MINUTES OF THE
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
TUESDAY, APRIL 14, 2022

CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

Chairperson Celske called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m. Present at roll call were Chairperson Dan Celske and members Bloom, Buster, Cramer, and Dimmick. Also, present were Administrator Soderholm, Assistant to the Administrator Bechler, and Clerk Caesar. Members Anderson and Riley were absent.

APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 13, 2022 MINUTES

A MOTION was made by Bloom and seconded by Dimmick to approve the January 13, 2022 minutes. Members Bloom, Buster, Cramer, and Dimmick were in favor. Celske abstained. Motion carried.

ZONING CASE 2022-01: REZONING FROM R-1 TO R-3 AND VARIATION OF LESS THAN FORTY (40) FEET BETWEEN BUILDINGS, 110 UNIT RESIDENTIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT – 28855 IL ROUTE 22

Chairman Celske opened the public hearing for zoning case 2022-01 and accepted the proof of mailing certificates as well as a picture of the required posting. He explained that the petitioner was seeking to rezone the parcel at 28855 IL Route 22 from R-1 to R-3, requesting a special use for a planned unit development (PUD), and requesting a variation to allow setbacks between buildings of less than forty (40) feet (30' proposed between front and rear walls, 10' proposed between side walls with four (4) or fewer windows). Celske introduced Kelly McIvor, Vice-President of Acquisitions with Redwood and Kevin Serafin, with Cemcon LTD, Redwoods engineering firm to present their proposal.

Ms. McIvor stated that Redwood Apartment Neighborhoods is known for developing single-story townhouse style, apartment neighborhoods. She stated that Redwood currently has 14,000 homes, across many states, and they own and manage every single one of them. Each unit is designed with two bedrooms, two bathrooms, a 2-car driveway, and a 2-car attached garage. She said Redwood developments primarily attract the 45 and older, empty-nester age. Floor plans start at 1,300 square feet and each unit has its own private entry. On average, there are 1.65 residents per home, and eight (8) school age children are projected in the Redwood neighborhood. Ms. McIvor reviewed Redwood's strict qualification process, which includes extensive background checks, their maintenance standards, floor plans, the site location, planner comments to include sidewalk expansions and additional community elements such as sitting benches, a library box, a pavilion and a pet wash station. Ms. McIvor requested guidance from the Village on the Landscape considerations, which include shade tolerant ground cover between homes, ornamental trees at the front and rear corners of all homes and landscaping along Route 22 to be same as the Haydenwood unit type shown in the plan. The architectural review recommended continuing the shake and stone veneers onto the side and possibly the rear elevations.

Chairman Celske solicited comments and questions from the public.

Ken Witek, 401 Morgan Lane – Mr. Witek lives in the Hunters Farm subdivision. He asked why he did not receive any notifications regarding this proposal. Mr. Witek spoke against the proposed PUD due to traffic concerns, the Barrington 220 school district, and a belief that the PUD will reduce property values. Mr. Witek stated that a referendum was just passed, increasing homeowners property taxes to emphasize the overcrowded school district. Mr. Witek feels the PUD will negatively impact his property value that he described as being stagnant for the past eight (8) years. Mr. Witek questioned why two car garages were being offered versus one car, given the average resident per home was stated to be 1.65.

Lora Berger, 221 Bridle Path Court – No comment

Jerry and Emma Young, 201 Saddle Lane – Mrs. and Mr. Young are residents in the Hunters Farm subdivision and are not in favor of the Redwood development plan. Mrs. Young feels the number of projected students in the application are not representative of conditions in this community. Mr. Young finds the development attractive from an architectural standpoint, but does not agree that a 110-unit development would bring only eight (8) kids to the school district. Mr. Young feels given the demographics of District 220, this lower cost housing option will attract parents with school age children wishing to locate in District 220 to the development. He stated that there are not any parks in the development area, which will in turn drive kids to Hunters Farm Park. Mr. Young would like to see homes similar to Hunters Farm built in this location, which he feels, would help the value of their homes not hurt them.

Chris Gantz, 211 Bridle Path – Mr. Gantz recommended denial of the proposal. Mr. Gantz referred to his email sent to Mayor McLaughlin and the Planning & Zoning Commission citing the short and long-term consequences of rental developments, negative impact on property values, dangerous traffic impacts, adverse school system impacts, damaging environmental impact, and an adverse impact on village service as his concerns. Mr. Gantz identified Route 22 as a two-lane, major artery to the hospital and every minute matters in emergency transport, and he feels adding more traffic would negatively impact life safety. Mr. Gantz expressed concerns over public safety if an accident occurred as a result of this development.

Gaby Jasovic, 305 Saddle Lane –Mrs. Jasovic does not support the Redwood development. She expressed concerns about the density of the proposed development, narrow, curbless streets, lack of connectivity to Fox River Grove, lack of park amenities, school crowding, and traffic/speed limit concerns on Route 22 with kids ultimately attempting to cross Route 22 as reasons for objecting to the proposed development.

Cindy Cramer, 409 Morgan – Mrs. Cramer expressed concerns, related to safety, and environmental impacts as reasons not to support the petitioner's requests. She stated her concerns with school buses crossing Route 22, pedestrians crossing Route 22, environmental impacts on wetlands around the development and climate change requiring a certain amount of natural resource inventory. Mrs. Cramer feels the land would serve well as a conservation space.

Michael Danforth, 1107 Victoria Drive – Mr. Danforth is not in support of the petitioner's requests expressing concerns about safety, conservation, density, and lack of amenities. Mr. Danforth said he sees issues with the ingress and egress, conservation protection from transmission fluid, oil and gas leaks, the density of the development, and lack of recreation and business support within the project. Mr. Danforth feels the Village will not be happy changing the zoning from R1 to R3 and that the Village should stick with their original vision and reason for zoning the land R1 to begin with.

Korby Egert, 415 Morgan Lane – No comment

Michael Graft Jr., 565 Fox Glen Court – Mr. Graft is manager of a business in the Fox Glen area. He is in support of the Redwood development. He stated many of the concerns presented by residents tonight are the same concerns raised back when he went through the P&Z process for a special use PUD to build a twenty-four unit townhouse / business mixed-use development on County Line Road. Mr. Graft stated that 2017 tax deductions changed home buying and he sees the demand for rentals. Mr. Graft stated rent amounts are a bigger question. Higher rent usually equates to better care of property. Mr. Graft asked, "if not this, than what?" He suggested consideration be given by all on the positive impact residential development has on not just sewer and water costs, but on the overall community.

Richard Bielowicz, 212 Bridle Path Lane – Mr. Bielowicz is not in favor of the Redwood development. Mr. Beilowicz mentioned water/sewer infrastructure as a concern, expressing a belief that more users would require a system upgrade, which is very expensive and he does not see that as helping the community. He expressed overall concerns with the demand on Village services, and asked for completion of items raised in the environmental analysis.

Ms. McIvor accepted the opportunity to respond to residents' concerns. Ms. McIvor stressed that her presentation was thoughtfully planned out. Redwood complied with all notices and requirements. She explained that the traffic numbers came from a traffic memo and that a traffic study would be completed later in the process. She explained the reasons for design considerations with which the residents had expressed concern: 1) One-car garages do not meet the desires of the empty nesters targeted by this development, 2) the passive amenities make families less likely to want to locate in a Redwood development and which results in less school aged children. She stated the projected $2,400 per month rent is equivalent to mortgage and tax payments of a $350,000 home and comes with additional benefits such as no shoveling, no mowing, and no maintenance that the 50-plus age group is willing to pay for. She reiterated that the neighborhood has an onsite maintenance professional. Ms. McIvor referenced several studies of single-family homes next to PUD rental developments and they show that rental property does not impact the property value of nearby single-family homes. Redwood properties have a history showing they are safe, quiet and come highly recommended by their renters and the municipalities, which they are located. Ms. McIvor stated the reason for going with one-year leases is to allow management more flexibility, not renewing leases with clientele that is not compatible with the neighborhood values. The average lease life is 3.5 years. Ms. McIvor stated that Redwood understands wetlands and they are well versed on the requirements associated with impacting natural wetlands, and maintain existing wetlands is intentional and considered good practice. Ms. McIvor heard the mention that only eight (8) trees would be planted and ensured residents that hundreds of trees were included as part of the landscape plan. Speaking on the density of the plan, Ms. McIvor said it was not too dense with only 5.5 units per acre. The development has 464 parking spaces, 4 per home and additional guest parking in streets and private drive aisles. The reason for no curbs is to meet FHA requirements. The Village has expressed adequate utilities are in place to support the development. Crime studies have shown there to be less theft, domestic disturbances and assaults in Redwood developments versus surrounding neighborhoods.

Member James Buster questioned how Redwood would control who lived at the development. Ms. McIvor referenced several soft and firm measures in place to ensure knowledge of who is in their units. Member Buster stated he would not consider the proposal without a streetlight being put in on Route 22 at the entrance. Member Bloom expressed that he is not against the PUD proposed in concept, understanding of the need for housing for empty nesters, but feels that Redwood's projected impacts on traffic, District 220 are too low and has concerns with the density of the proposal. Member Paul Dimmick

cited anticipated surplus rental housing as his biggest reason for not being in favor at this time. While he acknowledged currently there are no rental properties available in Fox River Grove, which makes the development sound attractive, he stated with both Grove Residences and Redwood coming in at the same time, he fears it would create a surplus and that he would like to see Grove Residences filled first. Member Dimmick also agrees with the public comments raised, that families with kids could be looking to move there as a means to live within the boundaries of District 220. Member Tom Cramer asked how long it might take to fill Redwood and if units would all be built prior to leasing. Useable green space was also stated as a concern of Member Cramer.

Commissioner Celske expressed appreciation for the presentation and is not opposed to the PUD concept, but feels more information on traffic and school impact would be needed to consider approval. Commissioner Celske also feels the development is too dense and does not agree with Redwood's projected number of residents or cars per household, or the number of students the development will produce. A straw poll was taken.

A MOTION was made by Celske and seconded by Dimmick to recommend denial of the requests for special use, rezoning and variations. The Commission also directed Administrator Soderholm to draft a report reflecting the Commission's considerations relative to the zoning ordinance and recommendations to the Village Board. The findings of fact, as well as factual assertions as presented are adopted into this motion. A roll call vote was taken. Bloom—yes, Buster--yes, Cramer—yes, Dimmick—yes, Celske - yes. Motion Passed.
The public hearing for zoning case 2022-01 was closed at 9:03 p.m.

OTHER BUSINESS
None.

ADJOURNMENT
A motion was made by Bloom and seconded by Buster to adjourn the meeting. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Shelley Caesar

Shelley Caesar
Village Clerk
Village of Fox River Grove

4-27-2022

Date