

## **Staff Responses to Council Questions**

### **March 14, 2017**

**Consent Agenda Item B. (ADA Transition Plan) Removed from Consent Agenda** - At the request of Commissioner Waldack, Consent Agenda Item B. *Motion: Approve the Updated Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA Transition Plan* has been removed from the Consent Agenda for individual consideration at tonight's meeting.

#### **8. First Reading**

##### **C. Report: Facilities Sustainability Plan Update**

*Last week council was provided an email submitted to [dgfacilities@downers.us](mailto:dgfacilities@downers.us) by a resident. Have others submitted comments to [dgfacilities@downers.us](mailto:dgfacilities@downers.us)? If yes, can all submissions be shared with council?*

The Village has not received any additional comments submitted to [dgfacilities@downers.us](mailto:dgfacilities@downers.us).

*What is the estimated time that would elapse between council giving direction to proceed and actual closing on the sale of village land to a developer?*

It is estimated that this process could take between 6-12 months before closing on the sale of land. This estimate will be more specifically defined following the negotiation of the key terms of the redevelopment agreement. There are a number of key steps that will have to be performed between direction provided by Council and closing on the sale of Village land, including:

1. Negotiation of a redevelopment agreement
2. Developer due diligence on the property to be acquired
3. Developer submission of plans and completion of zoning entitlement process
4. Village approval of architectural design and construction management contracts
5. Village site selection and planning for use of temporary facilities

##### **E. Ordinance: Amend Stormwater and Flood Plain Provisions**

*Why were these changes not reviewed by the Stormwater & Floodplain Oversight Committee (SWFPOC)?*

The items proposed are clarifications needed to improve the permit process and ensure conformance with the Village's stormwater regulations. These clarifications were initiated by staff who review permits and work with applicants on a day to day basis. As these clarifications do not set new policy they were not presented to the SWFPOC for review.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

rEmarks are attached.

Submission to [dgfacilities@downers.us](mailto:dgfacilities@downers.us)



**rRemarks Data for March 14, 2017 Village Council Meeting**

Agenda Section	Agenda Item	Comment	Commenter
First Reading	C. REP 2016-6904 Facilities Sustainability Plan update	regarding the Washington Crossing-- the main problem is that cars do not use their turn signals. If the east side was closed off, traffic could still enter the downtown district and those wishing to go to the civic center would just have to go around the block. Easy to do and gets the job down. Safer for all. thanks	Cathy M Davidson, 916 Summit St, Downers Grove
	COMMENTS OF A GENERAL NATURE	Stop selling out our city to developers. Too many new apartment and condo buildings. This is how are city goes to ruin. We don't want to be another Chicago will all its inherent troubles. Stop over spending. This is DuPage not Cook County!	Sweet

March 7 - I was at tonight's meeting and also the prior meeting on Feb 28. My wife and I are residents of DG since 1986, and in our second DG home since 1991 and our two children went through the entire public school system here..

After reading thru the proposals and hearing all the discussion from the Council and public I would like to offer up the following:

1. Commendations to the Council and Village Staff for putting this comprehensive package of proposals together. Like some others I was a little surprised when I realized in the last few months that the earlier plan to remodel the Police Dept had been shelved in favor of this more comprehensive private/public partnership development. My initial reaction was that this was some sort of political ploy being pulled over on us taxpayers. However, after hearing the discussion and studying the materials on the Village website in some detail, I have come around to understand why all this makes sense at this time.

2. My general comment is a challenge to the Council to find the plan with the least \$ impact/most \$ advantage to the taxpayers while still minimizing the risk to the Village. The highest density apartment proposal initially sounded very scary and unreasonable to me, but having read thru it completely tonight, I am coming around to ask the question: "Why could this not work ?" The advantage of this choice obviously accrues to the property taxpayers (lowest net cost/highest savings), and there are side benefits in potentially adding a significant base of new customers to the struggling downtown businesses including restaurants, coffee shops, the Tivoli and various stores. So I will ask the Council and Village staff to consider carefully the potential downside(s) to the high density apartment proposal, and really consider -- could this work in a place like Downers Grove ?. The developer's proposal obviously seems to imply they believe they can make it work, though I do not understand the implications of their "guaranteed revenue" proposal on the option for taxable vs. tax-free bond financing. If that "revenue guarantee" forces the Village to use a non-tax advantaged bond issue, then perhaps the next less-dense apartment proposal is a better choice ? What other downside/risk is there for either of these apartment options, and what can the Village do to mitigate or best manage that ?

I hear lots of concern across the Council about whether the D.G. market can absorb the many rental properties from all the approved/potential new building occurring simultaneously downtown, but am wondering if someone with the needed expertise can advise the Council if the market for apartments adjacent to Metra stations is larger than just what we see in Downers Grove ? In other words, will people looking for apartments served by the train be looking at the overall supply/demand in locations from (say) LaGrange to Naperville, and is that really the market dynamic that needs to be taken into account ? Soliciting multiple opinions from experts in this issue might provide useful input to the final decisionmaking...

3. While there are attractions to the Medical Office development (adding a new type of development downtown, with some new jobs in that area), the proposal does the least for property taxpayers. We do need to also recognize that water/stormwater bills have increased substantially in a very short span of time, so the effective fee burden from this plus property taxes is significant for many taxpayers. I also would prefer any of the residential developments in that they put the new parking underground. A large parking lot next to this Medical Office is not the most attractive thing to have smack in the middle of the Village in my opinion, and would not seem to be the best use of the available land.

Thanks for listening...