustees and Mayor Shapiro to halt this proposal and firmly establish a thoughtful framework for future land development that takes into careful, studied consideration of all aspects that impact our community such as air quality, noise pollution, wildlife/tree preservation, property value and overall goals to build a Deerfield that will thrive for future generations. Additionally, with multiple industrial distribution sites currently being built in close proximity to Deerfield, the current Baxter development proposal cannot be evaluated as an isolated project, but one that will see an additive effect on our community with increase truck traffic and air pollution. I urge the Planning Commission, the Village Trustees and the Mayor to take this opportunity for thoughtful urban planning rather than executing a reactionary, knee jerk reaction to current changes in our local economy and ambiguous financial incentives.

Best Regards,
Helen Chung

Daniel Van Dusen

From: Gloria Irwin <irwinglo@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 6, 2023 12:13 PM
To: Plan Commission Comment
Cc: Daniel Nakahara, AICP; Daniel Van Dusen
Subject: [PUBLIC COMMENT] Bridge Plan

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Plan Commission,

I have lived in Deerfield for the past 23 years. I chose Deerfield for the beautiful tree rich neighborhoods. I love the quiet that is only broken by children laughing as they play. The fine school system here led me to believe that more families would move here to give their children the best opportunity for a great start to their adult lives. I believe that Bridge Industrial will destroy that dream making Deerfield not desirable to new comers and create difficulties for us living here, especially those planning on spending their retirement here. Bridge will add pollution to our air increasing respiratory problems for the very young and old. Removing so many trees for them to build their facility is counter productive to removing greenhouse gases. Trees that consume carbon dioxide will be replaced with a factory that will perhaps emit more than the trees that were there could remove.

I am also extremely concerned about the heavy truck traffic causing noise and impacting travel in the area. I frequently travel the Tri-State and Edens expressways which can be a challenge already in summer months with road construction projects. This extra truck traffic will tax the roads.

I understand that the loss of Baxter has left a tax revenue loss for the village but this is definitely not the type of business that Deerfield should invite to fill the void. As a recent retiree I don't want to even think about leaving this wonderful community but, if this happens I probably will.

Please don't approve this. It will destroy our lovely community.

Sincerely,

Gloria Irwin
1560 Woodbine Court
Deerfield, IL 60015

Daniel Van Dusen

From: sandy bernstein <shimmertwink@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 7, 2023 3:05 PM
To: Plan Commission Comment
Cc: Daniel Nakahara, AICP; Daniel Van Dusen
Subject: [PUBLIC COMMENT] NO TO BRIDGE!!!!

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

I am in SHOCK reading the communications between Bridge and our Deerfield representatives! I am also aghast that you would even CONSIDER this proposal! And after reading the zoning report, my jaw has dropped even lower if possible!

How is it that the citizens of our amazing community have to band together to foot the bill for unprejudiced air pollution studies, traffic studies, etc? How is this not something that our leaders have done on their own in order to protect our community?

I am copying and pasting from the 60015 website words that reflect my thoughts (and pretty much everyone in my neighborhood in Clavinia thinks AND pretty much everyone I have spoken to from friends, family, and just people outraged talking at the art fair, Whole Foods, etc. THERE ARE OVER 5,300 SIGNATURES ON THE PETITION FROM A COMMUNITY WITH ONLY 14,000 ADULTS, WHERE NEARLY 3,000 OF THOSE ADULTS ARE ELDERLY and thus much less likely to be social media savvy. Have you even seen the signs everywhere?!

OUR COMMUNITY DOES NOT WANT THIS!!! Don't you represent us? Don't you care what happens to Deerfield's future? To our home prices? To our reputation? To our streets with the traffic? To our infrastructure from the impact of 600 plus trucks a day, seven days a week? The noise? Can you honestly tell me that this would ever even be considered in Winnetka, or Kenilworth or Highland Park? We are supposed to be part of the beautiful North Shore, but we will no longer be considered as a viable community for people who want good schools, beauty, and an exceptional reputation for a top-tier place to live if this is built!

Here are some very wise words from typical conversations on the 60015 Unite FB page. Please READ! Please CARE about your community that you are supposed to represent! Please LISTEN to what the community wants, and more importantly, DOES NOT WANT!!!

-Sandy Bernstein - Deerfield resident of 34 years (soon to be moving if you approve this disgusting monstrosity that has no business being even considered to be built anywhere near our community).

-
- [Holly Ktz](#) you are 100% right. I think the same how could anyone read this and think this project is ok. Did anyone notice the real estate tax is now down to around 2 million from 3.6 I think? The costs incurred by deerfield to monitor and enforce this will end up higher than any tax received then add to that the drop in value of homes in the area and the impact of tax reduction from lower values. This project has the potential to not only destroy the reputation of deerfield but the long term viability of it. So why would they even consider it? The only answer is they think we are wrong but if we aren't? Is another 2 million a year in taxes even close to the risk? bridge now says we came to deerfield because we can't get the scale and density from current lake county zoning.

-
- Like
 - Reply
 - Share
 - [4h](#)



[Patrick Williamson](#)

Author



In addition to the costs to monitor and enforce the traffic, and the tax impact of lower home values, another huge deduction would come from loss of business revenue from the businesses on Lake Cook road, as well as a reduction of revenue from the businesses in the village square, once Deerfield road becomes too crowded to bother with, since no one would drive on Lake Cook with the tucks anymore. Oh and also, the school budgets would suffer due to lower home values and a known toxic risk to the west Deerfield schools, and we all know how expensive that can get, supplementing those budgets to keep the schools in excellent standing.

2

-
- **Like**
 - **Reply**
 - **Share**
 - [3h](#)



[Brian Cloch](#)

This is a perfect example for what the deerfield planners need to go deeper on. The answers from bridge are total bullshit and even support the opposition position that bridge is saying whatever they have to get a yes. Like creation of jobs. Last I checked we don't have a lot of union members or people that are interested in low paying wage positions in deerfield. Our Resturant's can't get staff. How about No drop in blue for real estate near their complex's. The reason is those homes are already discounted for being near industrial uses. The question that needs to be asked is when has bridge been the first industrial development in a high end residential market? The answer will be never. But if it is yes then what happen to the value of those high ends homes after bridge came in? I can on and on. We need deerfield leaders to ask hard questions not just take bridges words as accurate. There is way too much to lose here for deerfield just to trust bridge. We need hard verifications and facts.

Daniel Van Dusen

From: Dottie <dottief@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 8, 2023 6:43 PM
To: Plan Commission Comment
Cc: Daniel Nakahara, AICP; Daniel Van Dusen
Subject: [PUBLIC COMMENT] our reasons

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear Plan Commission,

I hope to attend this evening. It is imperative that we look for other meaningful entities to fill the space, as it appears that the community at large is not behind this project for all the reasons everyone has enumerated. It is understandable that the tax monies lost if this property isn't filled may be significant, but the community that we moved into will be eroded in my opinion by this industrial park. I urge you once again to look at alternatives to use this space in a meaningful way which fits in with Deerfield's esthetic and its sense of our business center and our bedroom community having meaningful borders. My partner agrees with me in this regard.

All the best,

Dottie

Dottie Fiedler, MAT, CDS, CAF
Lundberg Research
Varsity Tutors
Speisman Law
Former College Adjunct Faculty
Fine Arts Commission of the
Village of Deerfield

cc: Al Speisman, Atttorney at Law
Speisman Law
PFA