



rRemarks Data for September 01, 2026 Village Council Meeting

Agenda Section & Item: Comments of a General Nature

Commenter: Patrick Mucha

Comment: I request the full removal of all Flock and Flock-style cameras in the town along with assurances that similar systems not be used in the future. The warrantless use of mass surveillance, loss of privacy and continual stories of people abusing the system should be more than enough to sever all ties with the company and stop usage of such technologies in the future.

Agenda Section & Item: Active - MOT 2026-11303 A. Motion: Accepting the Attainable Housing Study Report

Commenter: David Rose

Comment: Comment on affordable housing report and discussion.

In light of the Longfellow (Lngf) fiasco, it is difficult to listen to VC's discussions of the affordable housing report and the proposed tree ordinance report and not be outraged.

VC reports should be understood as signals to residents of actions VC is considering.

The data provided in a report are meant to legitimize those intentions, as if VC's actions are thereby a response to public input rather than what they really are, which is a modest effort to 'do something' in order to avoid being criticized for doing nothing.

With respect to housing, the horse is already out of the barn, so to speak. It's a problem of multiple VCs' own creation.

Which CC indirectly admitted when he observed that a VC decades ago asked for a similar report about housing in DG.

For all the data the report does include, it offers little useful info in terms of either composition or trends. Other than its interest in price changes.

Implicit in VC's discussion of the current report — and self-evident to anyone living in DG the past decades — is that the trend in DG has been more housing and more expensive housing, with little to no attention given to maintaining a stock of 'affordable housing' within DG's boundaries.

Why this trend? It was not driven by VC's need to fill a housing shortage; it was driven by recent VCs' need to overcome prior VCs failure to collect property tax sufficient to pay for foreseeable expenses, such as the infrastructure work done in the downtown and the construction of a new village hall and police station. The Lngf fiasco was driven in part by a similar deficiency by DG58's boards.

DG's housing pattern was also a response to changing retail patterns in the country, specifically the mallification of America that compelled many munis to change their downtown from a retail center to an entertainment district.

Mallification is now under pressure, thanks to the rise of online shopping and the use of distribution facilities to deliver purchases. How long will that pattern last? As recent VC discussions revealed, commercial office buildings and malls no longer serving their original purpose may be repurposed to provide more housing. While the report does suggest subsidies and policies can help, it does not explore what will be required to make a sufficient number of the resulting units 'affordable.'

Painful missed opportunity: Converting Lngf to multi-family housing could have saved the historic school building and the old oak trees on the property ... and provided affordable housing. But no, DG58 and VC grabbed for the money, allowed 12 McMansions to be built on land cleared of its trees and much of its soil. All while disregarding neighbors' contention the change was contrary to the Comp Plan and VC's purported goal of maintaining neighborhood integrity. "They'll get used to it" was the now-departed-from-VC, little authoritarian's callous and ignorant response. Will any of the actions VC is considering make a difference? Maybe. But judging by the experts' comments the consultant provided, not much. Almost certainly not enough.

The data provided suggests the communities referenced who took steps of the kind DG is considering 'did something' but not enough to 'solve the problem'.

Nothing in the report suggests a better outcome lies ahead for DG, regardless of what VC decides to do.

Indeed, when CC BB asked the consultant how to gauge success, Consultant offered as an example 'build some ADUs' that the public will see as VC's effort to address the seniors-wanting-to-downsize concern/complaint. In other words, he gave the usual political definition of success: "do something."

How is that a measure of success when the report provides no data indicating the extent of actual housing needs for any of the target, purportedly underserved groups?

Which points to a major deficiency in the report: where's the data regarding the actual number and type of dwelling units required for the "housing problem" to be 'solved' ... relative to the current composition of housing in DG?

Affordable housing is a challenging problem in the US, in no small part because of the class segregation in muni development that characterized the post WWII period. Well-to-do people don't want their servants, working class, and low-level service providers living in their towns and driving down their residential property prices. This bias applies to most of a muni's public employees as well.

The report's travel data suggests the pattern holds for people working in DG. It's one's of the more damning pieces of data in the report.

The most notable and damning piece of data in the report is the table on page 17 of incomes versus renting/owning prospects in various local munis.

History shows residents in property-rich towns in IL don't want to alter IL's current method of relying on prop taxes to pay for K12 education, a method that reinforces the muni-based class segregation. Which casts doubt that the report's proposals will actually help solve IL's housing problem, of which DG is a piece.

Indeed, i would argue the report's key shortcoming is that It fails to examine housing as part of a larger socio-political economic problem involving issues that extend well beyond DG and well beyond housing per se.

For example, Why is the problem framed as not enough affordable housing? Why isn't it framed as too much unaffordable housing?

Why is the problem not framed as a failure of local governments to work more closely together, as some of VC's discussion hinted? That failure encompasses both policy formation and provision of housing itself.

I see no indication in EDC reports or elsewhere that housing for a business's workers has ever been a factor when VC tries to attract a business to its domain. If the housing its employees need doesn't exist locally, why isn't the business required to help finance the task of filling the gap BEFORE it's allowed to 'move in'? That neglect/disregard is another manifestation of muni-based class segregation that the report does little to address.

I would also point out that a major contributor to the lack of affordable housing in the US is the financialization of the US economy over the past 40+ years. The geographic class divide cited above is at root socio-political economic.

The de-industrialization of the US economy has hallowed out the middle class, yielding a bifurcation of the citizenry in which only the top 10% feel like they're getting ahead. A major reason housing isn't affordable is because incomes haven't kept up with rising prices. Not only for transportation, consumer goods, and food but also for rent or a mortgage.

Owning a house is marketed to Americans as an investment, that is, a method (the prime method?) the average family can use to build wealth. However, thanks to the financialization, it's a debt trap in which one pays a mortgage lending entity far more than the house is worth on the one hand and pays (prop) taxes to local government on the debt embedded in the house's inflated price on the other! The price inflation metastasizes to every property's taxed 'value'!! It's a ponzi scheme within the class war! And we are going to rue the day when the scheme blows up. Also worth noting: housing in the US is built upon the conceptual legal foundation of "property rights" and as such has been undertaken in complete disregard of the ECOS of the way of living that results. Which is to say, as I have noted repeatedly to VC, our way of living in the US including in DG is not ECOS.

In that vein, I would remind that in the case of DG and communities surrounding Chicago, growth of their populations and economies in recent decades is not possible without Chi's political leaders being willing to commit municipal self harm by selling water to its suburban neighbors. When these towns are located outside the Lake Michigan watershed, that action violates a key tenet of the great lakes compact, because none of them, including DG, return that water to the lake as the compact purportedly requires.

In other words, to overcome the housing problem, people will need to overcome their conceptual problem; they must come to understand the phrase 'property rights', as interpreted in the US capitalist economy, means 'the right to be socially and ecologically ignorant and abusive'.

Initial efforts in the US to address the shortcoming as it pertains to the environment have taken the opposite approach: a few communities have given nature "property rights," in an effort to deter/prevent some form of polluting behavior. Usually, the end result is simply to shift the problem elsewhere; "out of sight, out of mind".

To my knowledge, never does a community (a county, a state, a region, a nation, a collection of nations, the collection of all nations) ask, is our way of living ECOS?

That question is a bridge too far.

In sum, VC should reject the report in its current form and order a new one.

VC won't do that, of course. Which begs an obvious question: what criteria did VC set as the basis for accepting or rejecting the report? It acts like the criteria for acceptance was: "Did the report generate some ideas for possible actions?" Not exactly a high bar.

The recommendations in the report might have had some utility 20-30 years ago; today, they're too late.

The housing problems facing DG and the US more generally in the years ahead will be solved if and only if they are addressed within a framework in which the primary question is: is our way of living ECOS?

VC and DG residents are far from recognizing this reality. How will they react when they do?