



Agenda  
Village of Glen Ellyn  
Roosevelt Road/Taft Avenue Hotel Ad Hoc Work  
Group  
Monday, June 13, 2022  
7:00 PM  
Glen Ellyn Police Department Community Room  
65 S. Park Blvd.

---

Meeting Procedures Statement

*Visitors are most welcome to attend all meetings of the Village Board and can find copies of the Agenda on their chairs or online at [www.glenellyn.org](http://www.glenellyn.org) prior to the meeting. Any individual with a disability requiring a reasonable accommodation in order to participate in a meeting should contact The Village of Glen Ellyn ADA Coordinator, 630-469-5000, at least five (5) business days in advance of the next scheduled meeting. All matters on the Agenda may be discussed, amended, and acted upon.*

**A. Call to Order**

**B. Roll Call**

**C. Approval of Minutes**

- 1) Revised April 6, 2022 Roosevelt Road/Taft Avenue Hotel Ad Hoc Work Group Listening Session Minutes
- 2) May 5, 2022 Roosevelt Road/Taft Avenue Hotel Ad Hoc Work Group Listening Session Minutes

**D. Audience Participation**

- 1) Open:

Members of the public are welcome to speak to any item not specifically listed on tonight's agenda for up to (3) three minutes. For those items which are on tonight's agenda, the public will have the opportunity to comment at the time the item is discussed. In either case, please complete the Audience Participation form and turn it in to the Working Group. It is requested that, if possible, one spokesman for a group be appointed to present the views of the entire group. Speakers who are recognized are requested to step to a microphone and state their name, their topic and the group, if any, they are representing prior to addressing the Working Group. Individuals wishing to address the Board shall exercise proper decorum and respect for the proceedings and the business of the Working Group, and shall refrain from abusive demeanor and language. The practice of ceding time to other speakers shall be prohibited, except in the discretion of the presiding officer of the meeting. Public officials are not obligated to respond to questions.

In lieu of participating in the live meeting, the public may also complete a public comment form, which will be read into the record during the meeting. This form can be found at [www.glenellyn.org/publiccomment](http://www.glenellyn.org/publiccomment).

**E. Presentations Regarding Potential Commercial Options for the Property**

- 1) CJ McCann, Commercial Broker

- 2) Rick Massa, American Realty Advisors
  - 3) Jonathan Brazier, Hines
  - 4) Dan Lyne, CBRE
- F. Discussion of Vehicular & Pedestrian Traffic Near the Property (Police Chief Phil Norton)**
  - G. Presentation Regarding Attainable Housing (John Day)**
  - H. Discussion of Design Charette Process and Schedule (Valerie Kretchmer, Consultant)**
  - I. Other Business**
  - J. Adjourn**



Minutes  
Village of Glen Ellyn  
Roosevelt Road/Taft Avenue Hotel Site Ad Hoc  
Work Group  
Wednesday, April 6, 2022  
7:00 PM  
Glen Ellyn Police Department Community Room  
65 S. Park Blvd., Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

---

**A. Call to Order**

President Senak called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

**B. Roll Call**

Upon roll call by Village Manager Franz, the following Ad Hoc Work Group members responded "present".

President Senak  
Trustee Payne  
Donna Kemp  
Kevin McGrane  
Norris Eber  
Vik Mehta  
Marty Durkin  
Nick Nelson  
Clara Hughes  
Renie Atchison  
Katie Kreller  
Rachna Thakkar  
Dr. Emily Tammaru

**C. Ad Hoc Work Group Introduction**

The members of Work Group introduced themselves.

**D. Open Meetings Act (OMA)/Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Training**

Assistant Village Manager Rodman provided an overview of the Open Meetings Act and Freedom of Information Act.

**E. Audience Participation**

President Senak explained purpose of the meeting.

Assistant Village Manager Rodman provided an overview of the site and the public engagement process.

A Work Group member asked why there was an option to post comments anonymously on the Social Pinpoint application. President Senak stated he won't give as much weight to anonymous comments. Trustee Payne stated he believes people should be required to state their name. The Work Group discussed whether they support an option for anonymous comments and whether addresses should also be required. Village Attorney Mathews reminded the group that the Village cannot require those making public comment to provide their address. The consensus of the Work Group was that they did not support anonymous comments.

The Work Group asked about the timeline for the affordable housing consultant study that was recently approved by the Village Board. Village Manager Franz responded the study is anticipated to be completed in approximately six months. The findings will inform future policy decisions by the Village Board.

### Public Comment

Joyce Hothan spoke in support of affordable housing as the best option for the site. She stated that the 10% requirement of the Illinois Fair Housing Act is a floor not a ceiling. She asserted that there is currently a lack of diversity of housing, a lack of affordable housing and an overall lack of supply of housing options.

Julie Evans spoke in support of the need for housing for developmentally disabled adults. She stated they need affordable housing because many of them don't earn a living wage, don't drive and need lifelong daily living support. She reiterated the need for affordable, accessible, and supportive housing.

Keith Lavin stated there are too many existing safety issues at the corner of Park and Taft and housing will further contribute to this problem. He noted that classroom sizes in School District #89 are already too large. Mr. Lavin stressed the need for the Village to establish a quota for affordable housing in all new developments. He also noted that the Comprehensive Plan designates the property for commercial uses.

Tom Turek spoke in support of 55+ (senior housing) development that is affordable to this age demographic.

David Firchau stated he wasn't interested in affordable housing on this site. He asked what the hurry was to move forward with redevelopment. He suggested a swimming pool or some other amenity should be developed to serve residents south of Roosevelt Road.

Sarah Allen spoke in support of affordable housing. She stated it is essential to the well-being of individuals and communities. She noted the property has value beyond commercial uses. Ms. Allen suggested mixed use as an option and stressed the importance of providing good quality affordable housing for existing residents.

Jason Loebach stated that he is currently involved in work to support inclusion services for marginalized people. He shared that he has a 6-year-old with Down Syndrome and wants his son to have the ability to grow and stay in Glen Ellyn.

Lynn Bruno stated that she believes it's important everyone view Glen Ellyn as one community, She asserted the north versus south rhetoric only serves to divide the community. Ms. Bruno noted that when a community takes care of each other's children through the school system, we all benefit. She stated that Village needs housing for its workforce. She requested the Village not give TIF dollars for any type of development on the site.

Kelly North stated she was concerned about affordable housing. She asked why the Village paid \$2.85 million for the property if it was appraised at \$2.1 million? She inquired about the current and project tax revenue? She stressed the need to develop the site to support tax revenue generation. Ms. North stated that it appears to her the Village bought the property to build affordable housing and is now trying to justify this approach. She suggested the Village should take a vote of the entire community to decide what to do with the property.

Brian Milnamow introduced himself as the moderator for the south Glen Ellyn resident Facebook group. Shared that he had numerous conversations with neighbors and based on those conversations he is against using the space for affordable housing. Property taxes in Glen Ellyn are too high in comparison to other DuPage County communities with median home values over \$300,00, Glen Ellyn pays the highest percentage of property taxes. Higher than Wheaton, Clarendon Hills, Elmhurst, Oakbrook, Downers Grove and Burr Ridge. They are able to keep them low due to the abundance of commercial tax revenue that we do not have. Of the communities mentioned, only Downers Grove has a higher percentage of affordable housing than Glen Ellyn. Downers Grove pays 2% less in property taxes. The schools are incredibly important to our community. The schools are also why we agreed to pass a referendum to increase our school taxes. As a result of the referendum south Glen Ellyn residents pay more in taxes. The school that a housing development at this site would feed into is already the highest most diverse school with over 25% of the students are eligible to receive assistance. Adding affordable housing here will negatively impact our schools, test scores, and therefore impact the home values and therefore tax dollars into the schools. We should do all we can to optimize our existing affordable housing stock versus just adding more.

Rechna Chandhori shared some information she collected, stating there are currently nine developments underway in Glen Ellyn, including 376 units of new housing. She explained that new development affects existing development. She asked about the total housing capacity of Glen Ellyn and questioned the Village's ability to support additional housing. She noted there is an uneven balance of

housing development which is continuing to increase school populations to a greater extent in District #89 (Parkview) vs. District #41 (Ben Franklin).

Jamie Martin stated that anything built on the site will be better than the hotels were. She stated she has an autistic son who is 18. She explained that 80% of autistic kids are unemployed or underemployed. Ms. Martin noted the site is good option for supportive housing for developmentally disabled adults.

Corey Meyers asserted there are not as many park district facilities in south Glen Ellyn as there are north of Roosevelt Road. He suggested an indoor recreational facility for sports, ball fields, etc. would be a welcome use for the site.

Lauren Avanteen stated she heard there were four developments that were turned away by the Village and inquired as to why they were not supported by the Village. Village Manager Franz responded that the property has been on and off the market for a number of years. He further explained that he is unaware of any developments being brought forward to the Village or being turned down by the Village. Manager Franz responded that annual property taxes prior to the Village purchasing the property was \$60,000. He noted that when redeveloped, the revenue stream will be higher.

A member of the audience requested the Village provide an explanation of Tax Increment Financing (TIF).

At the conclusion of Public Comment, President Senak asked the Work Group members to share their comments regarding redevelopment of the site.

### Discussion

Member Durkin stated the Village needs to consider vehicle/pedestrian access to the site and pedestrian and vehicular safety. He discussed the need for people to have access to employment. He encouraged the completion of a traffic study to evaluate any proposed development. He noted the need for the Village to consider the return on investment when redeveloping the property and to consider the need to maintain an appropriate revenue base.

Member Eber stated that he is a former shopping center developer. He noted that Taft Ave is used as an alternate to Roosevelt Road. He does not believe the site is convenient or safe for residential uses. He stated this is a challenging site because its irregular in shape and not appealing for commercial development. Mr. Eber stated that he ran a pro forma for the site and doesn't believe the Village get a return on investment if its developed commercially. He reiterated the need to consider the impact to traffic on Taft Avenue.

Member Thakkar shared her concerns about the safety of pedestrian/bikers. She stated she was not sure if the site is developed with affordable housing that it's

going to provide the best quality of life for the residents. She stated she believes the Village needs data to determine best use for the site.

Member Nelson stated he believes redeveloping the site with housing is counterintuitive because of the surrounding uses. He noted that he feels there are two Glen Ellyn's, with two Glen Ellyn school districts and higher taxes in south Glen Ellyn. He wants South Glen Ellyn schools to thrive, not suffer. He believes that if affordable housing is built on the site it will be an "island" and be out of place on Roosevelt Road.

Member Tammaru (Superintendent of School District #89) stated that she is present to provide factual information about D89. She noted that the School District did change its boundaries years ago. She explained the District previously passed a referendum to support operating expenses and committed to not asking for additional funding for 10 years. She explained that based on the average home price in D89 of \$427,000, residents will see a decrease in taxes of \$239 due to some bonds expiring this spring. Dr. Tammaru stated that D89 enrollment has increased 12% while state-wide enrollment is down 17% and DuPage County enrollment is down 9.5%. She noted that in terms of capacity, the elementary schools as a whole are 85% full. Specifically, Parkview is the second most occupied school. She reviewed the 2021 District Report Cards for both D41 and D89.

Member McGrane stated the hotels were a problematic use. He noted that the ability for South Glen Ellyn to generate tax revenue is limited due to the amount of land that is occupied by the Village Links [golf course] and the College of DuPage. He suggested a restaurant/gathering space is needed south of Roosevelt. He stated the site should remain commercial. He's concerned about crime and overburdening schools if affordable housing is developed on the site. He noted the site is not ideal for residential due to the surrounding uses. He suggested considering housing for adults with disabilities at the U.S. Bank site. He asserted that it is dangerous to cross the streets in this area. He also expressed concern that putting housing on this site might violate EPA guidelines due to the proximity of a gas station. He asserted that he spoke with the Township Assessor who stated that commercial uses would generate more tax revenue.

Trustee Payne asked the Work Group for their thoughts on the existing affordable housing on Pershing Avenue, located behind the Jewel/Osco.

Member McGrane stated that while the affordable housing is surrounded by other housing uses, he doesn't think it blends with the neighborhood.

Ms. Wolfen, a member of the audience, mentioned she is an ESL teacher and knows many families who live in that housing complex and it's a great place to live and for children to grow up.

Member Mehta expressed concern about adding affordable housing on the site because of the increased tax burden. He believes this is a great opportunity on Roosevelt Road and it could be so much more. He concurred there is a need for affordable housing in the community, but reiterated this site is not best location.

Member Hughes stated that she believes this discussion is a great opportunity for civil discourse within the community. She said he doesn't want to exclude the less fortunate from the community. She explained there are non-profit housing developments which provide for people who need help with daily living and these entities manage their facilities.

Member Kemp stated she understands and relates to the need for housing for disabled adults and senior housing. However, she is concerned about traffic safety if housing built on the hotel site. She expressed concerns with regard to the proximity of the gas station to the site, and limited access to amenities. She stated that affordable housing in this location seems impractical. Ms. Kemp suggested the Village consider a youth center or community center as a gathering place (e.g. Wheaton, Villa Park).

Member Atchison restated the need for supportive housing in the community. She stated the property was available for years on the market. She believes the Village's plans are not representative of all of Glen Ellyn. She stated there is a need to care for the community's children. She shared the story of her son Rob who has a developmental disability and is limited to having no more than \$2,000 at any time because otherwise some of his supportive services are taken away. She reiterated the need to provide supportive housing for adults with disabilities.

Member Nelson stated the Pershing Apartments are an example of an appropriate transition from commercial to multi-family housing and then single-family housing.

President Senak stated the estimated cost to demolish the building is approximately \$1M dollar. He asked the Work Group for their thoughts on whether the Village should demolish the property.

The following members support demolishing the buildings: Norris, Atchison, Nelson, Durkin.

Member McGrane stated the Village should evaluate the total investment in the property before making the decision.

Trustee Payne stated he doesn't believe the cost to demolish the buildings has been fully evaluated.

President Senak asked about Work Group's interest in keeping the site as open land.

The general consensus of the Work Group was that maintaining the site as open land long term doesn't make sense. It may make sense in the short-term in order to allow the Village to acquire additional property for redevelopment.

President drew an outline of the property, illustrating the existing Exmor right-of-way which splits the property. He asked the Work Group to consider selling just the portion of the portion which fronts Roosevelt Road. He noted that an easement needs to remain where the right-of-way currently lies and a traffic study evaluating the impact of vacating the right-of-way will also need to be completed. The Work Group acknowledged the possibility of selling only the Roosevelt Road portion but felt retaining the full property would maximize redevelopment opportunity.

President Senak asked the Work Group to continue considering selling off portions of the property. He asked the Work Group if they thought the Village should put the property on the market now (for sale by owner)?

Member Eber expressed concern that listing the property for sale now may cause confusion without a plan. Word is out about the Village owning the property in the commercial development world.

Member McGrane stated the Village has a fiduciary responsibility to put the property on the market as we move forward.

Member Thakkar stated she sees no harm in putting the property out there.

Ms. Kemp concurred.

Member Tammaru agreed with the notion of putting it on the market, stating that the Village doesn't actually have to sell it.

Member Durkin expressed concern someone may buy it before the buildings are taken down and then hold the property, which would result in the community and continuing to have problems with the site.

Member Mehta stated he supported placing the property on the market, as the Village may get some good ideas in the process that will help inform things.

Member Atchison agreed with Member Durkin and stated the Village should take the buildings down now.

Member Nelson stated he had no strong opinion either way.

Member Hughes believes we should wait to list the properties, noting the Village has entered into a process to be mindful and plan for a better result. She expressed concern if we sell the property we may lose control of the end result.

Member McGrane stated he believes it's better for a developer to buy the property and take the buildings down. He thinks the developer should take the financial risk.

**F. Discussion**

- 1) Available Information: [Roosevelt Road Hotel Properties Redevelopment](#)
- 2) Public Feedback Received To-Date

**G. Next Meeting Date**

May 4, 2022, 7:00 PM at the Police Department Community Room, 65 S Park Blvd

**H. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 10:26 pm.



Minutes  
Village of Glen Ellyn  
Roosevelt Road/Taft Avenue Hotel Site Ad Hoc  
Work Group  
Thursday, May 5, 2022  
7:00 PM  
Glen Ellyn Police Department Community Room  
65 S. Park Blvd., Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

---

**A. Call to Order**

President Senak called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

**B. Roll Call**

The following Ad Hoc Work Group members were present.

President Senak  
Trustee Payne  
Donna Kemp  
Kevin McGrane  
Norris Eber  
Vik Mehta  
Nick Nelson  
Clara Hughes  
Renie Atchison  
Rachna Thakkar  
Dr. Emily Tammaru  
Rev. James Shannon  
Mark Shannon  
Mark Pfefferman

Village Staff noted in attendance, Village Manager Mark Franz and Assistant Village Manager Emily Rodman.

**C. Audience Participation**

Public Comment

Naazish Yarkhan spoke about her children attended school in D41. Lives in Glendale Heights and works at social services organization. Could not afford to live in Glendale Heights without two incomes. We lose diversity when we assume low-income means bad people. Consider who you are keeping out, people like me and my husband, highly educated.

Debbie White lives near Blackberry market, wants affordable housing in Glen Ellyn, like DuPage Habitat for Humanity. Shared stories of Habitat for Humanity home owners. Affordable housing residents are just looking for safe, reliable housing for their families.

Kim Reed shared she's a resident and volunteer. Supports affordable, accessible, supportive housing. Wants to dispel concerns about number of students generated by affordable housing and shared statistics. She shared stories of Glenbard South and West graduates and expressed need for affordable housing.

Bob Deitch shared he can see the hotels from his house. He appreciates the Village purchasing the property and the public input process. High school taxes in D89 is self-inflicted due to referendum. Housing location is good due to proximity to grocery. School overcrowding is a separate issue. Glen Ellyn to provide housing for all need to impact for walkability, signage, traffic safety and suggested Pulte Homes property may be a better location.

Jen Bystry commented property was awful for the past eight years. Spoke to objections to affordable housing. Safety: can make affordable housing safe; school overcrowding: will all affordable housing residents have children attending schools?; taxes: there are other opportunities for common space. Have an opportunity to show leadership and be a model for how to do affordable housing right.

Roger Houghes is a member of DuPage United and addressed the following concerns:

- Commercial development is not really viable
- Community center – the Village doesn't want to own property, residential development will create constant stream of tax revenue
- Affordable housing will general same number of service calls – Glen Ellyn Police doesn't show that
- Taft Ave is too dangerous for housing – let's do a traffic study and let experts determine
- Too close to gas station – there are other examples of housing next to gas stations
- Too noisy – there is housing next to the Metra station

Affordable housing is viable and desirable option and consistent with Village values.

David Firchau recalls 1985 when hotels went downhill. Received a voucher back when he was an addict from his church which enable him and others to feed their addiction. He is low income and would like to see some recreational amenity. Bowling alley, swimming pool, recreation center, show some love to south Glen

Ellyn. Put supportive housing at Main Street Recreation Center, it's a better location. Affordable housing will bring people from outside Glen Ellyn, not serve our own residents. Sean Castens office says he's been working with the Village on affordable housing on this site.

Paul Kuchuris stated poor site for residential because of traffic. Affordable housing, we don't need it on this site. Downtown Glen Ellyn has 2 developments that could be affordable housing. Sympathetic to need for affordable housing, more than our share of affordable housing on south side.

Scott Waldbusser stated the way we view the issue has been skewed. No one is against affordable housing and helping others. People are skewing the facts and being condescending. Empathize with the need for supportive housing, it would be a horrible place to put disabled adults. Its dishonest to say that people don't like poor people. How involved were affordable housing advocates with downtown developments?

Senak commented: [Affordable Housing] was not discussed with Apex, two (2) units are being included in the McChesney development.

Carlos Chivardi is opposed to housing being built on this site. Not against affordable housing in general, but doesn't support rezoning for this purpose. Stress on schools and expenses which drivees property taxes, current residents have to pay for affordable housing, making the whole community less affordable. Need to do what is in the best interest of taxpayers. Site is not appropriate for housing, it is dangerous for kids and isolated. Put affordable housing in areas already zoned residential, it would be better integrated and more dignified. Building affordable housing on this site is a breach of trust with the community.

President Senak introduced the two members of the work group who were not at the last meeting.

Member Pfefferman commented that affordable housing and community use are not mutually exclusive.

Reverend Shannon, from People's Community Church, didn't understand the connection between housing and crime. Affordable housing doesn't result in crime infestation.

President Senak called the on another person to comment on public comment.

Michael Chung is concerned and frustrated. Feels that a promise has been made by the Village Board to build affordable housing on the site already. Frustrated because he feels the Village Board should be listening to those most closely impacted, those who are nearby. Panfish Park can become the Lake Ellyn of south Glen Ellyn. Concerned because as a resident, feels that affordable housing will be pushed

through regardless of what is said by residents. Board should be listening to opinions of residents that live in the Parkview school area. Panfish area should be the Lake Ellyn of this area.

Senak commented: No vote has been taken regarding the site and this process would not be happening if a decision was already made regarding the redevelopment of the site.

Payne commented: The [Village] Board acts by vote, and no vote has happened, no promises have been made.

### Discussion

Work Group discussed the minutes. Pages 1 & 5, correct the spelling of Member Atchison's name. Page 5 Hughes changed from he to she. Strike "this not necessarily affordable housing depending on how its defined".

Approval of Minutes was tabled in order to distribute to other members.

Milton Township Assessor Chris Levan was introduced to address questions about how property taxes are assessed.

Assessor Levan explained that they use the market, income and cost to assess value, typically use market and income. For affordable housing, section 42 & section 8 can only use income value to assess based on Illinois statute. Rent paid is fixed, owner pays utilities, rent equals 30% of income and rest is funded by federal government, below market value.

Assessor Levan provided the example between affordable housing and market rate development taxes: For a 300-unit property, affordable housing \$442,096 taxes vs. market rate \$582,590 taxes.

McGrane asked about the difference between 42 & 8 housing?

Levan: They are taxed the same. Section 42, all revenue comes from the residents. Section, residents only pay 30% of the revenue and the federal government pays the difference.

Norris: Are there a lot of sales of affordable housing developments?

Levan: No, rarely sold because how they are financed, 1% loan amortized over 50 years.

Norris: How does affordable housing compare to commercial (e.g. Chick fil A)?

Levan: Hard to answer hypotheticals.

Nelson: How do commercial properties on Roosevelt Road compare to rest of township?

Levan: Roosevelt Road is at \$10, downtown area is \$40 because of land value. But Roosevelt Road properties are doing just fine.

Franz: Are multi-family units and affordable housing units considered commercial uses?

Levan: Yes, but can only base affordable housing on income.

Nelson: Confirmed that all else being equal, an affordable housing development would be assessed lower than a market rate development; income vs. income/market rate.

Levan: Yes.

Nelson: Do you know the assessed value of the hotel site currently?

Levan: It is pretty low.

Franz: Taxes when the Village purchased it were \$60,000.

Franz: Confirmed that assessed value of affordable housing is done on commercial market and income basis, except for 42/8.

Levan: Correct.

Audience member: What if only a few units are affordable housing in a market rate building?

Levan: Assessed at market/income approach.

Cat Vielma, Redstone Equity Partners, was introduced by President Senak to speak to Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC)- Section 42 housing. She provided history of LIHTC program. HUD sets rents for program and Illinois Housing Department Authority (IHDA) sets broad parameters for what housing must look like. Federal government awards LIHTC credits to states and then IHDA awards the credits to the "best" development. LIHTC are good for 10 years and are often higher than development actual tax bill. Developer sells the tax credits to banks because banks are required to invest in community. Banks provide oversight on property because its an investment asset for 30 years (IHDA).

Thakkar: Is there an assessment done before IHDA awards credits to evaluate appropriateness?

Vielma: Yes, IHDA looks at Phase I, market study, safety, etc. as part of evaluation. Project is then evaluated again by investment firm.

Chivardi: Inquired about liability of property owner.

Vielma: There is always an owner operated behind the LLP, LLC. LIHTEC funds 98% of affordable housing (used to build housing). LIHTEC applies primarily to 100% affordable housing, sometimes used for mixed use. IHDA qualified allocation plan is a document that sets forth standards for LIHTC development. Oversight by National Low Income Housing Council.

Kon Savoy shared a brief presentation of Tax Increment Financing. Answered questions about how TIF works.

McGrane: Stressed that he would like to see as much emphasis put on commercial uses for the site as on affordable housing.

Kretchmer: Consider that a developer may build a commercial property but lease it out to non-sales tax generating businesses [service]. Which would not add to the total tax revenue.

Eber: Another proposal is going to Plan Commission for more housing within the TIF district. If this site goes residential also, that's an impact on the TIF.

Tammaru: Expressed concern over the EAV in D89, which is almost \$20M less than the other school district. So considering what will be built and how that will impact the EAV going forward.

Franz: how do you compare the EAV, district over district?

Tammaru: Looking at one community with similar boundaries and less commercial sales tax dollars. Comparable housing different students per school district. D89 has less.

Nelson: Have any steps been taken to listing the property now? Knows developers interested but don't feel invited to participate.

Senak: The Board will be considering whether to list the site now rather than wait. Would like the authority to move forward with listing it.

Nelson: when will the public know.

Senak: Once a broker is hired and it is listed for a priced decided by the Board it will become public.

Eber: Look for a national retail brokerage company.

Senak: Yes, is the short answer. Someone who can produce results.

Eber: Glen Ellyn over paid for the site, anyone who is interested probably won't pay what the Village paid. Will the Village engage with Choose DuPage and other organizations.

Senak: once the Board decides to list then the Village will engage with all development partners.

Franz: Once the board determines direction, staff will partner with all the organizations to help promote the development of the site.

Nelson: Shouldn't we be engaging with these organizations right now.

Senak: Those are not mutually exclusive and we'll work through all these groups and explore all options.

Payne: We can do both and will be a little confusing to find the direction for the developers.

McCrane: Pricing will vary based on use.

Senak: The questions will be how much do we want to incentivize any development.

McCrane: Developers see it as an opportunity because the Village owns it. Can the process be faster?

Franz: Same process for approvals regardless if the Village owns it or not.

Kemp: Does the property have to be demoed?

Franz: Nothing will be able to be reused, but not necessarily demoed right now.

Senak: Wait on demolishing in case a developer wants it and is willing to tear it down. If not maybe the Village demolishes it and then it will be more interesting for developers.

Franz: Concern about the duo track for the project and sending mixed messages to developers about what the Board wants to see at this site.

Next meeting the Group requested additional information on commercial development and public safety.

## **F. Discussion**

- 1) Available Information: [TIF Presentation Shared at the Meeting](#)
- 2) Public Feedback Received To-Date
- 3) Minutes from April 6, 2022 Adhoc Work Group Meeting with edits

**G. Next Meeting Date**

June 2, 2022, 7:00 PM at the Police Department Community Room, 65 S Park Blvd

**H. Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 pm.