



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.