



**MEETING MINUTES
PLAN COMMISSION**

**TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2018
7:00 P.M.**

VILLAGE HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Members Present: Maria Choca Urban, Chairman
Michael Bailey
Homa Ghaemi
Michael Taylor
Jeffrey Head

Members Absent: Christine Norrick
Steven Schwab

Staff Present: John Adler, Director of Community Development
Jeff Stein, Corporation Counsel
Dan Manis, Village Engineer

I. CALL TO ORDER.

Chairman Urban called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. 2018-P-01 1925 Wilmette Avenue – Planned Unit Development

A request by Housing Opportunity Development Corporation for approval of a Planned Unit Development Preliminary Plan and Special Use to permit the construction of a multi-family building containing approximately 16 rental apartments.

Commissioner Taylor moved to recommend approval of the request for a Planned Unit Development Preliminary Plan and Special Use to permit the construction of a multi-family building containing approximately 16 affordable rental apartments in the NR, Neighborhood Retail, zoning district in conformance with the plans submitted.

Commissioner Head seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows:

Maria Choca Urban, Chairman	Yes
Michael Bailey	Yes
Homa Ghaemi	No
Christine Norrick	Absent
Steven Schwab	Absent
Jeffrey Head	Yes
Michael Taylor	Yes

Motion Passed. The subject request will be on the April 10, 2018 Village Board agenda.

Commissioner Taylor moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Plan Commission for case number 2018-P-01.

Commissioner Bailey seconded the motion and the voice vote was all ayes and no nays.

Case Minutes are attached.

III. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

V. AJDOURNMENT.

At 10:33 p.m., Commissioner Bailey moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Taylor and the voice vote was all ayes and no nays. **The motion carried.**

The meeting was thereafter adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

John Adler
Director of Community Development

Case Minutes 2018-P-01 – 1925 Wilmette Avenue

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

- 3.11 Harold Francke, Attorney for the Applicant, Meltzer, Purtil & Stelle LLC
- 3.12 Richard Koenig, Executive Director of Housing Opportunity Development Corporation
- 3.13 John Satter, Appraiser, Hilco Global
- 3.14 Eric Russell, Engineer, KLOA, Inc.

3.2 Summary of comments

- 3.21 Chairman Urban reviewed the purpose of the commission. A PUD will be heard at tonight's meeting. Mr. Adler will present a PowerPoint about the PUD process and Mr. Stein will discuss the applicable law as it relates to affordable housing.

- 3.22 Mr. Adler explained the PUD process, as well as information about the process for tonight's meeting.

Mr. Stein said the application before the Plan Commission is for a Planned Unit Development for an affordable housing apartment facility located within the Village in a Neighborhood Retail district. As the use for the property is designed to provide affordable housing to certain qualified individuals, certain protections under the federal Fair Housing Act, certain state laws, and the Village's own laws are triggered. As with any application, discriminatory practices in granting zoning relief are forbidden. Accordingly, commentary about the actual or perceived status, practice or expression of the potential users' and potential tenants' race, color, religion, age, national origin, ancestry, sex, age, disability, sexual orientation, marital status, parental status, military discharge status, source of income, or housing status, or the actual or perceived association with such a person, will not be considered by the Plan Commission in making its decision to recommend approval or rejection of the application.

- 3.23 Chairman Urban said that the plan commission will make a recommendation on tonight's case to the Village Board of Trustees. This is an advisory recommendation only and the commission is a fact finding body. She swore in those who would be presenting at the meeting.

- 3.24 Mr. Adler said this was Case 2018-P-1, a request for approval for a PUD preliminary plan and special use to permit the construction of a multi-family building containing approximately 16 affordable rental units in the NR retail zoning district for the property at 1925 Wilmette Avenue.

- 3.25 Harold Francke, attorney for the applicant, said he is representing Housing Opportunity Development Corporation (HODC). He made some preliminary comments before starting his presentation. The applicant's goal is to present facts to the plan commission so that they can recommend approval to the Village Board. He said that his presentation will help in the decision as to whether the PUD standards, as well as special use standards are met and satisfied. There are a lot of people at the meeting who want to speak. He indicated to village staff that they would try to keep their presentation as concise as possible. They have presented to the plan commission before and past presentations are on record. He is making reference to information contained in reports and studies. The goals and objectives of the comprehensive plan will be achieved by the proposal. The proposal is compatible with surrounding land uses. There is a market demand for what is being proposed. The project will have a first class design with adequate parking. There will be minimal impact on neighborhood traffic because of the nature of the development. There will be compliance with engineering requirements for the village code as well as an opportunity to make things better with regard to storm water management.

All of those facts need to be established and he asked to incorporate that information into the hearing record. They will not provide information that was previously provided. They believe that the development is compatible with surrounding land uses. There is a market demand for what is being proposed. For the record, their full complement of consultants are at the meeting and include their architect, traffic consultant, marketing consultant, appraiser who prepared a property impact analysis, and civil engineer. They can answer questions. Only the consultant who prepared the report about impact on surrounding properties will speak this evening.

For the record, the applicant has responded to site plan comments and conditions. They are in the record. All of those will not be reiterated. Mr. Francke asked Mr. Koenig to provide a brief summary of where they started and the current status of the project. He will answer any questions.

- 3.26 Richard Koenig, Executive Director of HODC, said he has been the executive director since 1997. HODC is a 501c3 nonprofit organization founded in Wilmette in 1983. He discussed their mission which is to develop affordable housing throughout the northern suburbs. There are not a lot of organizations that do this work in this area. They have developed 300+ units in 22 projects. They manage 255 units in 8 suburban communities. They have an excellent board and staff. Most are at the meeting tonight.

The project they are proposing is Cleland Place named after one of their founding board members. The proposal is for 16 new rental units, 1 and 2 bedrooms, targeting Wilmette residents, workers and their families and lower income residents as well as veterans and people with disabilities. The project addresses a need identified in the village's housing plan as well as the affordable housing plan and appeal act.

They originally presented in November 2015. This proposal was for more units. Since that time they have tried to improve the proposal based on recommendations and comments from the community. They held six community meetings over two years. They explored numerous development options to try to make it better.

The building is the former American Legion site. The Actors Training Center has been actively using the building. They were able to allow a new nonprofit to host a fundraiser in the building.

He talked about the Wil-Ridge Plaza redevelopment. They tried to do some cross easements with them to allow them to access his site and vice versa. When the new development of the shopping center property came forward, all discussions and hard work fell by the wayside because the new development could not incorporate their requests. Now that the process has gone forward on that site, it is now time for HODC's project to move forward.

They have not been able to meet all needs mentioned by the community. They took a number of steps to make the project a lot better and respond to many concerns. They reduced the unit count by 20%. They have a mix of 1 and 2 BR units. They increased the size of the community room. They increased the size of the office space. They increased and improved the parking ratio by 25%. There is more than one parking space/unit.

He talked about the selection process and how tenants are selected and not selected. They changed the parking configuration. They replied to all questions related to engineering. They improved storm water runoff. They reduced runoff from the site.

One of the more difficult issues raised was about property management. They tried to explain how the property would be managed. There is one building and a few smaller buildings that have issues that have frightened people. They tried to explain how they improved property management systems and hired property management staff that are more extensively involved in building management. When they took over a specific building it was already a troubled building. They realized that they need full time management staff. Eight out of 12 staff now do property management. They brought on an asset management director who won property manager of the year honor from the state.

They have continued to try and improve their processes as they grow. Tenant issues are addressed more quickly. The organization is more effective. They retained a lot of building benefits from the initial proposal. They tried to focus on providing units to village residents. The property will pay real estate taxes. They are not requesting any village funding. Funding will come from state and federal agencies. The building is fully handicapped accessible. It does have an elevator and is ADA compliant. They set aside units for veterans. This continues the legacy set forth by the American Legion.

There is a need for affordable housing in the community as shown in the market study and in the village's affordable housing plan. The building is built of quality construction. There is a laundry room and property management office on site. Reserves are set aside and ongoing so that the building can operate in the long term. There will be less impervious surface and the property will be green certified.

There are certain community benefits that need to be shown by this type of project before it moves forward. One of those is providing affordable housing. He talked about a bio swale and water running off of the site. One of the big issues raised was storm water runoff. Their engineers estimated that during a major storm, the facilities built within the property will reduce storm water runoff by 94%. Green community certification is similar to a LEED certification. It does not cost as much and is similar to LEED silver status. They obtained this certification on other properties. They meet all of the community PUD standards. All reports and studies show that it meets those standards. They wanted to talk about local property values and how it meets community standards.

- 3.27 John Satter, appraiser for the applicant, said he works for Hilco Global in Northbrook as the managing director of the Midwest region. He has been with the company for six years and prior to that he ran a practice in the village for 15 years out of the Baker building. He was part of the ad hoc business advisory group. He worked with Mr. Adler and the Village Board when they were looking at the downtown plan. During his time in the village he appraised 1000+ properties in Wilmette. He is serving on the Glencoe ZBA and on the Glencoe planning commission. He has experience appraising properties of the nature of what is being proposed. His CV is attached to his report.

He was retained by HODC regarding what influence, if any, the proposed project will have on surrounding property values. In the course of doing that, he inspected the property several times. They reviewed information that is part of the application including architectural and engineering plans. They read through follow up responses. They reviewed the Village Comprehensive Plan and the general standards, development standards and exception standards. They looked at development patterns and land uses in the zoning district in proximity of the property location. They reviewed sale and rental price data for properties that are in proximity to low income projects and compared those to properties that are not in proximity.

The Village Comprehensive Plan identifies human housing issues in the village – the availability of decent, safe, and reasonably affordable housing for elderly and low and moderate income households and whether an appropriate range of housing options is available to the village's senior population.

The proposed PUD is intended to house low income residents. To measure the effect of a low income property on surrounding properties, they identified 10 low income properties in Evanston, Skokie, Highland Park, and Deerfield. A summary is in the addendum section of the report. They completed exterior inspections of the

six lower income senior and four lower income family properties and noticed that all properties were in average to good condition, the sites were clean and the buildings conformed to local inventory. They researched and analyzed sale prices of single unit residential properties in the immediate vicinity of the 10 low income properties and compared them to sale prices of properties that are not directly exposed or located at least one block from low income properties. A relative comparison analysis for each location has been summarized in the addendum. It provides a side by side comparison of properties located adjacent or across the street from low income properties with similar type design and size properties located over one block from or not directly exposed to low income properties. The one block location metric is a distance used in market studies when measuring external factors such as noise or view impairments as a reasonable distance to diminish the impact.

Their analysis concluded that there was no significant market rejection or significant variance in the price (sale or rental) attributed to a property being located in direct proximity to a low income property.

They are seeking a height variance. While the building height is conforming to the ordinance at 30', the proposed development seeks a height increase from 2.5 to 3 stories. During inspection of the local area, they noticed five multi-unit 3 to 4 story buildings located along Ridge that are in proximity to Pin Oak and High Point townhouse projects. The proposed building is similar in three story height and appearance but significantly smaller in scale than the Ridge Road projects.

They reviewed market sales of the individual townhomes in the two projects and see no evidence that being in the proximity of 3-4 story multi-unit residential properties results in obvious rejection of the property, a stigma, an elongated marketing period, or significantly lower prices. They noted that the proposed project is significantly smaller in building height and scale compared to the recently approved 64-unit Artis senior living development.

In conclusion, the development of the subject property site with the proposed multi-unit residential project under the PUD general standards and in accordance with the NR neighborhood retail business district zoning code will not substantially diminish the market value of the surrounding properties and it will not cause a substantial impairment in property use.

The presentation is concluded and questions can now be asked.

3.28 Chairman Urban asked how HODC was created and what spurred its creation.

Mr. Koenig said HODC traces their roots back to the fair housing movement. An organization was created, the Interfaith Housing Center of the Northern Suburbs, which was a fair housing organization for the northern suburbs. It was a group of congregations that pushed for fair housing. As a spin off, they created the Interfaith

Housing Development Corporation and the two organizations grew up together, one doing fair housing work and the other doing development work. They decided to split in 1997 when he was hired as the first full time executive director for the development organization and then they changed their name to the current name.

- 3.29 Commissioner Head said that in reviewing some of the comments, one consistent theme was around traffic impact. Please speak to that.

Eric Russell, from KLOA Traffic Engineers, spoke about traffic. They performed the parking study and the village engineer hired a consultant that did the traffic study. They found that the traffic impact was very low based on the types of tenants in units. There is low ownership of vehicles. There is a low traffic generation. They used conservative assumptions. The intersection of ridge and Wilmette would operate with a minimal increase – less than one second of wait time per vehicle. The intersection is at service level C today. They found minimal impact related to traffic generation from the project.

- 3.30 Commissioner Bailey asked what Mr. Satter was talking about in the January 10, 2018 appraisal. It said that the project would not substantially diminish the values of neighboring properties. Can he assign a number or range of numbers to substantially?

Mr. Satter said it would be less than 5%. The standard language is that it would not substantially diminish property values but looking at the metrics and relative comparison for the 10 property locations it appears that there is no impact. There are cases where the properties near the lower income housing development are slightly higher than a similar property two blocks away. The variances are very minor.

Commissioner Bailey said substantially could mean 3% or 30%. It does not mean anything to use that word. Mr. Satter said substantially is the word used in the village ordinance.

Commissioner Bailey asked if there was a way to know what that word means in relation to the village ordinance. It means nothing unless there is a range of numbers.

Mr. Satter said in his opinion it would be less than 5%.

- 3.31 Commissioner Ghaemi said there was a mention that new managers were hired. How many staff do they have?

Mr. Koenig said that they have 12 staff members and 8 are involved in property management.

Commissioner Ghaemi asked how many properties does each manage.

Mr. Koenig explained how staff were allocated between the buildings. There are three out of Techny, three out Deerfield and two maintenance staff that rotate. There are really six property managers.

Commissioner Ghaemi asked where the property manager for this property would be. Mr. Koenig said this property manager would be out of the Techny office. Each property manager oversees about 100 units.

Chairman Urban asked how long has property management staff been on board?

Mr. Koenig said staff ranges from 1-15 years, average number is about 8 years.

Commissioner Bailey asked if they assume these responsibilities pursuant to management contract or just by virtue of being the owner.

Mr. Koenig said that most of the properties they manage are properties that they developed and own and some are properties that they develop and they don't own. They also manage third-party properties where they only perform property management. The Wilmette property would be owned and managed. They sign agreements with themselves and he signs on both lines.

Commissioner Head asked if they would they need more management staff if this project is approved?

Mr. Koenig said that their goal is to add an additional property manager as they continue to grow. They have several properties in the pipeline. They were approved by IHDA for two additional properties.

3.32 Commissioner Head asked if he could describe the size of units.

Mr. Koenig said there are 10-1-bedroom units that are about 535 square feet and 6-2-bedroom units that are about 715 square feet.

3.33 Commissioner Head asked if he could speak to targeted occupancy. Who will live in the units?

Mr. Koenig said the general qualification that they use is an income threshold. Any tenant total household income would have to be less than 60% of the area median income. For a two-person household that is about \$37,000/year. For a three-person household that is \$42,000/year. There is a maximum amount of money that they would be able to earn. They would have to earn enough income to afford the rent. The rents for the one bedroom is \$615 and \$800 for two bedrooms. About 30% of their income is for rent.

3.34 Chairman Urban asked if HODC has retained ownership of all units it has developed? Has it sold some off? If so, what informed the decision to sell?

Mr. Koenig said that they have never sold off any properties that they developed. They have developed on behalf of others and they don't own the properties. It is their goal to hold and maintain all properties forever. They do not have plans to sell properties. There is a 30-year compliance period. When that period is up their goal is to continue to hold them as affordable housing for the long term.

- 3.35 Chairman Urban said that earlier Mr. Koenig said that HODC would pay property taxes on the property. They are not for profit. Are they still required to pay property taxes?

Mr. Koenig said they are required to pay property taxes. The property would be held in a single purpose entity that would be set up as limited partnership. They would be the managing partner of that partnership. The partnership is a for profit entity. Although HODC is a charitable organization, they pay taxes because they enforce people paying rents. They will evict if rent is not paid. That is considered by the state as not acting charitably. They are not able to waive real estate taxes.

Chairman Urban asked if they get a tax break.

Mr. Koenig said taxes are based on property value. Their rents are lower than market. The valuation of the property is based on value and that is restricted through covenants and regulatory agreements in place that restrict that value.

- 3.36 Chairman Urban asked that people form a line if they want to speak and that people think about what is most salient about what they want to say. There are a lot of people who wish to speak.
- 3.37 Commissioner Head said the commissioners received binders at their houses last night. It is not signed by anyone. There is an organization, Wilmette Residents United for Transparency and Informed Decisions on American Legion Post 46 Redevelopment. It is unsigned by anyone and he asked that some associated with the organization identify themselves.

4.0 INTERESTED PARTIES

4.1 Persons speaking on the application

- | | |
|------|--|
| 4.11 | Mr. Alan Minoff, 521 Meadow Drive East |
| 4.12 | Ms. Lisa Braganca, 2125 Washington Avenue |
| 4.13 | Paul Kesselman, 1933 Wilmette Avenue |
| 4.14 | Hannah McNulty, 2145 Thornwood Avenue |
| 4.15 | Judie Goodie, 436 Prairie Avenue |
| 4.16 | William Sholten, 1041 Ridge Road,
Mallinckrodt |
| 4.17 | Bruce Smerch, 215 Pin Oak Drive |
| 4.18 | Gail Schnitzer Eisenberg, 8 th and Lake |

4.19	Sherry Medwin, 848 Park Avenue
4.110	Jon Marshall, 822 Prairie Avenue
4.111	Meg Maris, 1200 Cleveland Avenue
4.112	Sheila Schaeffer-Hirsh, 1712 Central Avenue
4.113	Carol Molscredeaus, 1616 Sheridan Road, 8A
4.114	Rev. Kristin Uffelman, 1130 Wilmette Avenue
4.115	Sue Loellbach, Connections for the Homeless
4.116	Mary Chamber, 207 Pin Oak Drive
4.117	Martha Witwer, Pin Oak Drive
4.118	Carol Goldstein, 1426 Lake Avenue
4.119	Scott Goldstein, 1426 Lake Avenue
4.120	Michael Sullivan, 448 Alpine Lane
4.121	Donna Spicuzza , 518 4 th Street
4.122	Ben Belkind, 422 Cedar Lane
4.123	Steve Sergesketter, 226 Pin Oak Drive
4.124	Lisa Schneider-Fabes, 108 Woodbine Avenue
4.125	Dave Wisel, Sandy Lane
4.126	Tom Hoepfner, 1234 Maple Avenue
4.127	Emily Molins, 206 10th Street
4.128	Rose Dubin, 323 Vine Street
4.129	Kathy Myalls, 2007 Wilmette Avenue
4.130	Andy Reese, 411 Pine Manor Drive
4.131	Jane Hornstein, 1610 Highland Avenue
4.132	Jeff Strange, owner of 307-317 Ridge Road
4.133	Chris Lee, 400 block of Pine Manor
4.134	Jennifer Manning, 1104 Forest Avenue
4.135	Nancy Hoying, 901 Forest Avenue
4.136	Mr. Mitch Klein, Owner of 1837 Wilmette Avenue
4.137	Donna Nye, 473 Highcrest Avenue
4.138	Erin Sullivan, 448 Alpine Drive
4.139	Igor Spektor, 203 Pin Oak Drive

4.1 Summary of Comments

- 4.1.1 Mr. Alan Minoff, 521 Meadow Drive East, has lived in the village for 24 years. He raised his family in the village. He lives a few blocks west of the proposed development. He urged the commission to deny the request and not work with this developer. It will be considered a sub-standard property the day it is completed. This design is cheap and ugly. It will be an eyesore. The building over parking lot design has been mostly phased out for its looks and safety. The project is not in keeping with the village's character. This is a village of privately owned mostly single family homes. Diversity is a goal for the village. His cul-de-sac and the village as a whole are examples of diversity. The residents in his cul-de-sac are able to purchase and maintain their property. What is the benefit to the village in giving 20

housing lottery winners the privilege of living in the village? This is one of the most desirable communities in the Chicago area. There are other communities where this could be built. He talked about the impact analysis. In the applicant's materials, it says that the project will not substantially diminish the market value of surrounding properties and will not cause a substantial impairment of the use of the properties. He feels sorry for the people who live nearby. 5% would be a substantial decrease in value.

The materials say units are not suitable for children. It is not clear how that would work in practice. If an occupant were to have a child would they be evicted? He does not think so. An adult could sleep in the bedroom and the children in the living room. What would prevent this? Why would someone want to leave the unit?

The materials say residents are less likely to have cars. Living in this development with no car is not practical. It is a long walk to the nearest supermarket.

He asked the board not to approve this proposal. Wilmette can do better than this project.

The chair asked the audience to hold their applause and to talk about this issue in a civil tone. There is nothing gained by disparaging future village residents.

4.1.2 Ms. Lisa Braganca, 2125 Washington Avenue, said she lives close to the development. She is excited to live in a community that is welcome to people with disabilities, people with low incomes who may not have the opportunity to live close to family members. She has a son with autism who could be a building resident. Right now there would no place for her son to live in the village. This is a wonderful opportunity so some children can stay in the community. Grandparents could also remain in the community and be near their families. The proposal means a lot to her and many who she knows.

4.1.3 Paul Kesselmen, 1933 Wilmette Avenue, said the proposed development is in his backyard. The applicant over the past two years has not changed much of the plan. The first time he came forward the meeting was adjourned due to the late hour. The applicant voluntarily withdrew the petition because he knew there were deficiencies. Mr. Kesselman went to all community discussions. Much of what was talked about has been ignored and is not part of today's presentation. All show and no substance. The applicant has not shown he is entitled to any relief he is requesting.

It bases its request on four benefits. Does the storm water management benefit and beautify the area? Technically he does not have the

qualifications to contest that. Some of the engineers and lawyers he spoke with says it does not comply. Without better information that determination cannot be made – that storm water situation will be better. Will the storm water system benefit the village? It benefits the applicant more than anyone.

The use of sustainable design and architecture – it primarily benefits the applicant. The style does not look like other buildings in the area. He has a single-family residence next door to the proposal. The proposed development is too big, it is unsightly with parking outside. It benefits the applicant and not the village. He is not saying that low income housing is not desirable. There are many deserving low income individuals who should be able to find a place to live in the village. But this project is not the right fit for the village.

The last benefit is affordable or senior housing set-asides. That is their representation. His house will go down in value by 5% or more. The set-asides may benefit the village but how will they be administered. At various meetings, the applicant said they are not allowed to set aside specifically for the village. How will it be ensured that the benefits they are touting will take place? That they will stay in place?

ADA features benefit the applicant. It is desirable to have housing that is ADA accessible. This is a selling/renting point for this property.

He hears a lot of good rhetoric. He does not see a lot of substance behind the presentations. He does not see guarantees. The decisions made by the Plan Commission and Village Board will impact the village for a long time. The applicant's track record does not bear that out. The applicant has been in business for 30 years. They have had a lot of issues. He talked about what goes on at the Evanston and other properties. Why did they just now hire a professional property manager? It is nice but they have not done this in the past. There is no indication that this will continue. The decision is not temporary. This will stay forever with the village.

Chairman Urban asked the speaker to move forward.

The speaker responded that this is important to him and the chairman said the issue is important to everyone.

Mr. Kesselmen said he has no qualifications as a property manager, as an appraiser, as an engineer or as a traffic consultant. But he talked about the line of cars he sees every morning. A lot of people who make 60% of minimum income have cars. Adding more cars to the area will make an impact at that intersection. Mornings are a very busy time at that intersection. Evenings are also a busy time. He has not seen an updated traffic study. The study presented two years ago was flawed and does not

show the traffic flow as it is today.

A suggestion was made to limit comments to three minutes or less. And if someone has already said something, indicate that and restate it as quickly as possible.

- 4.1.4 Hannah McNulty, 2145 Thornwood Avenue, said she has lived in the village for 17 years and raised two children. She and her husband support the latest proposal. She talked about the Affordable Housing, Planning, and Appeals Act of Illinois that was adopted in 2003 due to lack of affordable housing in Illinois. The village adopted an affordable housing plan in 2004, but there is affordable housing for only 4.1% of its residents and most of it is for seniors. She reviewed data from the Illinois poverty report and other reports and studies. The fears of new affordable housing developments are more myth than reality. Richard Koenig addressed previous concerns in his new proposal. Let's be a part of the solution to poverty. Don't let fear drive the decision.
- 4.1.5 Judie Goodie, 436 Prairie Avenue, said she submitted a letter to the Plan Commission and made the remarks public at the meeting. She urged the commission to support the proposal. People other than seniors require affordable housing. She talked about the Wilmette Comprehensive Plan and diversity. Wilmette needs to be part of the solution and not of the problem. This project if approved will help the village be part of the solution.
- 4.1.6 William Sholten, 1041 Ridge Road, said he lives in the Mallinckrodt building, which is a wonderful community. There is a set-aside for affordable housing at Mallinckrodt. He is an HODC board member because he believes in their mission. The proposal is a unique opportunity and he hopes that the commission will support it.
- 4.1.7 Bruce Smerch, 215 Pin Oak, said he lives adjacent to the proposed project. Concentrating people who are under-class causes problems. He agrees that people who are not quite so affluent need to live in the community. Wouldn't it make more sense to divide them up into various apartment buildings? Or why don't developments have set asides for affordable housing? The board has the power to do this. That would be good for everyone.

He talked about property values. There is a unit for sale on Pin Oak for \$210,000 and some can afford it. People who buy it would put down a \$40,000 down payment. As soon as that development is built, the purchaser is out \$10,000 or 25% of their equity. The affordable units should be spread out amongst the market rate buildings. Property values will be impacted by the proposal.

He owned apartment buildings in Chicago. He is compassionate about poor people. Having an award winning property management company is not enough. Someone invested in the building needs to live there. He had an 18-unit apartment building and Jean Cleland was his friend. Jean introduced him to the Section 8 system, which was great because he got help to some of the people in that building. He was at that building every day. He was not an absentee landlord. An award winning property management company will be at their offices 2-3 miles away and won't see what is happening daily

- 4.1.8 Gale Schnitzer Eisenberg, 8th and Lake, said she is a New Trier Township trustee. She served on the money follows the person committee that is charged with distributing funds to organizations who serve those with developmental differences as well as mental illness. The theme that emerged is that there is not enough housing in New Trier Township where people can stay in their communities after they leave their families. Housing is not affordable in this community. That issue can be addressed today. The commission can recommend to the full board that the proposal be approved. About 100 families from the village are served by the New Trier food pantry. About 48% of them are the working poor.
- 4.1.9 Sherry Medwin, 848 Park Avenue, said she has lived in the village since 1975 when she started teaching at New Trier. She raised her family in the village. New Trier students learn about tolerance, justice, inclusion, community, and the safety and well-being of all people. Students take action to ensure that the above can happen. Why aren't community values in line with what is being taught at New Trier? A substantial community benefit would be that the values the teens are being raised with are coming to fruition in their town. She asked the commission to make a positive recommendation to the board.
- 4.1.10 Jon Marshall, 822 Prairie Avenue, said he has lived in the village since 1994. He has friends on both sides of the issue. He feels strongly in support of the proposal. He talked about the benefits to the village including the veteran set-aside, people with disabilities who can stay in the community, and reducing storm water runoff, which is very important. Compared to the existing American Legion Hall, the appearance is an improvement. Providing affordable housing to individuals and families is important. The village is behind in this initiative. He talked about people who would live in Cleland Place. He talked about the Bureau of Labor Statistics and salaries for specific professions. He talked about people qualified to live in Cleveland Place. He said pre-school teachers, religious workers, floral designers, pharmacy technicians, home health aides, nursing assistants, crossing guards, waiter/waitresses, barbers, hairdressers, concierges, child care workers, retail sales people, bank tellers, library assistants, and many other professions might be income qualified. He would welcome these

people living in the village.

- 4.1.11 Meg Maris, 1200 Cleveland Avenue, said she has lived in the village for 44 years and represents the entire Gambacorta and Maris family from a business and personal standpoint. They oppose the proposed plan. She does not agree that builders should be forced to include low-income housing in developments. Her family are property managers for many properties in the village. No one knows how the proposal will impact home values. No one can speak to positive or negative benefits. There is no control over residents of Cleland Place. What regulations are placed on tenant screening? She posed a lot of questions about tenants. People are afraid because not enough has been spelled out. She needs to know what has been put into place regarding screening of prospective tenants. Without knowing who will be living there she and her family cannot provide their support at this time. There are too many what if's that are bringing the fear.
- 4.1.12 Sheila Schaeffer-Hirsh, 1712 Central Avenue, said she lives close to the proposed development. She has lived in the village since 1990. She believed she was moving into an open-minded and welcoming community. She has known people who have had to leave the village as it became unaffordable for various reasons. Affordable housing is an issue. She was initially excited about the proposal but got emails saying that it was bad but didn't say why. She did some research and got good information from the League of Women Voters website. 16% of village residents make less than \$50,000/year and she found this to be surprising. There is a need for affordable housing in the village. HODC has tried to deal with concerns in a positive way. She talked about the 2004 plan and the policy to provide affordable housing options. She hopes that the village does the right thing and puts the policy into action.
- 4.1.13 Carol Molscradeus, 1616 Sheridan Road, 8F, said she is a retired attorney. She is the former Executive Director of the homeless shelter in Evanston, which is a family and adult shelter program. It gave her an opportunity to see people who have lost a lot. One of the major causes of homelessness is not having the ability to juggle the cost of housing. She agrees about the language and goals of the Comprehensive Plan about affordable housing and community diversity. There is a major misconception that speakers have about the project. 10% of village residents have an income of \$35,000 or less. There are about 10,000 households in the village. There are people who can benefit living in Cleland Place who are Wilmette residents. She talked about what the opportunity provides to the community. There is an ordinance that indicates that developers can include affordable housing or pay to get out of that obligation. Almost all of them pay. That is why there is not scattered low income housing in the village. Wilmette has set a goal of 15% affordable housing. Right now there are 140 units. 15% of 10,000 households would be 1,500 units so that the village is way behind in meeting

that goal. What is going to be done about this? This proposal is a good one. It is well thought out and listened to community comments. When will economic diversity happen if this is what residents believe in? Actions testify to values. Actions show where one places their values and what is important. No zoning variance is needed in the terms of it being a permitted use. It will add to the tax rolls.

The Chairman asked the speaker to wrap up her remarks.

Ms. Molscradeus continued and asked, if not now, when? When will the village become diverse? This is a chance for the village to act on stated beliefs.

- 4.1.14 Rev. Kristin Uffelman, St. Augustine's Church, 1130 Wilmette Avenue, said she is grateful to lead a church with a commitment of inclusion and hospitality. They are a neighbor to Gates Manor. She supports Cleland Place.
- 4.1.15 Sue Loellbach, Connections for the Homeless, said she works at Connections for the Homeless. She leads a coalition of 30 nonprofits called Joining Forces for Affordable Housing. They drafted a document that was sent to commissioners. She found a Stanford University study, Who Wants Affordable Housing in Their Backyard? This looked at affordable housing and its impact on property values in low- and high-income neighborhoods, integrated neighborhoods and segregated neighborhoods. They found that the development of low-income housing in poor neighborhoods increased property values. In high-income neighborhoods there was either no impact or it increased property values up to 2.5%. The study focused on larger low-income developments. The proposal is a small development – 16 units – it should have little impact. She asked the commission to support the proposal.
- 4.1.16 Mary Chamber, 207 Pin Oak Drive, said she lives next door to the proposed development on Pin Oak Drive. She moved there in 2012 and grew up in Kenilworth. She is raising her daughter here. She is outspoken on diversity. They are building a senior care facility on the former Wil-ridge site and it is a big structure. The footprint of the proposed building, Cleland Place, is dense. There are 17 kids in Pin Oak who are seniors in high school or younger. She sees the traffic. She is not on board with the concept of minimal impact. It takes forever to get out of Pin Oak. Pin Oak is dense. High Point is dense. It is an odd space that could be well used as a park or green space. The neighborhood is school focused. There are problems with traffic on Wilmette Avenue. Kids need to be able to safely cross to Highcrest School. She gives a thumbs down to the proposal. The senior care facility is dense. The senior facility is a positive, however, for the village. She agrees with tonight's first speaker of interested residents.

- 4.1.17 Martha Witwer, Pin Oak Drive, said she lives in Pin Oak. She said there are no backyards in Pin Oak. She is the closest resident to the development. She said that there are a lot of dense developments in the area. To add a new building on a school route seems dumb to her. She supports affordable housing. She asked about rehabbing an existing building. Why does a new building have to be built? What about having affordable housing in the project on Green Bay Road which is more accessible without a car. She supports the idea but opposes the location.
- 4.1.18 Carol Goldstein, 1426 Lake Avenue, said she grew up in the village and moved back 15 years ago. She served on the HODC board for almost 10 years. She has heard falsehoods and misinformation about HODC over the past year and that is upsetting. Tonight HODC's PUD application should be reviewed under the zoning ordinance vs. fears and misinformation. The village has a commitment to expanding affordable housing. The zoning variance requests are minimal when compared to public benefits to the residents. HODC is not asking for village funding for the project. HODC will provide tax revenue to the village. She asked the commission to act on what the community values and follow the current zoning ordinance.
- 4.1.19 Scott Goldstein, 1426 Lake Avenue, said he loves the community and previously submitted a letter with his thoughts. He was on the Plan Commission and acted as chair for two years. He is a strong believer of affordable housing. Tonight, it is not the decision of the Plan Commission to support affordable housing because that is established policy. Does this project meet zoning code standards? There are eight standards. If one looks through the facts of this case, if this was not affordable housing, it meets all standards. The exceptions are minimal. Projects he works on require far less parking than the village requires. The proposal provides public benefits. Affordable housing is a public benefit in the ordinance. He asked the Plan Commission to vote in favor of the project.
- 4.1.20 Michael Sullivan, 448 Alpine Lane, said he lives with his wife and infant. He is a member of the group that submitted the package to the commission. He does not support the PUD. Not enough of the community input was put into the project. The applicant's projections show less than two children in the project out of 40 tenants, which does not play well for families. He and his wife had a child last year and if they lived in one of the one-bedroom units, which is the majority of the units, they would not have renewed their lease. He would favor a smaller development with a mixed-use component.
- 4.1.21 Donna Spicuzza, 518 4th Street, said she is a new village resident. She supports the application and urged the commission to make a positive recommendation to the Village Board. Regarding property values, people mentioned this as a fear. Property values are not a given, but a risk. She

spoke about residents of Georgetown Square, where she lives, being opposed to a past senior project, based on possible decrease in property values. The development went through and they are good neighbors. Property values were not negatively impacted and are healthy and robust at this time. The property value concept should not be a concern to the commissioners when evaluating this proposal.

- 4.1.22 Ben Belkind, 422 Cedar Lane, said he has lived in the village for 30+ years. He is not at the meeting to support or oppose the project but encouraged the commission to look at the facts and pseudo-facts that were presented with a fine-tooth comb. He gave some examples of what he meant such as property values adjacent to the project. One block away is not a valid statistical sample and urged the commission to require that a valid statistical sample be selected, two blocks away, five blocks away. They should require that statistical tests be applied to the data and the confidence limit be at least 95%. Nothing scientifically valid was presented as related to the case. Wilmette Avenue is heavily traveled. Adding three more cars may mean waiting three more light cycles to get home. He urged the commission to take emotions out and examine facts carefully and make a decision based on valid engineering concepts, science, and valid math.
- 4.1.23 Steve Sergesketter, 226 Pin Oak Drive, said he is on the board of UnCorked Adventures, NFP and his organization used the American legion hall for a fundraiser. He is against the development. They anticipate 1.5 children across 16 units. Families are not going to live here. Residents will have limited public transportation options. Treasure Island is ½ mile away. There are better locations for this project.
- 4.1.24 Lisa Schneider-Fabes, 108 Woodbine Avenue, thanked the PC for the time and for the opportunity for the community to share its perspectives. Wilmette's vibrancy is enhanced by expansion of economic diversity. HODC is a strong organization with a long-standing record of providing quality affordable housing in the northern suburbs. She expects that village staff and leadership will reach out to HODC communities to get accurate facts and input. HODC should be treated the same way as all developers. The project provides a clear public benefit as defined in the zoning ordinance. Their requests are modest. How much traffic did the legion hall create? The proposed use is probably less. She asked the Plan Commission to recommend approval of this case to the Village Board.
- 4.1.25 Dave Wisel, Sandy Lane, said he has lived in the village for 22 years. He was part of the group that presented the binder mentioned at the start of the hearing. He has a number of concerns about the project. His biggest concern is that everyone keeps referring to the Wilmette Affordable Housing Plan, which he read through. Page 4 spells out that a project that is 100% low income is a risk and not recommended. At the most the number should be

15-20% low income and more of a mixed use. This project was always intended to be 100% low-income, which isn't even recommended by Wilmette's own plan. He does not understand why this configuration is continued. He wants to see it change to something that aligns with the village's Housing Plan. Between this project and Artis, the residential character of the neighborhood changes to an institutional housing zone. How does that fit in with a single-family neighborhood? He doesn't think it does. He recommends that the village reject the plan.

- 4.1.26 Tom Hoepfner, 1234 Maple Avenue, said he has lived in the village for 46 years. He supports the plan and appreciates the suggestion of the chair that there be no applause, etc. He suggested that the chair take a straw vote to get a sense of the feelings of the group that has shown up to the meeting.
- 4.1.27 Emily Molins, 206 10th Street, said she attends Loyola Academy and is enrolled in a justice seminar. They spent a lot of time talking about homelessness and affordable housing. She volunteered at a homeless shelter in Evanston. She has a clearer picture of what it means to be homeless. She talked about the cause of homelessness and how this proposal can help those who are homeless live in a wonderful neighborhood. Diversity makes communities stronger and makes for more compassionate human beings.
- 4.1.28 Rose Dubin, 323 Vine Street, said she was on the housing commission when the affordable housing plan was created. One of the developers who she talked to about affordable housing was Richard Koenig. She knew of HODC and their reputation. They were highly qualified. She is an affordable housing professional and has worked with Mr. Koenig and his staff. The village should be honored and proud that HODC and Mr. Koenig want to be part of this community. She recommended that the Plan Commission and Village Board approve the proposal.
- 4.1.29 Kathy Myalls, 2007 Wilmette Avenue, said she wanted to respond to some of the comments made at the hearing. What are the benefits of low income housing? Why should it be in the village? Presumably it's to make people part of the community. She met people in the community through her children's various activities. If you put people in a building that have no other members of the community and they have no previous ties to the community and no future ties to the community, which you have to assume may happen. As much as she would like to have your mom or your child or my cousin that was in the military we don't get to pick the people that will live in the building. We don't even get to line up first. The best HODC can tell us is that they will market to our families but they have a residence in Evanston that has a waiting list a mile long. Nobody believes that they will pass those people up who have been waiting for low-income housing and tell them not to come here. The way that people meet in a community is by being out with children, attending community events that they can afford to

attend. The proposal will have 44 people with probably no children. Tonight, the applicant asked for a parking waiver because tenants will not have cars. If they don't have cars they cannot get around. The village does not have Target or Walmart for lower income people.

She wrote down addresses of the speakers tonight. Where people lived impacted their opinion about the project. HODC is comparing some of its successes in senior and family housing to this, which is neither. If you want to learn about their track record without seniors or families look in Evanston. Look at the 911 reports that were part of the package submitted. Crime went up in Evanston. Talk to people who live in Evanston. Somebody suggested that the development complies with the zoning ordinance. That is not being done with the parking, FAR and setback requirements. The residents who live on the west side of Wilmette are being asked to absorb the risk of what will happen. It is important to look at records from the Evanston buildings. The Wilmette low-income housing plan calls for integrated housing. The best way to make people part of a community is to have them as neighbors, but that is not happening. A lot of the people who support this project and knowing what the history is at similar types of property do not have children that get off the bus right where that building is. They don't have children that have to walk right past that building to get to the closest park, which happens to be in Evanston. Asking those who live nearby to take a chance because the people who don't live nearby are hoping that perhaps some family members will end up at this property is just not the right approach.

Low-income housing should be integrated through the community. Make sure people become friends and that they have a chance to succeed because they have a support system of people who have succeeded. Let's make sure we get to know them so that to the extent we can offer help finding better paying jobs and better opportunities. So we can meet them. So we can recommend them for those opportunities. With the money that it will cost the Village by this property not paying market rate property taxes we could buy apartments for low-income housing residents and put them in places where they are more likely to succeed. She added that she was not hearing a 5% reduction in property values from her real estate agent. 5% of a \$500,000 house is \$25,000 and is still a lot of money and it's not fair to ask people who live nearby to take the chance that will be the impact. She noted that one of the studies was family and senior housing and their impact on property values. That is not being proposed here. She would love to see family housing but that is not what is being proposed. If we are not inviting families to avail themselves of our resources, the most important being our schools, we are missing a real opportunity to change outcomes.

How is having someone move in, have no connection to the community and eventually leave help the community? The plan should be rethought. Don't

put 44 people in one building on a single-family plot. If she was told that there was a low-income family that needed a home here she would open her doors because that is how her children are going to learn to open their hearts, but they won't have the chance to meet anybody in this building. That is a shame and a real missed opportunity. She opposes the proposal and hopes the Plan Commission will ask the developer to come back with something better.

- 4.1.30 Andy Reese, 411 Pine Manor Drive, said he is 100 yards from the property. He asked that PC members to review notes from the previous building. There were good speakers who brought up a lot of different points. Like not putting all low-income individuals in one building where only low-income individuals reside.

There initially were 10 one-bedroom units and 10 studio units with 30 occupants maximum. With the new plan, the maximum number of residents would be 44 on a single-family lot. There is no on-site management and that is a concern. He manages two apartment buildings and he is there at least every other day. Outside management is needed especially if there are people with disabilities. He said he heard from Mr. Koenig that there would be a property manager on-site about 20 hours/week. He does not see how that person can check in on residents and take care of the building within that timeframe.

Regarding parking, what is the future use for this property if this project does not work out? The next owner would inherit a building with less parking. Part of the reason for the zoning standard is to ensure future use.

He talked about the storm water management system. He said he does not have a clear idea what is benefit and what is code. If another company built something like this, but for profit, it seems like it would be code. The proposed storm water management system seems to be code. How is that a community benefit?

Regarding management of different properties and how long they have been with HODC. Employment longevity is good, but the downside is when one goes to look at their performance and track record, those are the same people managing the property as who used to work at HODC. Why weren't drastic measures taken to improve the Evanston building if there were problems?

Regarding taxes on the property and what HODC would pay, he thought that the number was \$10-\$15,000/year or round it up to \$20,000. If this property was used as NR as it was zoned for, there would be commercial use on the second floor with retail on the first floor. He talked about \$50,000/year times 30 years and that is over \$1M in lost taxes to the village. This project must be a significant community benefit. When there are 44

people in a building, that is a 46% increase from their first proposal when there were 30 residents. There are no families in the building. Why can't someone build a two-story building with 2-4 units and put families in there? Give them access to the schools. He talked about living space for the proposed project.

- 4.1.31 Jane Hornstein, 1610 Highland Avenue, said she is the former chairman of the Housing Commission in the village. There was a rent subsidy in the village budget but it was cut in 2008. This is the first time since then that there is an opportunity to house disabled families. She recommends that this proposal be approved.
- 4.1.32 Jeff Strange, owner of 307-317 Ridge Road, said he owns the 82-unit apartment building next door to this property. The idea of affordable housing is okay and his housing is the most affordable in the village. He has 20 units in his building where people receive affordable housing vouchers or funding from charitable organizations. He can speak from actual experience about what is needed. The idea that tenants will have jobs is not true. Most of his tenants are disabled – physically or mentally who cannot work but who can live alone. 60% have cars. What he is concerned about is that there is no one on-site to watch what is going on. He has two full time managers living in his building. They have stopped petty crime and prostitution and drug dealing. It takes five months to evict someone. These tenants will not be from the village. They cannot discriminate based on where they live. They have to take people who are on the list.

The project is also way too large for the site. There should be 7-8 apartments. There is not one bush or blade of grass – it is all concrete. The building is not in character with the community. The village has a suburban landscape vs. urban landscape. A lot of the tenants won't be working and someone has to watch what is happening or there will be a problem. He would be fine with the proposal if it had fewer units and an on-site manager. The building needs grass or greenery. There are too many units for the space. He urged the commissioners not to accept the proposal without changes as stated above.

- 4.1.33 Chris Lee, 400 block of Pine Manor, said he has lived in the village for 15 years. He raised his family here and the community is welcoming. It is a community worth protecting and growing. This is not a meeting as to whether Wilmette wants affordable housing. The village spoke many years ago. No one has said that they don't want affordable housing. This is not a referendum as to whether HODC should be allowed to develop low-income housing. They could develop housing if they conformed with the zoning requirements. It is the job of the PC to figure out what is being proposed and they can do that by reading the many documents. As a man of color and son of a single mother that raised three kids he has benefited from the

generosity and processes that are available for families like his. This isn't a NIMBY or a YIMBY reaction. This is a process that should really focus on what is in the document before the Commission, so let's talk about that.

It has been pointed out that it would be wonderful to have more affordable housing. He agrees. What is being lost is what is being proposed – how does the structure impact the neighbors and whether they have the financial viability and competence to have long-term success in Wilmette. This is the first time for a facility like this in the village.

Who gets to develop the project and what is their track record? Height, bulk, lack of below grade parking, noncompliance with number of parking spaces, lack of areas for emergency vehicles and garbage trucks to enter the property and properly turn. This is proposed in their front yard along Wilmette Avenue. Other variances are being requested. Why are the variances being requested? It is up to the PC to determine if they are minor or significant.

Chairman Urban asked the speaker to conclude his remarks as the line to speak has gotten longer.

Mr. Lee asked why the variances were necessary. He referenced the budget for the project and what it costs to develop the property. How much of a fee would HODC get? \$715,000 for a developer fee on a property that costs 3.7 million dollars to build. He said it is about \$390/per square foot of living unit. He thinks that is a very high per square foot number. The numbers for the project are high. They are so high because they are trying to pack in 44 people in a single-family sized lot. Why can't they build something smaller that is more livable? All of the variations are caused by the applicant's wish to maximize construction cost, developer's fee. In addition, operating expenses are severely underfunded.

He talked about property values. One document was from 1996 in an urban setting in the early 90s, but that is not Wilmette today. The other one by Richard Reed had a 2002 publication date, but the study was done in 1990 and 2001 in a large urban environment. That is not Wilmette. One document made sense was done by the Federal Reserve of Kansas City.

Chairman Urban insisted that the speaker wrap up his comments.

He read the conclusion of the study. It was inconclusive as to whether there was a meaningful impact in an affluent area. Extended results suggest that crime rates associated with proximity to LIHTC (Low Income Housing Tax Credit) developments may erode these benefits and leave a net negative impact on the surrounding area. He said at a minimum it is a wash, we don't know. He said what it is not supported is that property values will increase

per the applicant.

- 4.1.34 Jennifer Manning, Forest Avenue, talked about NIMBY situations and that this is one. There has been a pushback on low-income housing. At some point, the village has to be brave and do it. She is for the building not being too big, but permits are granted for McMansions every day. Regarding building location, there are businesses and buses in the area. That is not a valid argument to be against the plan. She wants units to be reasonably sized and safe. A lot of arguments are the same NIMBY that she has been hearing since she has lived in the village and she supports the project.
- 4.1.35 Nancy Hoying, 901 Forest Avenue, said the need for affordable housing was established. The plan was created to show public benefit. Fair housing laws are in place so individuals cannot decide who their neighbor is. The questions raised about increase in crime rates or too many people living in a low-income location in one location is fear talking and possibly biases and discriminatory practices.
- 4.1.36 Mr. Mitch Klein, Owner of 1837 Wilmette Avenue, said he owns the gas station at Wilmette and Ridge. He is for affordable housing. Regarding this location, he welcomes it, but it is too big and too dense. The corner is a problem at this time with traffic. When Artis opens the problem will be worse. He talked about cut-throughs because of bad traffic. He talked about a problem with traffic patterns on the neighboring streets. If any builder built on that property they would be asked to build to size. He asked that the Plan Commission ask the applicant to do the same.

He talked about use of public safety personnel for low-income individuals, for seniors. There are some drug issues at Mr. Strange's building. Who will move into the proposed building? If there is a building of this size, then someone needs to pick and choose residents, but this is not legal. The project is too dense.

The Plan Commission needs to make a recommendation to the Board. Do the right thing for the corner. It may not be enough for the applicant because they won't make enough money.

- 4.1.37 Donna Nye, 473 Highcrest Avenue, said she lives off Illinois Road. She is concerned about the welfare of building tenants. If all parking spaces are filled, there is no easy way to do a u-turn out of the garage. She said there will be one spot where a three-point turn can take place. This can take a long time. She assumes there will be car accidents.

There is only one designated handicap spot out of 20. Why is this given the potential population of the building?

She does not understand why the Fire and Police departments signed off on this. How could they do that given that what is needed has not been finalized? She said that she is impatient and cuts through the antique mall parking lot to get to her house because she would need to wait 10 minutes for the light at that intersection even if she is only four cars back from the intersection. If she is going east bound she cuts through the Shell station lot. Traffic will be impacted. The VFW did not have much traffic coming and going. The traffic study is flawed.

She worries about parking under the building and worries about emergency vehicles. She knows that affordable housing is needed.

Chairman Urban asked the speaker to conclude her comments.

The speaker had nothing more to add.

- 4.1.38 Erin Sullivan, 448 Alpine Drive, said she has been coming to the meetings since 2015. She contributed to the large packet that the PC received. Some of the buildings in Evanston got run down sooner than expected and they asked for money from the City of Evanston. It looks like \$570,092 for 131 Callan Avenue and \$300,000 for 1930 Jackson Avenue to make repairs to the building that were unexpected.

At these meetings she has been going to they have been asking will the village pay if the building gets run down unexpectedly? HODC said they have reserves. In Evanston the system was different. She looked at the budget for the property and she sees \$6,400 for reserves. That will not cover large expenses. If there are problems, Wilmette won't just let this building get run down. Where will the money come from to maintain the building if something happens unexpectedly? She opposes the plan for practical reasons.

- 4.1.39 Igor Spektor, 203 Pin Oak Drive, said he has lived in the village for many years. He found affordable housing in the village and he was approved. Mr. Strange was a good landlord. Selection criteria for housing is very important. It has nothing to do with low-income. He is for low-income housing. He talked about people coming out of jail or who had mental health issues or with a criminal history. People coming from jail are not a protected class. He is for low-income housing but against the project due to the project type, not size.

What is proposed? 16 units, too many for a small lot. Used for 100% low-income units, concentration poverty model, also known as a project. Use of adverse selection and PSH tenants. It is not about discrimination. What is 100% low-income units concentration poverty model? He read from an article. For decades American government efforts to house the poor have

relied on construction of subsidized housing plots, more commonly known as projects, the term originally used to describe the improvement projects. What city planners believed these developments would amount to have instead become synonymous with inner-city blight and crime. Today urban legend news reports talk about developments that were 100% low-income. He submitted the article to the board as attachment F in his larger packet of information.

100% low-income is unacceptable. This model guarantees adverse selection and bad management. He had attachments (A, B, C and D) to support those claims. Attachment A is HODC's track record of bad management. Attachment B is HODC's tenant selection criteria, consistent with PSH. It is called SMI for serious mental illnesses. There is another requirement for PSH and it is criteria number 4 that indicates where the people are coming from including residences of long term care facility State hospitals, etc.

Chairman Urban asked the speaker to conclude his remarks.

Mr. Spektor said HODC likes 100% low-income model because HODC gets general financing. The financing for 5.8 million dollars requires an annual payment of \$1,200. What does HODC promise to those people that give HODC that amount of money for practically nothing? There are serious obligations here, which have not been disclosed.

His second point was what does the Village of Wilmette get out of this plan? Increase in crime, decrease in local community safety, decrease in local property values. What does the Village's affordable housing plan say? Mixed model with 15%-20% of affordable units because experience elsewhere has shown that a larger percentage of affordable housing units might make the project unsound from both financial and social perspective. That is the Village's plan, not his perception.

Chairman Urban said that these points were already made and she asked him to conclude.

His concern is that project will cause crime to increase, decrease of property values.

Chairman Urban said that his concerns were shared and asked him to conclude.

He submitted his comments for the record.

4.1.40 Chairman Urban suggested that testimony be closed and asked for a motion. Commissioner Bailey said he had some questions for the applicant. Chairman Urban said she felt the time for discussion is following the motion. Mr. Stein said he thought the Chair was proposing that the public

comment portion of the hearing be closed now, leaving the commissioners to ask questions of any of the people who spoke, including the applicant.

Commissioner Urban called for a motion to approve the development. Mr. Stein said that motion would be premature and that a motion should be made to close the public comment portion of the hearing.

Commissioner Head made a motion to close the public comment. Commissioner Ghaemi seconded. The vote was all ayes and no nays.

Public testimony was closed.

5.0 VIEWS EXPRESSED BY THE PLAN COMMISSION

- 5.10 Chairman Urban reminded everyone that the Plan Commission is responsible to determine whether the proposed development meets the standards established for PUDs and to balance those factors against the benefits being provided by the proposed development. It is not the purview of the PC to rule on building appearance, mix of uses in the development or the financial structure of the deal or proposed management procedures and processes.

Mr. Adler said it is within the PC's purview to look at the building appearance and make comments on materials etc.

- 5.11 Commissioner Bailey asked for clarification on the storm water reports. Mr. Adler said that the Village Engineer is at the meeting. Commissioner Bailey said he read through the report. It was mentioned that dealing with storm water is a community benefit. It looked like it was slightly more than required. He asked for an explanation.

Dan Manis, Village Engineer, said they are meeting what would be expected for commercial and multiunit buildings by the way they are collecting storm water runoff from site, detaining it, allowing for some infiltration and slowly releasing runoff into the village system.

Commissioner Bailey referenced the Haeger engineering report. Storm water is a big issue for the village. Looking at the numbers it does not appear that much more is being done than is required. He asked for an explanation of the report.

Mr. Manis explained the report. A runoff of a certain volume is collected. There are guidelines as to how to control storm water related to development. These parameters are used for other developments.

Commissioner Bailey said that it looks like storm water collection was adequate – but barely greater than what was required. Does Mr. Manis disagree with that? Mr. Manis answered that he didn't disagree.

Commissioner Bailey said that storm water issues were shown to be community benefits, but the numbers do not jump out at him.

Mike Anderson, Haeger Engineering, said he wrote the report that Commissioner Bailey was referencing. The site conforms to standards that the village enforces. In terms of benefit to the property, there is no storm water management at this time. The benefit provided meets village code for storage. He talked about using green infrastructure. There are different ways to provide storm water management. They are proposing a bio swale to provide that infiltration. The code asks for green infrastructure as an optional item.

Commissioner Bailey said that there was a statement about no foliage or bio swale. Mr. Anderson said that was not incorrect. The proposed site has over 25%+ landscaped area. The site is now over 80% impervious.

Commissioner Bailey said it strikes him as a stretch to say this is a community benefit to just meet the standards. But Mr. Anderson said they are meeting the standards in a way that aligns with village's environmental objectives.

- 5.12 Commissioner Taylor asked about the expected resident turnover rates for this development.

Mr. Koenig said new development data is different from current development data. With a new development, tenants move in and love their home. They know the community and this is where their support systems are so they tend to stay for a long time. They work with tenants annually on their lease. Tenants are recertified every year.

- 5.13 Commissioner Taylor asked about the recertification process.

Mr. Koenig said they hope that people's income increases. There is a technical level which once a tenant reaches 140% of area median income they are still not evicted but they change how they are incentivized to pay their rent. Their rent amount goes up significantly. They want them to move out so that another tenant can move in. There is a point where they disincentivize tenants to stay.

- 5.14 Commissioner Taylor asked about expected project completion time.

Mr. Koenig said they need to put together financing so they are not starting anytime soon if they get Village Board approval. Zoning has to be in place for financing. It would be at least 18 months till they get financing in place. Construction usually happens quickly – 8 to 12 months – and then tenants can move in.

- 5.15 Commissioner Head asked Mr. Koenig about resident screening. Can he give an overview of the basic screening process and how it relates to recent criminal

activity?

Mr. Koenig said that the tenant selection screening process is dictated by a document, the tenant selection plan. It is available on HODC's website and the Village's website. It is provided through the Illinois Housing Development Authority (IHDA). There is a little flexibility on some of the basic characteristics based on the unit mix. The process is laid out in that document. They create a waiting list. They cannot use an existing waiting list. The waiting list would be marketed for this development. Screening includes doing background checks, credit checks on adult residents and based on those standards, they have some leeway on credit issues. Regarding criminal history, there are specific guidelines that indicate no sex offender tenants or tenants with a recent felony conviction. Those groups are specifically excluded and they are allowed to not select them. Once the initial screening is complete they certify income. They then decide if they are a good resident to live in the building. This is done initially and their income is recertified every year.

- 5.16 Commissioner Head said that there appeared to be some confusion regarding family vs. senior housing. Is it correct that family housing isn't really speaking to whether the unit is a one or two-bedroom unit but that they aren't designated for seniors?

Mr. Koenig agreed and said that the term family housing means generally open to anyone. If it is limited to 62 years of age or older it is designated as senior housing. Family housing can include a large range of people including seniors. Commissioner Head asked if a studio apartment would be considered family housing and Mr. Koenig answered yes.

- 5.17 Commissioner Head asked about management operations. He said that Mr. Koenig indicated they might hire an additional manager if the project was approved. How often would be management/maintenance on-site?

Mr. Koenig said they are anticipating growth and will hire another manager soon. He said they are estimating 20 hours/week between management and maintenance. It just isn't cost effective with a 16 unit building to have an onsite manager. He will spend time at the building. They are not absentee management. The tenants know who to call if there is a problem.

- 5.18 Commissioner Bailey asked if this was a smaller size project in the applicant's portfolio.

Mr. Koenig said it is on the smaller side for affordable housing. It is a small project for the type of financing they are trying to put together. It is average size for their portfolio. This is about the size of the new properties they are creating. They have a similar size building in Arlington Heights that they just got funded for. That is 16 units. They recently completed a 13 unit building in Glenview.

- 5.19 Commissioner Bailey asked if they had an increase or decrease in problems at smaller developments. This is totally different from a ten-story public housing project. It may be large for the lot but it is a small project.

Mr. Koenig said public housing projects had 3,000-4,000 units/development. It is not fair to compare a smaller development with a development of that size. There are fewer people with the proposed project and fewer types of issues.

- 5.20 Commissioner Bailey asked about the \$143,000 in deferred development fees and if there were any circumstances, such as needing repairs, that HODC would contribute that to the project rather than take it.

Mr. Koenig said these are required by the state for financing. He explained deferred development fees. A small fee comes in when the project is started to get it going. A large amount of the fee is deferred until the project is built, completed and running. Cost overruns come out of the deferred fee. The funder will not let that fee go out until the building is complete and up and running. The other money set aside to cover long term costs are the reserves. There are different types of reserves. \$12,400 is put in the reserve fund upfront and \$6,400 is added annually. The reserve fund is intended to cover the cost of future needed repairs.

- 5.21 Chairman Urban asked for an explanation as to why in Evanston did HODC ask the city of Evanston to help pay for major repairs.

Mr. Koenig talked about the funds from the city and said that the city had encouraged them to do certain projects (security cameras and bathrooms) and they offered to make funds available.

Chairman Urban said she was talking about the comment regarding major rehab projects.

Mr. Koenig said the Callan and Jackson buildings were mentioned because they received funding from the City of Evanston to do repairs. With the Callan building they didn't use any city funds when they took over the building in 2000. They did minor repairs initially but it got to the point after operating the building for 15 years it became rundown. The rents were very low. Because they acquired an existing building they didn't go through the process of funding and setting aside reserves. The process of taking over an existing building was very different than starting a new building from scratch. There were no developer fees or reserves set aside. It is comparing apples and oranges. They took over a building that needed more repairs than they had available cash.

- 5.22 Commissioner Ghaemi said HODC is building a 13-unit building in Glenview. How does that compare to tonight's building regarding square footage, number of bedrooms, etc.?

Mr. Koenig said that building has a mix of 1, 2 and 3-bedroom units. Eight 1-

bedroom units, two 2-bedroom units and three 3-bedroom units. It is set up as two separate buildings, eight units and five units. The site layout is different. There is a large parking area. The land was foreclosed. A townhome development had been approved for that site. The design is more of a townhome style design because the village had approved that design. That building is restricted to those with disabilities. It is permanent supportive housing. It is a different funding model.

- 5.23 Seeing that there were no additional questions Chairman Urban called for a motion to approve the proposed development at 1925 Wilmette Avenue in conformance with the plans submitted.

Commissioner Taylor moved to recommend granting a Planned Unit Development Preliminary Plan and Special Use to permit the construction of a multi-family building containing sixteen (16) affordable rental apartments located in the NR, Neighborhood Retail, zoning district at 1925 Wilmette Avenue, in conformance with the plans submitted. The use to run with the use. Commissioner Head seconded the motion.

- 5.24 Commissioner Ghaemi said she was conflicted. Sometimes the Plan Commission tries to fix something and ignores the problem. She is in favor of low-income housing. Her issue is that we tend to put people in one spot, whether they are rich or poor, could be based on religion or ethnicity, and she sees that this creates problems. Her objection is from that perspective. If you respect people enough to mix them without looking at color, religion or income, then things will work out. They will become part of the community. With that said, she has an issue with density. It is a small site and they are cramming too many units and people on the site. Traffic is really bad in that area. Whether or not the 16 units will make the traffic a lot worse, she knows that this project will not make the traffic situation better. She would like for the applicant to consider reducing the number of units. If someone doesn't like something, the applicant has to listen to why they don't like something. She said that some people who say that low-income housing is great do not live next door. We need to respect peoples' opinions.

- 5.25 Commissioner Head asked about parameters for consideration.

Mr. Stein said that this should be considered as if this was any other type of housing unit and not take into account the affordable housing or low-income impact of it. Under the federal fair housing act as well as Wilmette's local ordinance the low-income aspect of the development should not be considered. The density comment should be well taken but the socio-economics of individuals living there are not within the purview of the Plan Commission.

- 5.26 Commissioner Ghaemi said that wasn't what she was talking about. The reality is you will be living with the people you are living with. Her biggest issues are density and traffic. She would like to see less units. That would buy a lot of good will.

- 5.27 Commissioner Head supports the proposal. He works for a development company that manages a lot of property. He is not troubled by the density. This is a small number of units. He is not that concerned about impact on traffic based on the expert's testimony. With 16-20 cars you would need all of the vehicles to leave the site at the same time to make a noticeable impact. He drives a child to Highcrest School and has not noticed the traffic impact that people raised at the meeting as being a huge concern. Regarding parking, in property management there is a clear trend towards fewer cars at every income level. The rise of Uber and Lyft has made a huge change. Impact is dramatic and the number of cars at his company's properties are falling 5-7%/year. Underutilized parking is more of a problem. Mr. Koenig's organization has 30 years of history. Mr. Koenig has been doing this for 20+ years. He is inspired by Mr. Koenig's commitment to the project and trying to do something in the Village that has not been successfully done.
- 5.28 Commissioner Bailey said he was on the commission two years ago and heard this project. There were a lot of comments about the project being better if it was made more suitable for families. Families would better mesh into the village. The applicant has tried within their financial restraints to respond to this. There are some defects in the whole low-income housing tax credit program. One of the problems is that there is a lot of money upfront and hard money to support over time, it is just intrinsic to the program. There will not be a low-income tax project with a better developer than the applicant. He thinks that the applicant has made an extraordinary effort. They are getting funding from the feds from the low-income housing tax credits and some from the state. The village does not have to pay anything. It is not a perfect program but this is as good as we are going to get. He is in favor of the project.
- 5.29 Commissioner Taylor said based on legal counsel's guidance in terms of the limited scope of the Commission, he comes out in favor of the project. It is hard as there are many arguments on both sides. He understands the Plan Commission's limited scope.
- 5.30 Chair Urban said she feels frustrated. As a Commission there was an opportunity to ask for a percentage of affordable housing in the new building on Green Bay. That building is better located than the site being discussed this evening. The developer said it was not possible to include affordable housing. The Commission accepted their word but maybe the Commission should have been more forceful. Like Commissioner Bailey she is heartened that HODC took the community's feedback to heart. They scaled down and restructured the proposal. There has been a lot of talk about whether this is a family development. The definition of family is rapidly changing. There are more families without children than families with children. This is a good site for affordable housing. The character and scale of the development is in keeping with the general character along Ridge and the townhomes in Pin Oaks and across the street. She will vote in favor of the project.

6.0 DECISION

6.1 Commissioner Taylor moved to recommend granting a Planned Unit Development Preliminary Plan and Special Use to permit the construction of a multi-family building containing sixteen (16) affordable rental apartments located in the NR, Neighborhood Retail, zoning district at 1925 Wilmette Avenue, in conformance with the plans submitted. The use to run with the use.

6.11 Commissioner Head seconded the motion.

6.12 The vote was as follows:

Maria Choca Urban, Chairman	Yes
Michael Bailey	Yes
Homa Ghaemi	No
Christine Norrick	Absent
Steven Schwab	Absent
Jeffrey Head	Yes
Michael Taylor	Yes

Motion Passed. The subject request will be on the April 10, 2018 Village Board agenda.

6.2 Commissioner Taylor moved to authorize the Chairman to prepare the report and recommendation for the Plan Commission for case number 2018-P-01.

6.21 Commissioner Bailey seconded the motion and the voice vote was all ayes and no nays.

7.0 FINDINGS OF FACT UPON WHICH DECISION WAS BASED

A majority of the Plan Commission finds that the proposed Planned Unit Development Preliminary Plan and Special Use to permit the construction of a multi-family building containing sixteen (16) affordable rental apartments located in the NR, Neighborhood Retail, zoning district meets the Planned Unit Development standards. The provision of affordable housing will be a benefit to the community. The character and scale of the development is in keeping with the general character along Ridge and the townhomes in Pin Oaks and across the street. The impact on traffic will be minimal and the storm water management of the site will be drastically improved over the current property.

A minority of the Plan Commission finds that the proposed Planned Unit Development Preliminary Plan and Special Use to permit the construction of a multi-family building containing sixteen (16) affordable rental apartments located in the NR, Neighborhood Retail, zoning district does not meet the Planned Unit Development standards. The proposed development is too dense and out of character for the neighborhood and will negatively impact traffic in the neighborhood. A lowering of the number of dwelling units

would bring the proposed development more in character with surrounding properties and lessen the traffic impact. If the proposed development was mixed-income, the resident would have a better opportunity to integrate into the Wilmette community.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

The Plan Commission recommends granting a Planned Unit Development Preliminary Plan and Special Use to permit the construction of a multi-family building containing sixteen (16) affordable rental apartments located in the NR, Neighborhood Retail, zoning district at 1925 Wilmette Avenue, in conformance with the plans submitted. The use to run with the use.