



1200 Wilmette Avenue
Wilmette, IL 60091

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

(847) 853-7550
Fax (847) 853-7701
TDD (847) 853-7634

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
of the
Plan Commission
Tuesday, September 6, 2016 at 7:00 P.M.
Village Board Conference Room – First Floor of Wilmette Village Hall
1200 Wilmette Avenue, Wilmette, Illinois**

AGENDA

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Approval of Minutes**
Minutes of the Plan Commission meetings of November 3, 2015.
- III. Village Center Master Plan Implementation Discussion**
- IV. New Business**
- V. Public Comment**
- VI. Adjournment**

Gary Kohn, Chair

IF YOU ARE A PERSON WITH A DISABILITY AND NEED SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS TO PARTICIPATE
IN AND/OR ATTEND A VILLAGE OF WILMETTE PUBLIC MEETING, PLEASE NOTIFY THE VILLAGE
MANAGER'S OFFICE AT (847) 853-7509 OR TDD (847) 853-7634 AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.



**MEETING MINUTES
PLAN COMMISSION**

**TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2015
7:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

Members Present: Gary Kohn, Chairman
Michael Bailey
Richard DeLeo
Jeffrey Head
Christine Norrick
Steven Schwab
Maria Choca Urban

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: John Adler, Director of Community Development
Michael Zimmermann, Village Attorney

I. CALL TO ORDER.

Chairman Kohn called the meeting to order at 7:15 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES; PLAN COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 2, 2015.

Mr. Schwab moved to approve the minutes of the June 2, 2015 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Head. Voting yes: Chairman Kohn, Urban, Mr. Bailey, Mr. DeLeo, Mr. Head, Ms. Norrick, Mr. Schwab and Ms. Urban. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

III. 2015-P-03 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 20 affordable rental apartments on the property at 1925 Wilmette Avenue.

Mr. Schwab moved to continue the request for a Planned Unit Development Preliminary Plan and Special Use to permit the construction of a multi-family building containing

approximately 20 affordable rental apartments on the property at 1925 Wilmette Avenue until the December 1, 2015 Plan Commission meeting.

Ms. Urban seconded the motion.

The vote was as follows:

Gary Kohn, Chairman	Yes
Michael Bailey	Yes
Rich DeLeo	Yes
Jeffrey Head	Yes
Christine Norrick	Yes
Steven Schwab	Yes
Maria Choca Urban	Yes

Motion was approved.

Case Minutes are attached

V. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

VII. AJDOURNMENT.

At 10:40 p.m., Mr. Schwab moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Urban. Voting yes: Chairman Kohn, Urban, Mr. Bailey, Mr. DeLeo, Mr. Head, Ms. Norrick, Mr. Schwab and Ms. Urban. Voting no: none. **The motion carried.**

The meeting was thereafter adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

John Adler
Director of Community Development

Case 2015-P-03 Minutes - Plan Commission Meeting November 3, 2015

3.0 TESTIMONY, COMMENTS AND ARGUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT

3.1 Persons appearing for the applicant

Richard Koenig, Executive Director
Housing Opportunity Development Corporation
2001 Waukegan Road, Techny, IL

John Clark, partner
Cordogan Clark and Associates, Inc

Jeff Cooper, P.E.
Haeger Engineering
Schaumburg

Mike Magnuson, P.E.
Alfred Benesch and Co.
205 N. Michigan Avenue, Chicago

Luay Aboona, P.E., Principal
KLOA, Inc.

Valerie Kretchmer, President
Valerie S. Kretchmer Associates, Inc.

3.2 Summary of comments

- 3.21 Chairman Kohn said that the PC will hear case 2015-P-03, 1925 Wilmette Avenue, Planned Unit Development. He explained the proceedings and the purpose of the meeting. The request is for preliminary plan and special use approval of construction of a multi-family building containing 20 affordable rental apartments at 1925 Wilmette Avenue. The PC will make a recommendation to the Village Board of Trustees as to whether the application should be granted or denied. The Board will vote as to whether the application meets the standards of review in sections 5.3.e and 6.4 of the Village zoning ordinance. If the Plan Commission reaches a decision tonight, the Board of Trustees will hear this case on Tuesday, December 8th. Recommendations are advisory only. The Village Board of Trustees has the final say on all applications and will decide whether to grant or deny an application.

The Village Board is not legally bound by the Plan Commission's recommendations. This meeting is a legal proceeding and all testimony must be given under oath. He swore in those who would be testifying at the meeting.

- 3.22 Mr. Adler gave a presentation of the case. This request is for a planned unit development, Housing Opportunity Development Corporation, to permit the construction of a multi-family building containing 20 affordable rental units at 1925 Wilmette Avenue.

The PUD process consolidates the ZBA process, the ARC process and the PC reviews into one process. There is a preliminary hearing from the Plan Commission, which is tonight's meeting and possibly subsequent meetings, preliminary review by the Village Board at which they would take the PC recommendation and act on that and a final review by staff and a final review by the Village Board. Included in the PUD request is a zoning review as outlined in the case report on page 3. For the PC to recommend approval of the PUD request, it will have to find that the special use and PUD standards have been met. The standards are document 2.81 in the report and the applicant's response to these standards is document 2.1.

He wanted to address some questions about the traffic study and a market analysis. Did the Village pay for the traffic study? The Village did not pay for this study. Engineering and Public Works has a list of prequalified traffic engineering firms. If an applicant wants to use one of those firms, the Village is treated as the client, but the applicant pays for the study. The firm chosen by the applicant was a pre-chosen firm.

Another question came up about the market analysis. Valerie Kretchmar Associates did not analysis has worked for the Village in the past, about ten years ago. They did a market analysis for the Linden Square area and one for Green Bay Road. Her firm has not completed recent assignments for the Village that would qualify as a conflict of interest.

If someone in the audience submitted correspondence to the Village since Friday, all of the information has been given to Plan Commission members. If something was submitted after 6:15 PM that has not been given to the Plan Commission.

- 3.23 The Chairman called the applicant to give their presentation.
- 3.24 Richard Koenig, Executive Director of the Housing Opportunity Development Corporation said his corporation is interested in developing the parcel to a property to be called Cleveland Place. He thanked those in the audience for coming to the meeting. The present building on site is the American Legion Building. HODC purchased the property from them.

Regarding project and community inspiration, they bought the property in June. He talked about the comments made by American Legion members and one of the comments spoke about the project as a noble purpose. They are doing the project for their company and for the community. They named the property Cleveland Place and said it was named for Jean and Bob Cleveland who talks about the needs of the community and about affordable housing. Jean was the first chair of the

housing commission in the late 70s, a founding board member of his organization in the late 80s. He has been in contact with the family and once they came up with the proposal it seemed natural to make this in honor of the Clevelands. The family got together after the request and said it would be an honor to name this after the family. Jean Cleveland is an inspiration and he wants to make her and the family proud. Some of the family are at the meeting.

The overriding vision-

Create housing opportunities for Wilmette residents, workers and family members. A 20 unit building makes a difference although it cannot change everything. They want this to last for a long time and want people to live there for many years. They want to be a fixture in the community.

They have a lot of goals in mind including affordable, accessible, green, barrier free. They put together a plan that achieves those goals. They went through a design process that makes the units accessible in a physical sense and through the community, but is green and responsible to the community. Accessible also means barrier free and anyone can get into the building.

He will do a quick presentation about the organization, they will present the proposal, go through the architecture of the building, talk about traffic, marketing and physical aspects of the building and talk about how the building will be operated. This will give a clear picture of what the property will look like and its potential.

HDOC is a community based nonprofit, 501c3. They have Board members from throughout the Village and the northern suburbs. The organization was founded in Wilmette in 1983. It came out of the fair housing movement. They were also known as the Interfaith Development Corporation. They changed their name in 2002. He talked about the fair housing movement.

They were based in Wilmette because most of the congregations that supported them were in the Village. Most of their leaders came from the Village. They want to maintain those roots.

He talked about the mission which is to develop, manage and preserve affordable housing for low and moderate income people throughout the northern suburbs. There is a Board of Directors and they are his 'bosses.' There are 12 on the Board. At one time the Board was made up of mostly Wilmette residents and now there are individuals from other North Shore communities. He spoke of individuals who were part of the organization in its history.

He is the Executive Director and has been at the organization since 1997. They have been busy with the mission of trying to create opportunities for people throughout the area. Their primary target area is the 16 North Shore communities in Lake and

Cook counties. They have also expanded into McHenry County. This is where the congregations came from and leadership came from.

He introduced the development team who will speak at the meeting. HODC will act as the developer, the owner and property manager. They are working with Cordogan Clark and Associates as the architect, Haeger Engineering as the engineer, Alfred Benesch and Co. did the traffic study, KLOA did a parking study and Valerie Kretchmar and Associates did the market study.

HODC has 30+ years of development experience. The first property was developed in 1987. They have completed 20 developments in 10 communities with 280 units. They do their own property management and manage 230 apartments. There is a mix of type and size of buildings. They are a HUD-certified housing counseling agency. They have people on staff to work with those who want to buy homes.

They are involved with rental and for sale developments, new construction and rehab. Some of the buildings are for seniors, for families, special needs. Each property has a different origin, story and type of residents. The organization has acted as a sole developer on their own. They have done joint ventures with for-profit and non-profit developers. They have helped people who want to do affordable housing and need help in this area.

He worked for the IL Housing Development Authority for 6 years. It is the state agency that provides funding for affordable housing. He has a Masters in Urban Planning from University of IL in Champaign. He learned the ropes of financing affordable housing developments. The financing is layered. He has a Ph.D. in community economic development. He studied the impact of affordable housing, what it can do and its positive benefits.

He showed a slide depicting types of developments they have done. Small to medium sized buildings and they fixed them up and repaired them. They have done some very small buildings like single family homes and duplexes and four flats. Most were done with other non-profit organizations. They have done new construction with another developer in Highland Park. They built a senior building and a family building and they will be constructing another building in Glenview called Axley Place, which is a 13 unit development. It should be completed in the next 6-8 months.

He showed building interiors. There is a community room in each building. They furnish the room. People can get out of their units and talk with other residents. It creates a sense of home. He showed a unit interior. They use high quality materials. It looks like a 'regular' apartment.

The Comprehensive Plan provides an overall Village vision to what the Village should and can be. The Plan was adopted in 2000. In the housing section, chapter 4, they talk about affordable housing and issues. There was a lack of affordable

housing for low and moderate income individuals and seniors. Some issues have been addressed. There are several senior properties in the Village. There is a vision with several goals in the Plan. It is to maintain the high quality detached single family character, foster a climate of equal opportunities and to provide housing options that complement the traditional single family character.

There are a number of housing policies that talk about the interest of the commission and the community and who it provides housing for. There is a specific housing policy that talks about creating opportunities for non-single family detached housing. That is something that is appropriate for this zoning and for affordable housing.

The next step beyond the Comprehensive Plan is the Housing Plan. The Village adopted a housing plan in 2004. It starts out by addressing the commitment of the Village to promote and be proactive to provide more affordable housing. Part of the impetus to create a housing plan was through the IL Affording Housing Planning and Appeal Act. This was passed by the state in 2003. The idea was that every community in the state should have its own share of affordable housing. They set a standard of 10% affordable housing for low and moderate income individuals. In Wilmette that would mean 1033 units at the time. The state determined there were 556 units so there was additional housing needed. The Village had 5.5% affordable housing. That has dropped to 4.1%. They are providing one opportunity to increase affordable housing units.

The housing plan is reasonable and realistic. Most properties are now developed as single family homes. The Village has no funding available and property is expensive. They planned to create new affordable units in multi-family buildings. They recognize that single family housing is hard to do as affordable. It said that multi-family may be the way to go. They are targeting seniors, people with disabilities and workers. The plan identifies potential sites and what they can be if they come up for redevelopment. It does not hold hard and fast to those rules. It sets a goal of trying to increase the housing stock or create affordable housing in new developments as they go forward. There are incentives for trying to do this. These include the PUD process, it requires developers to meet with Village staff to talk about the opportunity to affordable housing, the village being directly involved and reaching out in trying to find ways to make that happen. It talks about creating a non-profit organization.

When he uses the term affordable housing and how the plan addresses affordable housing, there is sometimes a mix of connotations about what affordable housing is. Some say the phrase attainable housing should be used or low income housing. What makes it affordable housing is the ability to serve lower income households. That is based on an income standard which is 60% of the area median income. That is about \$31,000/year for households of 2 or less and incrementally goes up from there. There are also rent limits where rents have to be below a certain amount. There are limitations for housing that receives some government subsidy. The goal

for affordable housing is to create a long term community asset. It is to create something that will last a long time. Most requirements have a 30 year minimum time hold. There is a selection process that is strictly regulated through the state funding agency. There is a process that is open to those who can go through the screening process and tenant selection process. They provide significant oversight.

Affordable housing is not public housing. It is not section 8. Affordable housing is privately owned. He explained public and section 8 housing and why this property is not like public and section 8 housing. Affordable housing does pay real estate taxes based on the value of the property as an asset and those it is serving. Some think that affordable housing will bring down property values. Research has shown that it does not reduce the property values of properties around affordable housing. Affordable housing becomes integrated in the community and is an asset.

Affordable housing does not remove local decision making. Part of the PUD process allows them to present ideas, what they would like to do, how can they work with the community on a local decision, what is the zoning, what is possible, what does the housing plan say and how can that be implemented.

Wilmette has a few affordable housing developments. All 3 properties are senior buildings. Village Green Atrium – 35 units; Gates Manor – 51 units; Shoreline Place – 43 units; Mallinckrodt in the Park – 12. The Village has a long term commitment to affordable housing. He is hoping to create something that is not just for seniors.

He showed a picture of the property from the front and the back. HODC bought the property and it was listed by the American Legion. HODC was notified about the property by the Village. Anyone could have bought the property. HODC submitted a competitive bid and won. This was announced in July 2015. They had to raise the funds to buy the property. The entire process takes a long time. They are going through the process right now and tonight is one of the first steps of the long process.

1925 Wilmette Avenue is zoned Neighborhood Retail or NR. The site can be used for different purposes and residential above the ground floor is an allowed use. He talked about other uses for NR such as commercial, retail space, medical space and more. There are also institutional uses in NR. It allows limited multi-family housing in a small scale mixed use neighborhood environment which is what they are proposing. The site is retail on one side and residential on the other sides. This is a buffer.

They are proposing 20 units – 10 studio and 10-1 bedroom units. The targeted population is low income below 60% of area median income in the \$30-\$35,000 range, people with disabilities whatever the disability – 4 units set aside for those with disabilities, veterans – 4 units. It makes sense to continue to work with the

American Legion. Long term, HODC will be the owner and the manager. He asked if the Commission had any questions.

- 3.25 Mr. Bailey said he looked at their form 990, which is federal tax information. It refers to the management company acting as the executive director. Is there a management company.

Mr. Koenig said they do their own property management in-house. There is not a separate outside agency that does it. HODC as HODC does the property management. Through the financing mechanisms they have subsidiary organizations, LLCs or LLPs that are controlled by the organization. Mr. Bailey asked if Mr. Koenig was personally involved in the management company. Mr. Koenig said as the Executive Director, he leads the organization but he doesn't have a management company and isn't involved in the management company. As the director he is the boss of the property managers.

- 3.26 Mr. Bailey asked who the management company was. Mr. Koenig said that the management company is HODC. He has full time staff that does the property management.

Chairman Kohn explained that public comment and questions will be taken at a later time during the meeting. The applicant should continue the presentation.

- 3.27 John Clark, Cordogan and Clark Associates, said he joined as a partner in 1984 and the firm began in the 50s. They focus on public and municipal buildings, colleges and universities, police and rec buildings. They have won national and international design awards. There are about 50 in the firm. They have done a lot of multi-family residential and single family residential, condos and have done work in the Village. His grandfather lived in Wilmette. He was raised in the Congregational Church and knew the Clevelands.

The site is just west of the Shell station, adjacent to a non-descript low retail building on one side and to the west is essentially an alley with residences turned away from this property. To the south is more multi-family residential. Further east across the street is another gas station that is closed and other buildings to the north of it. The site is challenging. It is challenging to build residential near a gas station and to a commercial building.

The site faces Wilmette Avenue. They oriented the building to keep with the main north/south grid of the community. They made a gesture on Wilmette Avenue. To the left is Pin Oak Drive and to the right is Tokyo Beijing and then the Shell station. It is a 3 story simple building. Residences are above open parking. It is similar to the Optima building down the block on Central and on Lake Avenue. The back of the building is open. It is 20 units, 10 studios and 10-1 bedroom units. He showed a perspective of the building. The front has red faced brick. The American Legion building was historic and he wanted to pay homage to that building. They

incorporated some oranges, tan brick, angled bay. It angles parallel to Wilmette Avenue. They replaced the originally planned white brick with a red brick so it reads stronger. On the building front is face brick. The brick carries back around the corner a certain distance and it turns again into orange brick and then is replaced with fibrous cement siding around the back of the building. It is a hardie panel with a 25 year warranty. It has generous natural light, large windows. They did not include the existing fence in the rendering. The fence is cedar and fairly tall. There are 20 parking spaces on site.

The elevations were included in the packet. There will be office and community room, laundry room, trash room, handicapped accessible units and green landscaping.

The site plan was shown. There is a small footprint at the ground floor level and towards the back is parking mostly covered by the building above. The unit layout is conventional. Stairs at either end of a double loaded corridor. The corridor connects towards the south wall so there is natural light in the corridor.

He showed the roof plan with roof top equipment.

He showed development standards which was part of the packet.

The Landscape plan includes a bio-swale, grass pavers, native and adaptive landscaping. Currently the site drains towards the west towards Pin Oak Drive. The pavers are permeable to allow grass to grow through. He showed some of the landscaping they are proposing. The site plan was shown and they are meeting the lighting foot-candle requirements. They are improving the grading and drainage. They are going to be improving it by catching the water before it drains onto the site. It is not only important to have a building look good when it is first built but it should look good 30 years after it is built. He said the buildings he worked on 30 years ago have held up. They believe in institutional quality construction and this is why they focus on public and municipal architecture. They want buildings to last.

It is an architecturally challenged site and challenged surroundings. They want to enhance the site. They want a building devoid of institutional stigma. They want it to look like great architecture. The use of different materials is playful. It will be a distinctive piece of architecture. It will enhance the community.

- 3.28 Jeff Cooper, Haeger Engineering, said his company is the land surveyors and civil engineers. The site is 1/3 of acre in size. He wants to talk about storm water items. The adjacent homeowners had some concerns about drainage. Their plan is an improvement to drainage.

They will improve it with grading and drainage improvements. They will improve capacity. There is no capacity on site. He showed a plan with existing and proposed conditions. The existing site is all pavement and building with some grass along the

front walkway. The existing site has two driveways that come off the roadway on each side of the building to the rear parking. The rear parking area is all pavement. In the proposed situation, they are getting rid of one driveway. On the west side adjacent to Pin Oak, they are creating a whole strip of open space, grass and landscaping. It is about 13' from the property line. It is all pavement at this time. There will be one access on the right. Currently 85% of existing site is impervious. In the proposed they have a 10% reduction to 75% and they have made a 1500 square foot reduction. This can absorb or slow the water. The main benefit is on the west side of the site. He showed a plan.

The whole site, especially the rear of the property, drains from east to west and it goes to Pin Oak Drive. Now water runs off the property over the curb and it relies on Pin Oak Drive's storm sewer to be removed. They are providing a buffer on the west side. They have to maintain drainage and will provide a bio swale on the west side. The benefits are for the Pin Oak Drive residents and the site will collect storm water via a series of inlets, perforated water drains and sewers that will collect water and carry it north to Wilmette Avenue and connect to another storm sewer. Water quality benefits will be better. There is a good volume of buried stone that allows water to infiltrate much quicker and has less runoff. The stone is an underground storage system. Water can sit in the voids. There is an underdrain and storm sewer system to also help with the water situation. He said that the improvements should significantly help with run off onto Pin Oak Drive.

- 3.29 Mike Magnuson, Alfred Benesch Co, said his company has been around for 50+ years. 90% of clients are public sector. The other 10% are railroads and utilities. Traffic work is for municipalities. Sometimes the traffic engineer prepares the study for the Village and is reimbursed by the private property owner. His company does not work for developers.

They looked at traffic along Wilmette and at the Wilmette/Ridge intersection. The project started in July and they looked at traffic in August. There was a staff review process and a comment was made that in the Village there is a drop off in traffic volumes in mid-August. Based on that, they looked at traffic in October. When they look at intersections they look at levels of service. The scoring is from A through F. A you don't stop, there is little to no delay. F is horrible, you may sit through 6-7 lights and lots of delays. Most intersections operate at D or E. Wilmette/Ridge intersection would be level C. It is better than what is normally seen around here. With this development and with affordable housing, they analyzed this as a typical apartment building. They used industry wide statistics to come up with the trip generation rates. Adding those volumes into the current situation at the intersection there could be a slight increase in delay, but it is not appreciable. The intersection is under capacity.

Looking at the site driveway is the second capacity analysis. Driveways coming out on a major route and the concern is trying to turn left in – how easy is that maneuver and how easy is it to get out going left or right? Based on both studies and analyses,

left into the site does not have a lot of delay. Coming out of the driveway = some delay. The change between the summer and fall is a few seconds. Wilmette asks that crash analysis be performed. Looking at the intersection, it is well below what they typically see. Wilmette provided that data and there were 3 crashes in 5 years at that intersection with no observable safety pattern.

Looking at traffic generation, morning peak hour, based on industry standards, during that peak hour there would be 14 trips and 29 in the evening. During the morning people leave for work and in the evening people go in and out. Looking at NR zoning, a convenience store or restaurant would have 75-125 trips/hour.

Conclusions were that there is really no appreciable traffic impact on the area. KLOA will talk about parking. Looking at unit types and the mix, 1 parking spot/unit is adequate. The site now has two driveways. One is immediately next to Pin Oak. With the proposed site plan that driveway will be eliminated and increasing spacing between two driveways. It is a much better situation. They recommended that there be the ability to turn around a larger vehicle on the site like a large garbage truck. That request was accommodated.

- 3.30 Luay Aboona, KLOA, said KLOA are traffic and parking consultants located in Rosemont. Their firm has been in business for 20 years and he has been in this business for about 30 years. They have done projects in the Village and will be working on the new development on Green Bay Road across from the train station. They were asked to do a quick parking evaluation to determine the adequacy of the parking supply. There will be 20 parking spaces for 20 units. Their data shows greatly different parking characteristics than the typical apartment development. Most of the residents do not own a car due to financial or disability situation.

They did a survey of residents of existing developments in the area. They worked with HODC to get information about car ownership in some of their developments. They found that vehicle ownership is less than .75 vehicles/unit and as low as .5. They looked at data from other projects they worked on and some of the other developments had lower vehicle ownership, as low as 10%. They did surveys to determine actual demand. The units are studios and 1 bedrooms, which is a unique use. The data shows that it greatly different parking characteristics than a typical residential apartment development. Most of the residents do not own a vehicle.

They looked at some of HODC's other projects to get a feel for the demand. The demand for two buildings was less than .6 per unit. They have surveys from other projects verifying low ownership.

They showed that parking will be sufficient for the proposed use and 1 space/unit is more than adequate for parking demand.

- 3.31 Ms. Norrick asked about the distance from some of the other developments to mass transit. There is a bus route that passes in front of the proposed building. The building is almost a mile to Metra. How close are other HODC developments to public transportation?

Mr. Abuna said that for the development in Skokie it is close to bus lines but not train stations.

Mr. Koenig said the property in Skokie is about .75 miles from the L. With the Evanston properties, one building is within .75 miles from the L and the other building is on a bus line and nowhere near an L.

- 3.32 Valerie Kretchmer, Valerie Kretchmer Associates, said they do real estate market analysis and urban planning. They have been in business for 30 years. They are in Evanston. They work on a wide range of real estate. They do market rate and affordable properties.

They looked at the market for the project based on having 20 units for low to moderate income individuals. They look at competition, other alternatives in the community, the areas they are likely to draw from. When they did their rent survey they found that there is very little that is affordable anywhere the market area. The median gross rent in the Village is \$1573. She talked about lower rents in low income senior buildings.

When they look at how much of the potential market has to be captured to fill the building, that number is .07% of eligible population. They have incomes and they need to qualify to live there. It is a very small percentage. It should not be hard to fill a building like this. They estimate that absorption should take only a few months.

They put additional information together that was not part of the market study to show how many people there are in the Village and within the larger market area that fall within the categories. There are almost 1300 individuals in the Village that have incomes that would enable them to qualify for this. They look at those who were under 65 as they are the target market. There are 537 households or 8%.

- 3.33 Mr. Koenig said that the property is in the Gross Point Historic District. The building is a significant structure in the district although it was altered so it is not a landmark. To remember the old building, they want to incorporate the existing cornerstone into the building. They have spoken with the Historic Commission about this and what is possible.

The commission has the review standards that are used to decide whether or not they can approve the project. The standards were forwarded to staff and the commission has this information. He does not want to spend a lot of time going through this but he wanted it on record that this was done in writing. Under the

review standards, the property does fit in NR zoning. It creates the ability to be a community asset so the PUD process is appropriate. There will be no impact on other properties. It fits within the neighborhood context. The proposed development will probably enhance property values and have no negative impact on values. The PUD will not impede development of future properties. They will decrease water runoff which is a positive. They are improving drainage. They are improving traffic flow. They are removing a curb cut which is an enhancement as there are clearer traffic patterns on the overall site. They are a natural buffer between residential and retail space. Regarding landscaping they went through the plan and described trees, shrubs and landscaping and they will meet/exceed Village requirements. They spent a lot of time speaking about the PUD fits with the Comprehensive Plan. They talked about the affordable housing plan and meet goals under the Comprehensive Plan.

Additional questions have come up regarding management, the organization, the tenant selection process. The packet did not include that information because it is not the typical information the Village would ask for.

HODC will provide on-site property management. He has a team on his staff who are property managers. He has an asset management supervisor in charge of all properties. They have increased the size of the management staff. There are four full time management staff who are in charge of all properties. They report to him. They have to follow a lot of rules and regulations.

Part of the process of doing management is tenant selection. The way they select tenants is through the tenant selection plan. It is a formal document. It lists all requirements for doing the process for the tenant selection procedure. It talks about outreach, how they process the tenants when they come through the system. They will affirmatively market the project. They have to be proactive in getting tenants to apply. After the application is received the review process starts. They work with a lot of social service agencies and partners in the area. He named some organizations they work with. The selection process involves doing a criminal background and credit check. They get permission from the applicant. They have to income qualify. They have to have a source of income. Rents are lower than area rents. The Village does not require a background and credit check. His staff does that process. Felony occupants cannot occupy any of their properties. They review credit, but don't anticipate extraordinarily high credit scores. They make a judgment call as to whether they can afford the unit and can continue to live there. Have they had past evictions? What is the nature of their credit history and issues? It does not start until the building is under construction so there is no waiting list. They will create a new waiting list for this building. They want good tenants for themselves and for the community. They used to be able to create community based preferences. In the past if you lived in the Village you could bump to the top of the list, but that does not occur now under fair housing regulations. They market the property in the local area first. They can set targets for certain populations. Everyone is below 60% of median income or low income. They will have units

available for people with disabilities. The set asides for veterans follow the same rules as those for people with disabilities. Four units are for veterans. It is incorporated into the process and the legal documents. They have to make sure that tenants can live independently. All residents will sign an annual lease. Each lease is for one year and there is an annual recertification process. Sometimes leases are not renewed. The recertification is monitored by the funding agency.

On the financing side, the primary source for funding for affordable rental housing in the U.S. is the Low Income Tax Credit. It is an IRS housing program through section 42 of the code. It is a market based approach for affordable housing. There is market based financing. Each state gets an allocation of credits. He explained the process of how municipalities get credits in the state. The credits are given to the organization and sold on the open market. This is another entity that makes sure HODC follows the rules and that the property is appropriately operated. The building has to be a long term asset. There is an additional level of review and oversight. There are 3-5 other sources of financing. They must keep units affordable for 30 years. They have to charge below market rents.

They have reserves set aside so they can do future repairs. They are required to plan for the future. They fund that through the mortgage payment process. It has to be long term feasible.

There are five main areas within the process of PUD. One is that zoning allows a 2.5 story building 30' tall. They are requesting a 3 story building only 30' tall. They want the building to be at grade. The way the building was designed was to fit within FAR. The site is 14,000+ square feet. They designed the building and based on Village code, calculations include underground parking for the FAR. The square footage of the building is within FAR, but the way the code is written, some of the parking under the building is included in FAR.

Parking should not be within 8' of grade and they are requesting parking to be at grade level. It is required that ½ of the spaces are enclosed within the envelope of the building. More than ½ of the spaces are under the building but there are not walls. It is better to have it opened. They are requesting 20 vs. the 30 required spaces. They are fine with the side buffer yard. The rear buffer yard is encroached on. They laid out the building so there are site lines all the way through to the retail space. The parking spaces fall 2' within the 10' setback requirement. There is also a turnaround space. They can back cars out into the buffer zone. The other side of the rear yard is a parking lot. Currently there is parking up to the back lot line of the back fence. On the other side of the fence there is also parking. They are requesting that the rear buffer yard allows a parking lot to back up to a parking lot.

The PUD process requires benefits. The benefits they are providing are the benefits discussed including affordable housing, storm water management, availability of accessible units as well as a sustainable design. The tradeoff between the PUD process requires there be a legal process they go through.

The proposal implements the Comprehensive Plan as well as the affordable housing plan. The goal is to rejuvenate a community asset and fill a long term vision.

- 3.34 Chairman Kohn asked the commissioners if they had any questions at this time.
- 3.35 Mr. Head asked the applicant to speak more about marketing outreach. According to Ms. Kretchmer there are between 500-1300 eligible families in the Wilmette Area who could benefit from the proposed housing. How do they do that outreach? How do they fill the building?
- Mr. Koenig said they create a waiting list. They will actively market the building once it is closer to the building becoming a physical reality. They will do outreach and marketing. They will make connections with local organizations like Our Place New Trier and New Foundation Center, they will employ the Village newsletter, through newspapers, via flyers.
- 3.36 Mr. Head clarified that the set asides for persons with a disability and veterans were a minimum of 20% each and seniors were eligible to be part of the resident mix. Mr. Koenig answered yes and that while they are not proposing a senior only building, seniors are eligible to live there.
- 3.37 Mr. Head said there were questions about traffic from neighbors. Under current situation it showed that the typical wait at the Ridge/Wilmette intersection is about 28 seconds and this project could increase the wait to 30 seconds. How does volume of traffic from this development compare to the Shell station or the shopping center?
- 3.38 Mr. Magnuson said that the average delay over that peak time is about 30 seconds. It will increase slightly. The development will not generate a lot of traffic. He talked about peak morning and peak evening numbers. A gas station would generate more during peak hours. They also generate more cars throughout the day and residential is a morning/evening peak.
- 3.39 The Chairman said they need to move on to public testimony. A lot of people want to speak. The case will probably be continued and there won't be a vote this evening. It is an open forum and everyone can speak. He asked that comments be brief, limited to a few minutes if possible. If the testimony is redundant he might interrupt and ask them to move on. Family members do not need to repeat similar comments. There will be different opinions expressed and he asked for consideration when others spoke. He wants the meeting to end by 10 PM. He asked speakers to state their name and address.

4.0 INTERESTED PARTIES

4.1 Persons speaking on the application

- 4.11 Judith Godfrey
1408 Wilmette Avenue
- 4.12 Melissa
Sandy Lane
- 4.13 Carol Swerdlove
560 Hunter Road
- 4.14 Christine Moran
823 Ashland Avenue
- 4.15 Karen Hogan
Lives off of Ridge Road
- 4.16 The Rev. Kristin Uffelman White
1130 Wilmette Avenue
- 4.17 Mark Weyermuller
208 Lawndale
- 4.18 Paul Kesselman
1933 Wilmette Avenue
- 4.19 Colleen Reese
411 Pine Manor
- 4.20 Joe Cohen,
104 Hollywood Court
- 4.21 Kathy Miles
2007 Wilmette Avenue
- 4.22 Robin Jerutis
404 Lavergne Avenue
- 4.23 Hans Guyer
2000 block of Central Avenue
- 4.24 Ellen McManus
705 11th Street

- 4.25 Tim Cary
442 Locust
- 4.26 Karleen McAllester
323 Wilshire Drive East
- 4.27 Laurie Garvey
1932 Highland
- 4.28 Mark Wagstaff
219 10th Street
- 4.29 Pamela Matiosian
700 Illinois Road
- 4.30 David Rankin
1731 Wilmette Avenue
- 4.31 Jack Kelly
826 Chestnut Avenue
- 4.32 Mitch Klein
1837 Wilmette Avenue
- 4.33 Allison Williams
412 Pine Manor Drive
- 4.34 Alina Binder
425 Pine Manor Drive
- 4.35 Rich Wallach
1630 Elmwood
- 4.36 Bob Larson
1900 Block of Highland
- 4.37 Jerone Kujawa
2145 Washington Avenue
- 4.38 Lisa Braganca
2125 Washington
- 4.39 Brandon Wilson
Attorney for Pin Oaks Condo Association
- 4.40 Andy Reese
411 Pine Manor Drive

- 4.41 Tim Clemons
1811 Wilmette Avenue
- 4.42 Curt Stover
1928 Highland Avenue
- 4.43 Elisa Swerdlove
560 Hunter Road
- 4.44 Phil Rothrock
134 17th Street
- 4.45 Hettie Karis
420 Pine Manor
- 4.46 Rich Sciortino
819 Ashland Avenue
- 4.47 Lorelei McClure
1135 Wilmette Avenue
- 4.48 Ken Sohn
- 4.49 Rich Goodwin
- 4.50 Gail Schechter
Executive Director of Open Communities
- 4.51 Van Gilmer
137 Millbrook Lane
- 4.52 Sam Gambacorta
464 Highcrest

4.2 Summary of comments

- 4.21 Ms. Godfrey, 1408 Wilmette Avenue, said she lives in a townhouse. How will such a building be governed? How will the people living in the building manage to get along with each other? How will they address behavior problems? What about administration? How are problems brought to management? The Chairman said that the applicant will return to give further clarification.
- 4.22 Melissa who lives on Sandy Lane said she lived in the city with her husband. They lived in Evanston for 10 years. They looked at every suburb and moved to Wilmette because it was a nice balance between single family homes and some of the multi-

tenant houses. She raised her family in the Village. There is a good mix of multi-tenant housing. When will it stop? The sense of community will be lost.

- 4.23 Carol Swerdlove, 560 Hunter Road, said she has lived in the Village for 40+ years. This project has code violations that would need permission required to allow them to build this building. They do not conform to the ordinances. What is the Village going to do about that? The Chairman said that is the purpose of the hearing and what will be discussed this evening.
- 4.24 Christine Moran, 823 Ashland Avenue, said she has been a resident for 6 years and that she moved to the Village because she has a special needs child. She supports the project because her son could call it home in the future. She knows HODC and it is an important project for the Village.
- 4.25 Karen Hogan, lives off Ridge Road, said she did not know when they did the traffic study, but that is her route every day and she sometimes has to wait 3-4 lights, especially during school hours. It is a traffic nightmare at Ridge/Wilmette Avenue. There are so many people in the community who could benefit by this project. It is not likely they will get into the project. They are taking people from outside the community. The project is not benefitting the Wilmette community.
- 4.26 Reverend Kristin Uffelman White, 1130 Wilmette Avenue, is rector of St. Augustine's Episcopal Church at 1140 Wilmette Avenue and directly across from Gates Manor. They are happy neighbors of Gates Manor residents. She is in favor of the project. Who does the Village want to be as a community? Wilmette should be the kind of community that values difference and cares for neighbors especially those who are most vulnerable and in need.
- 4.27 Mark Weyermuller, 208 Lawndale Avenue, said he is in favor of affordable housing but not this affordable housing. He would like lower property taxes. He thought it was arrogant to make the meeting attendees wait 1 hour and 45 minutes to speak. He said he would have had a 20 minute presentation or a presentation after public comments. 34 people left the meeting. He suggested that the Village walk away from this project. The Ford property took years to develop and how will this property be developed in a few months. He does not trust nonprofits and non-government organizations. He questions the property taxes. This property should be taxed at \$50,000/year. Are they going to get some tax reduction? Will residents have to subsidize taxes? The lot is 75' wide. In the Village 50' is required and in East Wilmette one needs 75' to build a single family home. A single family home should be built in this location. He suggested that the applicant sell the property and let someone build one or two homes on the property. In the North Shore article, it talked about HODC's other property having crime issues. Will there be criminals and/or sex offenders living in the proposed building? He is against the project.

- 4.28 Paul Kesselman, 1933 Wilmette Avenue, said he lives directly west of the property. He has lived in the Village for 21 years. His wife grew up in the Village. Traffic has been a problem on Wilmette Avenue. The property at 2107 Wilmette Avenue had a significant fire years ago. The ZBA had to take up an issue as to whether to subdivide that one house into a two unit townhome. It was decided to not allow the subdivision because of traffic increase. At 7:57 AM traffic was backed up from Ridge to Illinois. When he went to work at 8:05 AM traffic was still backed up. Sometimes it takes him three lights to get out of his driveway. In the evening it takes a while for him to turn left into his driveway.

To add 20 units and 20 potential cars is a lot. How many people will be in the office? What about their cars? Residents have friends and relatives – where will they park? There is no parking on Wilmette Avenue during the day. Pin Oak is private property. To the east is the shopping center which is also private property. There are no spaces to be found in that lot. There is no ingress to that center off of Wilmette Avenue.

He read the original report and what is on the website. There should be 30 spaces for parking but because they made a deal to buy a piece of property and try to shoehorn in a project onto the property they are asking for a variance. Evanston is a different environment than Wilmette. The Evanston property is a huge apartment building. Wilmette's project is small. To say that somebody who is disabled doesn't drive is an insult. To give a variance from 30 to 20 is not appropriate.

He has a problem with the appearance of the building and the grass pavers and the parking lot in front. Wilmette Avenue is not a junk yard. The applicant is trying to make a service entrance on the front door. If the project doesn't fit then it doesn't fit. He has a problem with the height. All trees are between units. Mature trees will not be planted. The windows look into his house and his backyard.

Housing values are not going to go up and not stay the same. Do the commissioners want this project next to them? His realtor said that the project will impact property values.

- 4.29 Colleen Reese, 411 Pine Manor, said she has lived in the Village for 10 years. She lives about 200' from the proposed project. She chose Wilmette for its historical commitment to children as shown by outstanding schools. She is for affordable housing in the correct manner.

Many children walk on Wilmette Avenue to various schools. Children also walk on Wilmette Avenue to access public transportation to schools. Her neighbors discovered amazing facts. The target for the units is under 65 since there is sufficient senior housing in the Village. Under 65 is also a goal at one of their facilities on Dempster in Evanston.

The City of Evanston Chief of Police has written letters to this management company describing their ideas for better security which is greatly needed. She paraphrased from a letter written from the City of Evanston to Mr. Koenig

In summary, there is a history of offenses ranging from criminal damage to property, disturbances, assaults and batteries that required police response and disrupted the area around the project. She provided a list from the City of Evanston that showed 294 police reports at 319 Dempster. She read information from the list. 57 nuisance complaints were on the list. It is in the best interest of Wilmette children not to have the facility at 1925 Wilmette Avenue as proposed.

She interviewed two residents of the Dempster project. The Chairman said commissioners received that information. She replied that Village residents do not have this information. She paraphrased. There is a big difference between low income housing and transitional housing which is what the Dempster project has. It is one thing to have diversification regarding income but it is different to have people who are transitioning back into society from prison. Residents do not feel responsible for their behavior in the neighborhood. Their visitors do not feel a part of the neighborhood. There have been drug sales at that building. One resident screamed at children that she would kill them with a hatchet. It took the management company 6 months to get her out.

There is a lot of vehicle traffic due to taxis and Ubers for people who do not have cars. There is emergency vehicle traffic. There is no on-site management. If people get locked out they call 911. A resident of the Dempster project does not recommend this type of housing unless it is going in an appropriate location because neighbors will suffer and said that living in the building is a hassle. The Wilmette Village Board needs to better think this through.

- 4.30 Joe Cohen, 104 Hollywood Court, said he lives around the corner from the proposed project. He can see the project from his house. He is new to the Village. He wants to talk about home values. He has empirical evidence. There is a multi-family building down the street. He got an appraisal on his house and the home value on his home was docked by \$50,000 just for the presence of multifamily. There were bullet points listed and it was stated that there is no impact on home values. That is based on a few studies. Those studies have different facts from what they are intending to build in the Village. There are different tenant mixes and number of residents/unit. It was placed in more high density communities and in buildings that had subsidized and full priced tenant housing. It was not single unit or studio units in a non-high density area with no full rent tenants. This project will have an absolute impact on every person in this room's home values especially the people who live within ½ mile of the project. He urged the commissioners to remember that and he applauds their altruistic goals, but they are going to hurt a lot of people in the community by putting the project in the proposed location.

- 4.31 Kathy Miles, 2007 Wilmette Avenue, said she has lived in her home for 11 years. She could not get out of her driveway to drive her child to school this morning because of traffic. The neighbors had little notice about this hearing. There was no real effort to notify the community about the meeting. No one wonders why. She is a big fan of low income housing being brought into a community the right way. Why is this project not designated to giving disadvantaged families with children an opportunity to improve their situation by attending Wilmette schools? Why isn't it being targeted to families who will set down roots? Why isn't housing designated for seniors? Why are they looking at targeting a group who is not from the Village and who will not stay in the Village? The project will impact traffic and safety of the children but it is missing an opportunity to allow more children to go to area schools. She opposes the project as proposed because it will damage the community. The Village needs to look at how to help disadvantaged people.
- 4.32 Robin Jerutis, 404 Lavergne Avenue, said she has lived in the Village for 14 years. There was no school at New Trier on August 4 or October 14, which is a reference to the traffic study. A few years ago it took her a year to fight for a special permit to put a play structure in her backyard.
- 4.33 Han Guyer, 2000 block of Central Avenue, said he has lived in his home for 16 years. The applicant made a comment about what HODC does and said they figure out how to crack the code when doing developments. He believes in affordable housing. He noted that there is a need for seniors and for families. Why are they going down the SRO route? Because 20 units is better than putting in 4 or 5 units. More money = more income, but this does not work. He noted that the presentation was lengthy.
- Does the project fit in the neighborhood? No. Will it increase property values? He saw no evidence that it will and thinks it will be no. Does it meet the affordable housing plan? It has not been tested and talked about the Ford development where they got a pass on affordable housing. Does it create a community site? No. The population is aging. People want more families with children to go to Wilmette schools. He asked the commissioners to respect this.
- 4.34 Ellen McManus said she is speaking as a member of Wilmette Cares. She believes in diversity. She is proud to say that next door to her building is Gates Manor and she is proud to have them as neighbors. She has a disabled daughter that requires 24/7 care. She told her daughter's caregivers about this hearing. One of the caregiver's daughters goes to a Wilmette school. We look to our children to change our attitudes and have a more welcoming community.
- 4.35 Tim Cary, 442 Locust Road, said he has lived in his home for 1.5 years. His family has lived in the Village since 1951. He applauds Mr. Koenig's altruistic efforts. This is a great thing to do, but in this instance he is damaging far more lives than he is helping. He said that the bus in front of the project only runs during rush hour Monday through Friday. It is obvious from comments that it is believed that the

project does not fit into the community. He urged the commissioners to not allow this to move forward.

- 4.36 Karleen McAllester, 323 Wilshire Drive East, said she is speaking because HODC has done a lot of work to prepare and she appreciates this. Many people want affordable housing in the neighborhood. The site would be a fitting place and the project blends with the current multifamily. She was wondering what would happen to the site. It does not seem appropriate for retail. She talked about her blog - sewersofwilmette.com. The project would reduce the runoff to the neighborhood. She hopes that she has moved to a welcoming community. She heard that in the past people had to sign covenants that they would not sell to Orientals, Jews or Negros. That is not the Wilmette that she see at the meeting. She sees a group of smart people and whatever affordable housing the Village gets will be done well.
- 4.37 Laurie Garvey, 1932 Highland Avenue, said she tried to get a permit to build a deck and was not allowed to build it the way she wanted yet the commissioners might let the applicant build an additional story. Her problem is precedent – how will the commissioners say no to future cases?
- 4.38 Mark Wagstaff, 219 10th Street, said he is in favor of affordable housing and thanks the commissioners for considering this project. It is the kind of project that needs to be seen in the village. He served on the Transportation Commission for 8 years. The Village has talented staff and he holds their reviews in highest esteem. Take their opinions very seriously.
- 4.39 Pamela Matiosian, 700 Illinois Road, said she owns a business in downtown Wilmette at the corner of Central and Wilmette Avenue. She knows the area very well. Why wasn't Illinois Road put into the traffic study? There is traffic backup from Illinois to Wilmette Avenue in the morning and in the evening. She is a staunch liberal and she is in favor of affordable housing. She is a licensed art therapist. She works in social service. She knows the architect personally. This site is a mistake for what is under consideration.
- 4.40 David Rankin, 1731 Wilmette Avenue, said he has lived in his home for 16 years. He sent a letter to the commissioners. He wants to build on Commissioner Bailey's comments regarding tax returns, transparency and governance. He knows HODC's work, but he thinks that the proposed development is for the wrong site. He questioned a series of tax returns from 2012-2015 that identify no key employees, list the property tax payment of \$47,000, assets are locked into limited partnerships. He said that this particular development causes residents to 'look under the hood.' He encouraged commissioners to do that. The preliminary plan is not ready for a recommended approval.
- 4.41 Jack Kelly, 826 Chestnut Avenue, said he is a longtime resident. He is a strong believer in affordable housing. The Village is at 4.1% today. He was at the meeting when Shoreline Place was approved and his mother lived there. There was a lot of

fear mongering going on with that development. None of that happened. There are four established successful examples of affordable housing in the village. Are the crime rates higher than other places in the village? No. He does not think there will be an increase in crime with this development. He strongly supports the project. He suggested looking at the variances. Maybe reduce the unit count to 18 and allow children. Don't throw the whole project out.

- 4.42 Mitch Klein, 1837 Wilmette Avenue, said that his gas station is open not vacant as described by the applicant's architect. There will be a parking nightmare if the project is approved. Where will snow go if the variance is granted? More building than the site is capable of handling should not be approved. If they can't make it work then they should sell the property.
- 4.43 Allison Williams, 412 Pine Manor Drive, said she has lived in the village for 19 years. Her driveway empties out onto Wilmette Avenue directly across from the site for the proposed development. It is easy to be in favor of the project if you don't live in the neighborhood. The proposal brings safety risks. She has done due diligence research into the developer's other property and the research is not good. The applicant did a great job in his presentation. He knows the high level of concern about the project and he tried to defray some of the concern. But his statement are in direct conflict with the written proposal. She thinks that a new proposal should be submitted.

This project has relied on two flawed traffic studies for its purposes. The first was conducted on August 8th which was a Saturday and the Saturday before high school started. The traffic consultant said his study was conducted during peak hours in the morning or in the evening. He misled the board and the community. The second traffic counts were conducted on a day when there was no school. No stock can be put into the studies when residents told the board a different story. There is a lot of traffic.

She is not against affordable housing. Details are concerning. People who live next to the Claridge Apartments indicated that this management company is not responsive. It took three years for a resident to get a problem resolved. He has been threatened by residents. This is nothing like the senior residences in the village. This is transitional housing. It would be irresponsible for the board to approve a building that can house up to 30 tenants with 20 parking spots. She is vehemently opposed to the project.

- 4.44 Alina Binder, 425 Pine Manor Drive, said she has lived in the village for 13 years. She and her family have an investment in the community. She is a clinical psychologist. She has worked with low income residents. There is a need for affordable housing but the proposed development will not serve the needs of future tenants.

The proposal states that there will be a caseworker with access to an office at the project. Is this a social service center? Does it meet zoning?

It states that the residents can obtain supportive services at the New Foundation Center in Northfield and Orchard Village in Skokie. The PACE bus will get residents to these services but the buses run with a limited schedule. Her experience indicates that certain types of residents need easy access to services or they won't be compliant with treatment plan. Residents are being set up for failure.

Subsidized housing residents do not want to live with those like them especially those with complex problems. Affordable housing could be scattered throughout the village. This proposal of having 20 units of this type of housing in one building is not in the best interest of future residents. There needs to be a better plan.

- 4.45 Rich Wallach, 1630 Elmwood Avenue, said he is a real estate professional and is familiar with traffic studies. Housing is a low traffic generating use in a commercial zoned location. Anything else put on that site would most likely generate more cars and higher volume. He supports the project and asked that the developer be given a chance to respond to some of the comments related to this project and the Evanston project.
- 4.46 Bob Larson, 1900 block of Highland Avenue, said he goes past Ridge and Wilmette several times/day. Property value issues are close to his heart. He endorses the project and thinks that it is wonderful that someone who wouldn't have this chance now has this opportunity.
- 4.47 Jerome Kujawa, 2145 Washington Avenue, said he is a lifelong Wilmette resident. Affordable housing would be fine but this lot is small for this type of project. Perhaps a building ranging in size from 3-6 units. He feels compassion for disabled people but asked how control will be maintained if there is alcohol and/or drug abuse as a disability.
- 4.48 Lisa Braganca, 2125 Washington Avenue, said she lives close to the proposed project. She is a member of Wilmette Cares. She has a child with behavioral disabilities– autism. She is grateful for what the community has done for her son and her family. His behavior is better and he may or may not need this kind of housing. The police understand people with behavioral disabilities. She appreciates that many people at the meeting support affordable housing. It is important that there is housing in the community so that people who grow up here and need a community around them have the ability to live and work here.
- 4.49 Brandon Wilson, Pin Oaks HOA attorney, said the Board of the condo association asked him to speak. Concerns people had about parking and the association is concerned that parking will end up on their private drives. They are concerned about property values and about density. The association polled residents on this issue and they found that 73% of residents agree with concerns raised this evening.

4.50 Andy Reese, 411 Manor Drive, said he lives 200' from the site. We need to slow down and find out all of the economic benefits the project can bring. He took two days off of work to focus on this issue. He supports affordable housing. He talked about the affordable housing plan and quoted from the plan. He talked about the spirit of the plan. To provide zoning variances for a project of this size, benefits need to outweigh the costs. There are few if any benefits to the community. The lot is 15,000 square feet. Why does the applicant present things that are not in line with zoning laws or even mildly compliant. They want the 10' buffer to the south dropped. He said that the proposal is a bait and switch. He wants to hear public comments and then return with something else. The applicant is not a competent manager. He got a D as a manager from residents in Evanston. He does not want drug dealing out his back door. He talked about an emergency management plan except there is none at this time. There is already enough congestion on Wilmette Avenue. He talked about emergency vehicles and will Wilmette Avenue be closed down if they need to respond to the proposed development.

He referenced the PMA and said that the applicant was drawing from the entire state. He asked how many people there were on staff. Only one person shows up once/week at the Evanston building. These tenants need an in house social service person. The company is overstretched and the project will fall back on tax payers.

4.51 Tim Clemens, 1811 Wilmette Avenue, said he also owns 1819 Wilmette Avenue. Traffic at 5:10 PM is backed up past 15th Street. He talked about the duties of the commission and how they would not be meeting their responsibilities if this project is built. There are single family and townhomes that are adjacent, not 20 unit buildings. His son is severely handicapped and needs 24 hour care. He said that 20 units = 40 cars if there are caregivers. He was before the board because he wanted to build a 24' wide garage. He was told no. He talked about what the zoning ordinance regulated. He said that the proposed building is oversized at 3 stories. There should not be 20 people living on a lot of that size.

4.52 Curt Stover, 1928 Highland Avenue, said he is a newer resident of the Village and he moved here about 1.5 years ago to raise his two daughters. He is concerned about his daughters taking buses to the junior high. He is also concerned about the parking situation. The single family character of the community must be preserved. To add multifamily housing on a lot of that size makes no sense to him.

4.53 Elisa Swerdlove, 560 Hunter Road, said she has lived in the Village since she was 10. What disturbs her the most about this project is lack of transparency and notice given to the residents? She supports affordable housing. Families will not be able to live in this particular building. It is a big building on a small property. The residents have had no time to investigate future impact of this property. Her concern is about what kind of funding is the developer getting from village property taxes. Is there a slush fund for this type of housing? Taxpayers need to be aware of where their money is going. The board is trying to rush this project through so quickly. Village residents need input on what type of affordable housing they want in the

village. Most would prefer families or single parents with children, not 20 individuals living in individual units. There was no real notification on this case. They mailed to 250' around the project. Is this project right for the residents? Maybe it needs to be put to a Wilmette vote? Everyone who lives in this town should be allowed to comment. Don't push the project down residents' throats.

- 4.54 Phil Rothrock, 134 17th Street said he was not sure where he stood on this project. He is now concerned about traffic related issues. He wants to know about an expansion plan for more low income housing. He wondered what other areas would be considered for affordable housing and whether there would be this much outcry in those areas. He hopes there are more facts about the traffic and whether there will be a social worker on site. He thought a plan with little less density would be better.
- 4.55 Hettie Karis, 420 Pine Manor Drive, said she has lived in the village for 19 years and owns two homes. She has two children she is trying to raise. She is a full time attorney. The residents did not have time to learn and digest the issues. She lives less than a block from the project. She reviewed all plans and paperwork. She talked about lack of credibility in the submissions before the board. Lack of credibility regarding safety, concerns and ways they will be addressed. The Evanston project does not support what is being heard at the meeting. There has to be a way to address safety. There is lack of credibility regarding the target audience. She questions if the project is being built for a 'noble purpose.' Conflicting information has been given as to who is the target group for the project. The target audience seems to be those on a wait list for the Evanston property. She questions credibility. Traffic studies were conducted of days indicative of where is the evidence to support the rhetoric spoke for almost two hours. Her neighbor Dr. Binder said it is does not appear that the future residents would receive social services that are needed. She urged the Board to give the project the requisite consideration and time so residents can better understand what the project is about and what the facts behind the smokescreen really are.
- 4.56 Rich Sciortino, 819 Ashland Avenue, said that everyone seems to be in favor of affordable housing. The last affordable housing the village looked at was Mallinckrodt. There has been a serious intent to supply affordable housing for the community. Some additional affordable housing is a valuable asset to the community. Every multi-family project will require some type of variance. A precedent should be set that favors affordable housing. No one will be happy with the board's decision. There are many people who are not at the meeting who are in favor of affordable housing. There are a lot of legitimate concerns raised by neighbors. Address those concerns. Either affordable housing is a serious contention for the Village or it's not. This is an opportunity that comes along once every ten years, let's make it happen.

- 4.57 Lorelei McClure, President of Wilmette Cares applauds and supports the proposed plan by HODC. No one has spoken against affordable housing. Wilmette Cares has heard concerns raised by neighbors. She asked that all commissions, HODC, Wilmette Cares and neighbors to step back with a reasonable mind and open mind and listen to what was said and objections satisfied. Come forward with the intention that Wilmette is being put first and that people believe in affordable housing and the plan.
- 4.58 Ken Sohn has lived in the village for all his life. The money comes from subsidies they will receive from low income housing. The federal government might not be able to always give tax credits. How will the project continue its funding when credits are reduced or eliminated? Structures decay after 15 years. How will structure be maintained if the building is turned over to someone else? Will they have a higher standard to ensure a quality building? What about 1:1 ratio of apartment dweller per unit. More people could come to live in the units.
- 4.59 Rich Goodwin said he has lived in the village for 36 years and has been a property manager for 41 years. He has managed scattered sites like this. He knows the village and the area. He said what he has heard tonight is a little twisted. He will email the corrections. This is not transitional housing. The tone he hears from the audience is a little disappointing. There is bias, anger and misinformation and discord. It seems strange to have people being rude and yelling out at the meeting. He is not used to this. He asked the board to look at the plan closely. There are people who need housing. The biggest thing he noticed tonight is fear.
- 4.60 Gail Schechter is the Executive Director of Open Communities, which is a fair and affordable housing advocacy organization that covers the northern suburb. They are the sister agency of HODC. They are at the meeting to ask where everyone was when they tried to get affordable housing at 611 Green Bay Road. She hopes that an affordable housing set aside is being considered. Why not set aside a few units for affordable housing in new developments? In the comprehensive plan it states that the village should revisit looking at affordable housing needs annually. Perhaps an affordable housing study should be done. Give and take is a good thing and the process is great in helping to massage the proposal. What kind of community do we want to have? We want to be a welcoming, open, just, diverse and inclusive community and a safe community. When people know one another they live more safely and with more trust.
- 4.61 Van Gilmer, 137 Millbrook Lane, said he has worked in the village for 10 years and has lived here for 8 years. He is a proud village resident. He thanked HODC for having the subject of affordable housing come up and trying to do something about it. He came to observe and not to speak. He talked about the feeling of working in the village for 10 years and not seeing diversity. He hopes that diversity will come to the village and not the kind that people are afraid of. He supports affordable housing. He has the same fear if one of the tenants had just come out of prison. Affordable housing is for people who want to live and work in the village

and who can't. He is the only person in his house. If you describe the affordable housing as one person living in a house, look at who it could be. He is wondering what will be done and said that something has to be done.

- 4.62 Sam Gambacorta, 464 Highcrest, said he is a lifelong resident. It was described that the development would be an asset to the village. If it is truly an asset it should first serve the residents. Preference should be given to village seniors, village disabled, and single parents with children. He recalled making an inquiry a few years back to Gates Manor for a parent and was told if they were a Wilmette resident they would get bumped up to the top of the list. If this development cannot do that then maybe another development could. To bring people in from outside the community that don't have a vested interest in Wilmette is something he does not agree with. It is bad for the village and he does not want this. Affordable housing for Wilmette residents is a good thing.

Regarding criminal activity at the project in Evanston, he was unaware of these problems. If this is true, he urges the village to talk to village police and ask them to look into this. He would not want that in his neighborhood. This has to be looked into.

This building is in the Gross Point Historic District and is a significant historic structure. He urged the Historic Preservation Commission to look at the building before it is torn down. Maybe it should be saved vs. torn down.

- 4.63 The Chairman said this was a logical break point and asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting and continue the discussion to the December 1, 2015 meeting.
- 4.64 Mr. Schwab moved to continue the case to the December 1, 2015 meeting. Ms. Urban seconded the motion and the voice vote was all ayes and no nays. Motion carried.



1200 WILMETTE AVENUE
WILMETTE, ILLINOIS 60091-0040

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT

(847) 853-7550
FAX (847) 853-7701
TDD (847) 853-7634
EMAIL: comdev@wilmette.com

Date: September 2, 2016
To: Chairman Kohn and Members of the Plan Commission
From: John Adler, Director of Community Development
Subject: **Village Center Master Plan – Implementation Section**

In 2011 the Village Board adopted the Village Center Master Plan as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. The Master Plan contains an implementation section that outlines priority action tasks and catalytic projects. Since it has been over five years since the Plan was adopted as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and over three years since the implementation section was last reviewed, it makes sense to revisit the implementation section.

The purpose of this review is to get the Plan Commission up to speed on where the Village is in pursuing the goals of the VC Master Plan and to be ready if and when the Village Board asks the Plan Commission to report on the progress of the implementation of the Plan. As you will see a number of the priority action items and catalytic projects are already underway. The items/projects that have been completed or are underway include:

Completed

- Village Center zoning code amendments & comprehensive plan update
Completed in 2011 and 2014
- Develop Village Center design guidelines
Completed in 2014

Underway

- Ford site/ Block redevelopment
611 Green Bay Road is under construction. 601 Green Bay Road is being return to historic appearance by new owner. Village owns 1225 Central.

- Develop Village Center business development and marketing recruitment/retention strategy

The Village is working with a Chamber of Commerce marketing group to determine the best way to spend Village, Chamber and individual marketing dollars.

- Develop Village Center marketing/branding program
The Village is working with a Chamber of Commerce marketing group to determine the best way to spend Village, Chamber and individual marketing dollars.
- Coordinate and implement redevelopment opportunities within yearly Capital Improvement Program
Streetscape improvements have been added to the CIP.
- Land acquisition & assemblage
Village purchased 611 Green Bay Road (under construction) and 1225 Central Avenue.
- Village Green enhancements
While no Village Green only enhancements have been completed, the Village has installed year round tree lighting and is investigate hanging baskets and upgraded holiday decorations. In addition the Village began sponsoring a monthly summer concert on the Village Green that has been very well received.
- Chase Bank site
JP Morgan Chase recently purchased the bank building. During past discussion with Chase, the bank expressed an interest in being part of any redevelopment of the Chase property.
- Wilmette/Central Avenue streetscape enhancements
Central Avenue is scheduled to be reconstructed in 2019. Opportunities for streetscape enhancements will be considered.
- Comprehensive wayfinding & signage program
The Village increase the number of Village parking signs and is sponsoring a projecting sign program for private businesses.
- Village Center Master Plan update and evaluation
The Plan Commission last reviewed the implementation of the Plan in 2013.

WILMETTE VILLAGE CENTER MASTER PLAN - PRIORITY ACTION TASKS

LEGEND ▲ High \$\$\$ > \$500,000
 ◆ Medium \$\$ \$100,000 - \$500,000
 ▼ Low \$ < \$100,000

INITIATIVE/PROJECT/PROGRAM	PRIORITY	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	IMPLEMENTATION TOOLS/ FUNDING SOURCES	ACTIONS/KEY TASKS	COST LEVEL	GENERAL TIMELINE
Identify and Pursue Grants/ Funding Sources for all priority action plans and initiatives	▲	• Village Staff • Village Board	• Village Funds	• Compile list of potential sources and due dates • Identify requirements for each submission • Identify responsible groups/parties for preparing the submission	\$	0-1 year Ongoing
Village Center Zoning Code Amendments & Comprehensive Plan Update	▲	• Village Staff • Planning/Zoning Commission • Village Board • Planning Consultant	• Village Funds • ITEP Grant • TIF	• Redefine Village Center district(s) • Amend standards for heights, parking, densities, shown in Village Center Master Plan • Develop Form-Based Code strategy • Revise Village Center within Village Comprehensive Plan	\$\$	0-1 year
Develop Village Center Design Guidelines	▲	• Village Staff • Planning/Zoning Commission • Arch. Review Board • Design Consultant	• Village Funds • TIF • SSA	• Develop detailed building, site, public realm, landscape standards • Create a working committee • Coordinate with form-based zoning code	\$\$	0-2 years
Conduct Initial TIF Eligibility Study for Village Center	▲	• Village Staff • TIF Consultant • Village Board	• Village Funds	• Identify TIF district boundaries • Work with TIF consultant • Evaluate fiscal impacts	\$	0-1 year
Explore Options for Establishing Special Service Area for all or portions of Village Center	▲	• Village Staff • Village Board • Financial Consultant • Business/Property Owners/Chamber	• Village Funds	• Begin discussions with business/property owners • Establish potential SSA boundary	\$	0-1 year
Develop Village Center Business Development and Marketing Recruitment/Retention Strategy	▲	• Village Staff/VC Development Director • Village Board • Steering Committee • Business/Property Owners	• Village Funds • SSA	• Establish Village-supported entity and Steering Committee • Collaborate with other organizations • Create staff support structure or hire part-time director	\$\$	3-5 years Ongoing
Develop Village Center Marketing/ Branding Program	◆	• Village Staff • Branding/Marketing Consultants • Steering Committee • Development Director	• Village Funds • SSA	• Engage in an open community/business/merchant process • Identify theme, develop concepts/strategies	\$	0-2 years
Coordinate and Implement Redevelopment Opportunities within Yearly Capital Improvement Program	◆	• Village Staff • Village Board • Plan Commission	• Village Funds	• Establish priorities based on Master Plan • Create budget estimates for priority public projects	\$	0-1 year Ongoing
Comprehensive Village Center Streetscape Design	◆	• Village Staff • Village Board • Planning/Design Consultant • Steering Committee/Arch. Review	• Village Funds • ITEP Grant • ITCP • SSA	• Identify funding for design assistance • Conceptual, detailed design • Create overall budget and priorities for implementation	\$\$	0-2 years

WILMETTE VILLAGE CENTER MASTER PLAN - CATALYTIC PROJECTS

LEGEND ▲ High \$\$\$ > \$500,000
 ◆ Medium \$\$ \$100,000 - \$500,000
 ▼ Low \$ < \$100,000

INITIATIVE/PROJECT/PROGRAM	PRIORITY	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	IMPLEMENTATION TOOLS/ FUNDING SOURCES	ACTIONS/KEY TASKS	COST LEVEL	GENERAL TIMELINE
LAND ACQUISITION & ASSEMBLAGE	▲	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Staff Planning/Zoning Commission Village Board Finance/Real Estate Consultant Planning Consultant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Building Operations ITEP Grant TIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop public/private Partnership agreements Creat RFP/developer recruitment strategy Project structuring and finance sources 	\$\$	0-1 year Ongoing
LAND/PROPERTY ACQUISITION FEASIBILITY	▲	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Staff Village Board Real Estate Consultant Engineering/Design Consultant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Funds TIF General Revenue Bonds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop target area aquisition list Negotiation/discussion of property ownership Develop appraisals for acquistions Negotiate offers and/or public/private partnership opportunities 	\$\$\$	0-3 years Ongoing
VILLAGE GREEN ENHANCEMENTS	▲	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Staff Planning/Zoning Commission Village Board Design Consultant Arch. Review Board 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Funds ITEP Grant OSLAD Grant/LWCF TIF SSA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design and detail new plan Budget estimates and permitting Bid solicitation and construction coordination 	\$\$	0-2 years
CHASE/UP FRONTAGE SITE REDEVELOPMENT	◆	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Staff/Village Board Developer Union Pacific Property Owner Design Consultants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Funds TIF General Revenue Bonds Private Funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiate property/development agreements Determine revenue sharing scenarios/agreements Finalize building plans/permits Construction management Ensure replacment for displace parking 	\$\$\$	0-2 years
VILLAGE PARKING STRUCTURE	◆	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Staff Village Board Metra Developer (if applicable) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Funds TIF Commuter Parking Fees General Revenue Bonds TCSP Program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiate property/development agreements Determine revenue sharing scenarios/agreements Finalize building plans/permits Construction management 	\$\$\$	3-5 years
FORD SITE/BLOCK REDEVELOPMENT	◆	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Staff Property Owner Village Board Consultants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Funds TIF General Revenue Bonds Private Financing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiate property/development agreements Develop and market new retail Secure Building Permits Construction design and management coordination 	\$\$\$	5-10 years
GREEN BAY ROAD STREETScape ENHANCEMENTS	◆	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Staff Village Board Arch. Review Board Metra Union Pacific 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Funds ITEP Grant SRTS SSA TIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify funding for design assistance and construction Conceptual, detailed design Create overall budget and priorities for implementation 	\$\$\$	3-5 years Ongoing
CHASE BANK SITE	◆	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Staff Village Board Property Owner Real Estate Consultant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Funds TIF General Revenue Bonds Private Financing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiate property/development agreements Develop and market new retail Secure Building Permits Construction design and management coordination 	\$\$\$	5-10 years
WILMETTE/CENTRAL AVENUE STREETScape ENHANCEMENTS	◆	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Staff Village Board Arch. Review Board Design Consultant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Funds ITEP Grant TIF SSA SRTS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify funding for design assistance Conceptual, detailed design Create overall budget and priorities for implementation 	\$\$\$	3-5 years

WILMETTE VILLAGE CENTER MASTER PLAN - CATALYTIC PROJECTS

LEGEND ▲ High \$\$\$ > \$500,000
 ◆ Medium \$\$ \$100,000 - \$500,000
 ▼ Low \$ < \$100,000

INITIATIVE/PROJECT/PROGRAM	PRIORITY	RESPONSIBLE PARTIES	IMPLEMENTATION TOOLS/FUNDING SOURCES	ACTIONS/KEY TASKS	COST LEVEL	GENERAL TIMELINE
COMPREHENSIVE WAYFINDING & SIGNAGE PROGRAM	◆	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Staff Village Board Architect/Designer Planning Consultant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Funds ITEP Grant SRTS TIF SSA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify funding for design assistance Conceptual, detailed design Coordinate with streetscape design 	\$	0-2 years
AT GRADE CROSSING IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVES	◆	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Staff Village Board Union Pacific Metra 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Funds ITEP Grant CMAQ SRTS TIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue on-going dialogue with Union Pacific/ Metra Identify issues, establish priority projects Create a timeline and budget for improvements 	\$	0-2 years Ongoing
VILLAGE MASTER PLAN UPDATE & EVALUATION	◆	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Staff Planning Zoning Commission Village Board Planning Consultant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Funds ITEP Grant TIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate/update goals Revisit Plan in context of market conditions and new development that has occurred 	\$	5-10 years (3-5 year increments)
DEVELOP A VILLAGE CENTER TRAFFIC & PARKING MANAGEMENT STRATEGY	▼	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Staff Planning/Zoning Commission Village Board Consultants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Funds ITEP Grant SSA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate demand/supply and locations of parking Keep up-to-date counts and maps Develop a strategy for future demand 	\$	3-5 years Ongoing
EVALUATE NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICT NOMINATION	▼	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Staff Planning/Zoning Commission Village Board Planning/Arch. Consultant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village Funds ITEP Grant SSA HPTC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perform a comprehensive building inventory Identify local landmark buildings for potential designation 	\$	0-2 years



Welcome to the Plan Commission Meeting

Gary Kohn, Chair

Michael Bailey

Richard DeLeo

Jeffrey Head

Christine Norrick

Steven Schwab

Maria Choca Urban

Plan Commission

The Plan Commission is a recommending body reporting to the Village Board of Trustees. All members are Wilmette residents appointed by the Village President with the advice and consent of the Village Board. Plan Commissioners are appointed to a four year term, and may serve a maximum of eight years. The Village President appoints a Chair to preside at Commission meetings. The Commission is responsible for reviewing Planned Unit Developments, subdivisions and updates to the Village's Comprehensive Plan. All votes of the Plan Commission are recommendations to the Village Board and are not final, binding determinations.

General Order of Business

An agenda of items is prepared for each meeting. The general order of business for Plan Commission meetings is as follows:

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of minutes of the last meeting
4. Presentation of Applications
5. New Business
6. Public Comment
7. Adjournment

The Meeting Process

- The Chair opens the public hearing for the application(s) and presents a brief explanation of the public hearing procedure.
- The Chair swears in those wishing to give testimony. All persons offering testimony at a public hearing shall testify under oath. An attorney shall be sworn if he/she offers testimony, but not if he/she is questioning a witness, summarizing witness testimony, or addressing the body conducting the hearing on procedural issues.
- The applicant presents testimony regarding the petition and associated applications. The applicant is allowed to present without interruption from members of the Plan Commission or public.
- The Plan Commission members may ask questions of the applicant.
- When the applicant has completed his/her presentation, the Chair will ask if any members of the public present wish to speak on the application. Anyone raising their hand will be provided the opportunity to speak.

- All persons wishing to testify will be asked to state for the record his/her name and address before making their comments, submitting evidence or questioning a witness. All interested parties may appear for themselves or be represented by a person of their choosing. Written statements will be accepted prior to the hearing to be entered into the public hearing record.
- Any person may appear at a hearing and submit evidence, upon receiving recognition from the Chair. Any person may ask relevant questions of other witnesses, but only through the Chair and at the discretion of the Chair. The Chair may use reasonable discretion in determining when testimony has become redundant or is not relevant to the proceedings.
- The application and any accompanying exhibits will be identified and made part of the record. Any materials submitted and/or presented by an interested party will be identified and made part of the record.
- The Plan Commission members may ask questions of interested parties regarding their testimony.
- After all interested parties have addressed the Plan Commission, the Chair provides the applicant with the opportunity to comment on any public testimony and/or to answer questions that were asked. The Plan Commission members may have follow-up questions for the applicant.
- After everyone has addressed the Plan Commission in turn, the Chair will announce that the testimony is closed and request that a member of the Plan Commission make a motion. The motion is given in positive form as a motion to approve the request. Having the motion made and seconded allows the Plan Commission to begin discussion.
- The Plan Commission members will discuss the testimony given and evidence gathered.
- When the Plan Commission has completed discussion, the Chair will ask that a vote be taken on motion. Because the motion is made in the positive, a vote in favor of the motion is a vote in favor of the request.
- If the meeting extends past 10:00pm, the Chair may ask that the application be continued to the next regular meeting date of the Commission (the first Tuesday of every month); it is not uncommon for larger projects to be heard at multiple Plan Commission meetings.

It is important to remember that the Plan Commission is a recommending body and is not authorized to take final action on any application. The Commission's recommendation is forwarded to the Village Board of Trustees for final action.

Addressing the Plan Commission

All members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Commission in support of or against an application listed on the agenda. When addressing the Plan Commission, please state your name and address. In order to ensure that all persons have an opportunity to speak, a time limit may be set by the Chair for each speaker (typically such limit is 5 minutes). When a large number of citizens are scheduled, please avoid repeating statements already made. Members of the public will generally not be allowed to speak multiple times during the time. Following these procedures provides all interested parties an opportunity to speak while ensuring time for the Plan Commission to ask questions of the applicant and Village Staff as well as deliberate before it becomes too late in the evening.

Wilmette is a community of neighbors and prides itself on conducting professional meetings that respect all parties involved. Accordingly, we ask you to keep your comments respectful and to direct them to the Chair of the Commission, and not to the applicant or other speakers from the public.

Public Comment

Public Comment is intended for items not on the Commission's agenda. All members of the public will be provided the opportunity to speak on items listed on the agenda at the appropriate time during the meeting (or at the next meeting if the subject is continued). Any member of the public wishing to address the Commission on a matter not on the published agenda is welcome to do so under the Public Comment section of the agenda.