

**MINUTES
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
JANUARY 13, 2021**

ZOOM TELECONFERENCE MEETING (ID: 839 7200 5334)

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83972005334>

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairperson Rosenthal called the regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals to order at 6:30 PM on Wednesday, January 13, 2021 via Zoom Teleconference Meeting, hosted at City Hall, 101 Green Street, Galena, IL.

ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM:

As Roll Call was:

Baranski	Present
Bochniak	Present
Calvert	Present
Cook	Present
Jansen	Present
Nybo	Present
Rosenthal	Present

A quorum was declared.

Zoning Administrator Matt Oldenburg, Building Official Jonathan Miller and City Attorney Joe Nack were also present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Bochniak moved, seconded by Cook to approve the December 9, 2020 minutes.

Motion carried on voice vote.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Cal. No. 20PD-01, Applicants: Economic Growth Corporation, 100 19th Street, Suite 109, Rock Island, IL 61201; The Galena Foundation, P.O. Box 1, Galena, IL 61036; and Owner: Ursula Valente, Elk & High Street Development Corp, 511 County Road Z, Apt 307 Hazel Green, WI 53811. Location: Parcels: 22-100-323-03, Part of Lots 30, 31, 32 & 33, Former St. Mary's School; 22-100-297-00, Part of Lots 15, 16, 17, 18 & 29, Lots Between Franklin & Elk Streets; and 22-100-555-00, Part of Lot 10, Block 2, Original Lots of Galena, Galena, Jo Daviess County, Illinois. Common Address is 401 Elk Street, Galena, IL 61036. Request for Preliminary Plan approval and Rezoning for a Planned Unit Development with an underlying district of High Density Residential

to allow multiple-family residential development. **Continuance of Public Hearing from December 9, 2020.**

MOTION: Jansen moved, seconded by Cook to reopen the Public Hearing on Cal. No. 20PD-01.

Motion carried on voice vote.

Baranski asked to be recused from the agenda item as he is directly involved with the project.

Rosenthal granted his request.

City Attorney Nack swore all those in who wished to testify at this public hearing.

ROSENTHAL: All right, we'll go ahead and start, continue the public hearing. If the applicant wants to come forward to present. State your name and your address for the record please.

OLDENBURG: Does Jon want to start off?

BARANSKI: Yeah, Jon needs to be, Jon and I probably need to be on kind of at the same time if that's okay.

OLDENBURG: I'll start his video here. And, Jim, I think I've made you a co-host, so you can . . .

BARANSKI: Share.

OLDENBURG: . . . stream and present.

NACK: And, Matt, just so we're clear, the other people that you've taken off can see and hear everything, correct?

OLDENBURG: Yes, they should be able to see and hear everything.

NACK: Okay.

BARANSKI: So can, Matt, can you see my screen?

OLDENBURG: I do not see your screen at this point.

BARANSKI: Oh. That's because I haven't shared it yet. Okay, hold on a second. Now, do you see my screen?

OLDENBURG: Yes.

BARANSKI: And what are you seeing?

OLDENBURG: We see your site plan paper.

BARANSKI: Okay. Okay, good. Okay. So this is the original site plan. So, Jon, I'll toggle back and forth between the original site plan and then the revised site plan that we're going to be presenting tonight.

NACK: Yeah, if you could, just before, just to be clear, if you could just state your name, and then you're presenting for the applicant.

BARANSKI: Right. So my name is Jim Baranski. I'm at 1015 South Bench. I'm an architect, and I'm working with the applicant on the project.

NACK: Okay, thank you.

DAVIDSHOFER: Do you need me, Joe, to do the same?

NACK: Yeah, if you could.

Jon Davidshofer, Economic Growth Corporation, 100 19th Street, Rock Island:

DAVIDSHOFER: Yep, hi, everyone, so Jon Davidshofer, vice president with Economic Growth Corporation, and we are at 100 19th Street, Suite 109 in Rock Island.

ROSENTHAL: Thank you.

DAVIDSHOFER: You bet.

ROSENTHAL: So go ahead and present your, do your presentation.

DAVIDSHOFER: Absolutely. Well, first off, I just want to say thank you for the extension here of the project. As Jim is showing, you know, what we had before was a 35-unit proposed development for your review. And just real quick, I would like to note that we are no longer needing the variance on the side yard. And we're going to get to that later in the presentation. But, you know, while we did have the extension, one of the things we were able to do was we were able to host a neighborhood meeting. And we felt this was very important because, you know, we want to make sure that we're, we're good neighbors to those around us, and we want to make sure that we were able to hear everyone's comments.

And so two of the big things that came up were, you know, the number of units/the high density amount, and then the number of parking spots. And so what we were able to do was we were able to take the existing site plan that Jim had, and then we were able to shrink this down from 35 units to 31 units. So we have a reduction of roughly 11% in the amount of units. And then what that did was that was able to create an additional four parking spaces. So we went from 35 units and 39 parking spaces to 31 units and 43 parking spaces.

And so what the reduction of the building, excuse me, the reduction of the units actually led to a 17% reduction of the size of the building. So we, you know, we took their concerns, and we wanted to try to see how we could improve that. You know, looking at the St. Mary's piece of this, you know, the number or units within that building has not changed. You know, the St. Mary's Project was one that was presented to us just because we do have a favorable experience in the City of Galena.

You know, we do all the Coatsworth Building there, and we as an organization, being a not-for-profit community-based developer, we specialize in rehabilitation projects and those that are either, you know, national registered historic buildings or within historic districts. And so really looking at the St. Mary's project was kind of our bread and butter. And so we, you know, we obviously, we took a hard look at what we could do with the project and, you know, in order to make this, you know, I guess cost feasible for us, we wanted to include the new construction building here.

And so we have the 20 units that complements the 11, like I said, the additional parking spaces. Our plans, you know, changed a little bit with the design, and I'm going to let Jim kind of run with that right now.

Jim Baranski, Baranski Hammer Moretta & Sheehy, Architect, 1015 S. Bench Street, Galena :

BARANSKI: Okay. So what I'm going to do is show this in 3D model form. So it helps put it in context a little better. But one quick exhibit I want to show before that is what I call my site section. And what I'm trying to show here is that where the building, the new building is positioned is kind of nestled nicely on a little bench that is, you know, partway below Elk Street and partway above Franklin Street. And we think that actually helps allow this building to reduce its impact on the neighbors just because of its, you know, its vertical position relative to the others.

As you can see, what I'm showing for this building now is a sloped roof, even though we may not do a sloped roof. But I'm showing it now because that is the biggest the building will ever look when the roof has a slope to it. And as you can see in this section, even the top of our building, the very top of our building, is still going to be somewhere between 12 and 17 feet below the first floor of the residences up above on Elk Street. So the view shed will be uninterrupted for the people on Elk.

If they look down the hill right now, there's a, if you've drive on Elk, along that section, it's very heavily wooded. I wouldn't call it the highest quality foliage, you know, and trees and things, but it is pretty dense. And we intend to either keep that as is, unless people want different kinds of species, or we would, you know, propose to replant some of that area. Let me go to the 3D mode. I think this will help as I fly around a little bit. Can people see this 3D model and moving and movement?

MAN: Yeah.

BARANSKI: Okay. So the idea here is, what's unique about this project is the fact that it can be set in this nice little slot between the buildings below and then the buildings you can see above. Okay. So if I kind of come around here to the other side, you get a really good feel for where that thing sets in there, relative to those houses up above. Our goal here is to try to minimize the visual impact as much as possible.

And by being well below the buildings up above us, and with, and by maintaining the vegetative screen that's there, and then enhancing it, we don't think there will be any issues with respect to the buildings up above being able to even see this building for, frankly. And depending on the kind of species of plants we use, that would be all year round. You know, the other thing that I know there's a concern about is lighting. Well, of course, we would do, you know, I'm a big, dark-skies person myself. You know, any lighting that we would do would be, you know, poles that are short with the light cut off so it's just downcast. So we would do, I

think, we would work very hard with the neighbors and with the city to make sure that we came up with lighting that was going to be acceptable to everyone.

I'm going to just kind of bring this around. So the idea here is that, you know, in this building here, you have 20 units. They're each one bedroom. They are, there's eight on each floor, on the first two floors, and there's a walkout basement that has four units. That gives you the total of 20. That's a reduction of about 16% or 17% in the original building size that we were showing. And, of course, that was nice because it allowed us to increase the parking.

So now, our parking per unit has increased by about 24%, which we think is a, you know, it's above what's required by the ordinance in terms of one space per unit. And so, you know, we're getting up in there where, you know, we think that we are achieving the required amount of parking and then some. The other thing I wanted to show you is if you're up on Elk Street, upper Elk, you know, most of you have been up there. You know how sort of thick the foliage is up there. If you're up in this, any of these first floors of these houses or porches, this is kind of the view you're going to see, right?

So if you're looking straight out, your view that has been there is pretty much going to be uninterrupted. If you look down, you're going to be looking back into that whole thick of foliage that's there now, and our building will be just behind that. If we have a flat roof on this building, and the reason we may want to go to a flat roof on this building is because we may want to use that roof structure as part of our stormwater detention. Stormwater detention on this site has been problematic for years, and it is our feeling that what we're doing on this site is going to resolve that problem.

Because what we're going to do is we're going to collect that stormwater from above and get to our property, and then we're going to collect it, then retain it, and then we're going to, or detain it, and then we're going to slowly let it back out into the system. So we think that the work that we're going to be doing on this site will help ameliorate some of the issues that have been there before with stormwater detention. Let's go back down. That's St. Mary's right there, the school itself.

So that just gives you an idea of how that building will set in there. And, you know, there's the big parking lot right there. And then there's some additional parking across the street, of course. Jon, is there anything else you think I should add to this?

DAVIDSHOFER: No, so the only, after Jim kind of gave that walkthrough, so with the 31 units that we have presented right now, you know, we're anticipating three of those being market rate, and so this would be a mixed-income development. And one of the things that we've had a lot of great experience with on mixed-income housing is it's very good for social equity and, you know, social equality. It's really good for, you know, these types of multifamily developments, especially within a close-knit community.

And so, you know, within the mixed income approach, we're going to be targeting the service workers downtown Galena. And, you know, obviously, this is not exclusively for the service workers downtown Galena, but, you know, we did hear that there was a shortage of affordable, quality, rental housing because a lot of those units were being converted to Airbnb. And so, you know, the term affordable would mean essentially up to 60% area-meeting income.

And while that number does change annually, the one person 60% area-meeting income amount is \$32,000. So that would be someone who's roughly \$15.38 an hour. So if you did have someone sharing a bedroom, meaning it would be a two-person household, that number would jump from \$32,000 to \$36,600. Those are just the last points I want to make within the 31, one-bedroom proposal.

BARANSKI: The other thing we should point out is that, and this is most important, the reason this project came about was an effort to save St. Mary's. We've, there's been, people have looked for years at ways of saving St. Mary's. And economically, it's a very difficult thing to do because the construction costs on the restoration and renovation of that building are astronomical.

And it's only utilizing this, these creative tax credit structures that it allows us to, it allows economic growth to save St. Mary's, and when I say save it, meaning in the sense that it's acceptable to the National Park Service and the State Historic Preservation Agency because they're the ones who administer the tax credits, so there was a lot of very, it's a very arduous process to get through that. And then there's the affordable housing tax credit component, which again is a, you know, is a very creative way to help finance projects.

But that's how, and reducing it down to 31 units, this is about where it can, you know, anything at 31 and above, the project actually works. And even at that, this is a very long-term proposition. These tax credit projects take a long time. So to give you an idea, we don't believe we would have people moving into any of these buildings until probably sometime in the middle or the end of 2023, just so you know from the schedule perspective. That's how long it's going to take to put all, to jump through all the hoops and run the gauntlets that need to be done in order to get to that point. It's a very long, arduous process.

And so the first part is getting through, you know, hoping to get through the entitlement process, with zoning. But I think this is about the most viable strategy that I've come across that will save St. Mary's. And not just save it, but really, you know, literally restore it, and so it has a completely new life.

ROSENTHAL: Okay, anything else, gentlemen?

DAVIDSHOFER: Not at this time.

ROSENTHAL: Okay. Do we have any questions at this point for the, for either one of these gentlemen, from the board? If not, anyone else to speak in favor of the request?

NACK: It might be a good idea for Jim to take down his sketch so maybe people could come back on.

ROSENTHAL: Okay.

BARANSKI: Okay, sorry.

Testimony presented in favor of the request:

OLDENBURG: Anybody out there would like to speak in favor, if you can raise your hand, using the raise hand feature for Zoom, we can get your video started. I got David Wilmarth. We'll go first with David.

BARANSKI: It should be David Wilmarth, Ken Robb, and then Craig Brown.

OLDENBURG: Okay.

ROSENTHAL: Remember to, whoever comes on, make sure they state their name and their address for the record please.

OLDENBURG: Here's David.

David Wilmarth, 432 N. West Street, Galena :

WILMARTH: Would you like me to start, Matt?

OLDENBURG: Yep, go ahead. And just, yeah, state your name and address please.

WILMARTH: Yep. David Wilmarth. I'm 432 N. West Street in Galena, Illinois. And I am on the board of the Galena Foundation. Most Galenians, no matter how long they've lived here, know of someone who attended or graduated from St. Mary's School. Built in 1865, the school educated Galena's youth for more than 100 years, and like any school, holds a special place in the hearts of those who attended school there. However, recent memories of the building have not been so special.

In the 46 years after its closure in 1974, the building has transformed from a well-maintained center of learning to little more than crumbling bricks and broken windows. The deterioration of the building became so bad that in 2019, it was placed on Landmarks Illinois list of the most endangered historic places. In a town that prides itself on the reputation for restoring and rehabilitating historic properties for modern uses, what has happened to St. Mary's School is simply unacceptable.

Starting tonight, Galena can take the first step in restoring this historically significant building and in doing so, also address the need for affordable housing in the community. The project proposed by the Economic Growth Corporation will fix this desperate need for housing in Galena, but more importantly, achieve the primary goal of rehabilitating St. Mary's School. Rehabilitating this structure is no small undertaking. The estimated cost of this project is \$11 million. \$8 million of this \$11 million project is construction costs, with approximately \$5 million allocated for the new building and about \$3 million for the rehabilitation of St. Mary's alone.

The expertise that the Economic Growth Corporation brings to the planning of a project like this cannot be ignored. They will not only manage the project from start to finish, but they will also manage the operation of the facilities after the completion. They have done numerous projects with historic buildings across the country and even in our own backyard. The Coatsworth Building in downtown Galena and the current project in Mount Carroll at Shimer College are nearby examples of their work.

While some people may have a concern over the new building construction being a part of the rehabilitation of St. Mary's, the mere financial cost of rehabilitation means that one cannot happen without the other. The estimated \$3 million price for the rehabilitation of St. Mary's as a standalone project would not be financially feasible. Simply put, this is the right group at the right time to get this project done. Other developers have had 45 years to find another way to save and repurpose this building and could not find a way to make that happen.

While living in, while saving an endangered historic building, this project will ultimately give a boost to the local economy during construction. This project will create many potential opportunities for local contractors, subcontractors, and suppliers. Projects of this size and magnitude in Galena have been rare over the years. The St. Mary's Project creates affordable

housing options for the residents of Galena, including, but not limited to many of the service workers that help keep Galena's tourism industry flourishing.

It will also turn a neglected, low-value property into a multimillion-dollar property for the county tax roll. Ultimately, the opportunity for this project represents to Save St. Mary's is significant in many ways, but most importantly, it is likely the last feasible opportunity Galena will have to save this beloved landmark. Thank you.

ROSENTHAL: Thanks, David. Any questions of David? Anyone else to speak then, Matthew?

OLDENBURG: Ken, do you want to go next? Ken?

Ken Robb, 525 S. Hickory Street, Galena :

ROBB: Okay. I guess you can start your video. Okay. Thank you. My name is Ken Robb, and I live at 525 S. Hickory Street in Galena. I am on the board and am president of the Galena Foundation. The Galena Foundation supports this application. St. Mary's School is so much more than a historic building. It is the memory of formative experiences for hundreds of school children in Galena for more than 100 years. We have before us a viable opportunity to preserve the building that was the place where these memories were formed.

I did not attend school at St. Mary's, but I do have fond memories of my own school and the dedicated teachers who taught there. I can relate to the emotional attachment to this school. St. Mary's School opened in 1864 and continued as a school for grades one through eight until 1974. For all but six of those years, the sisters of Notre Dame taught classes, and during their tenure, school attendance grew dramatically. The alumni of St. Mary's include many living in our community today, and their contributions to our City and to the region have been significant.

I believe it is important to preserve this building and the memory of St. Mary's School. The historic buildings in our midst provide a glimpse into these memories, a perspective of why we came, how we lived, and how it shaped the people that we are today. In 2019, Landmarks Illinois placed St. Mary's on their list of most endangered historic places.

Over the 25 years that Landmarks Illinois has published this list, about 200 buildings throughout Illinois have been placed on the list, only nine or ten in any given year. St. Mary's was one of those. And nearly half of these buildings have been subsequently saved through restoration and rehabilitation. We have an opportunity to save St. Mary's School. Let's find a way to make it happen. Thank you.

ROSENTHAL: Any questions from the board? If not, Matt.

OLDENBURG: And Craig Brown is going to go next.

Craig Brown, 757 Dewey Avenue, Galena:

BROWN: I'm ready.

ROSENTHAL: Go ahead, Craig.

BROWN: Oh, do I, I'm sorry, I, I have to, yeah, he has to name my video. My timing is perfect. The heat just came on, so now, there's a bunch of background noise. My name is Craig Brown. I also represent the Galena Foundation. I'm a board member. My address is 757 Dewey

Avenue. And I also am in support of this project. I, first of all, I want to completely support what David Wilmarth and Ken Robb said. I agree with each of those points. I want to emphasize some of them.

First of all, we need these units. As some of you know, I'm a practicing lawyer in downtown Galena, and I have seen the effect that these Airbnb licenses has had on the places that our service personnel down on Main Street, where they live. They used to occupy the second and third floors of our Main Street buildings. And those have mostly gone the way of Airbnb. So that, it's not available anymore. Having a place that's walking distance from downtown, really valuable.

I also want to add that, you know, in working with Jon and Jim, aside from hearing what the folks had to say and downsizing the number or units, increasing the parking, on a going-forward basis, you're going to see a great amount of sensitivity over issues like lighting, noise, traffic patterns, refuse disposal, the types of things that could annoy the neighborhood are things that I think there's going to be extra effort to make sure doesn't happen. And in the end, I think the neighborhood and the whole town will be extremely pleasantly surprised with this project and how it comes out. And that is why I am so supportive of it, in addition to the fact that at its core, we are saving the St. Mary's School.

A final note, a letter got to me, which suggested Mr. Baranski was in a conflict of interest position. And I just want to say this. His heart is in the right place, and his integrity and his ethics are beyond reproach. And if anybody decides to go down that road, they need to understand, it's going to reflect more on them than it is on Jim. So I'm having none of that. Anyway, thank you.

ROSENTHAL: Thank you. Any questions? Anyone else to speak in favor of the request?

OLDENBURG: I see Adam Johnson, see if he wanted to speak.

ROSENTHAL: Yeah.

OLDENBURG: That might have just been a thumbs up. I don't know if that's wanting to speak or not.

Adam Johnson, 211 Fourth Street, Galena :

JOHNSON: Adam Johnson, 211 4th Street, Galena. Again, I'm an architect and hoping to assist with the historic preservation and rehabilitation of the St. Mary's School. I've been involved in this building with Orlando Valenti probably half my life. And it has been a long time coming, and I think anything we can do to save this school at this point, now is the time to do it. And I think having someone with the experience of already being in Galena to develop this project, I can't see how this isn't a win-win for everybody. So I appreciate everybody's hard work. I support this project. Thank you.

ROSENTHAL: Thanks, Adam. Anyone else to speak in favor? See anybody, Matthew?

OLDENBURG: Not seeing anybody. We can give it a couple seconds.

Testimony presented in opposition to the request:

ROSENTHAL: Okay. Is there anyone to speak in opposition?

Carmen Nicols-Alonzo, 418 Franklin Street, Galena:

NICOLS-ALONZO: Yes. I'd like to speak in opposition.

ROSENTHAL: Okay. State your name and your address please for the record.

NICOLS-ALONZO: This is Carmen Nicols-Alonzo. I'm a 418 Franklin Street.

ROSENTHAL: Okay. Go ahead, ma'am.

NICOLS-ALONZO: Okay. So I understand the desire to save St. Mary's. I think it's a great idea. I'm against, totally against the housing that's going in there. I was on the last zoning meeting as well by phone. I stated all my concerns then. One of the things that keeps coming up is lack of affordable housing in the City due to the Airbnbs that have taken over. So maybe the City shouldn't have issued so many licenses for Airbnbs, which undermines our local residents looking for affordable housing.

Does anybody on the call have any idea how many licenses were issued for Airbnbs? I know that across from my house at 418 Franklin, I don't have any permanent neighbors anymore. The four houses across the street from me are Airbnbs. So, you know, maybe that's the reason why people can't find affordable housing in this town.

ROSENTHAL: Okay. Is that it, ma'am?

NICOLS-ALONZO: I'm against this project whole heartedly. My property will abut to this St. Mary's portion of it. I'm against it. It's going to bring too many people into the area in a very small section of town. I understand the parking has been increased, but there's not going to be enough visitor parking. If there's two people in every unit, you know, maybe a child and two people in every unit is going to bring too many people into the area. That's what I have to say.

ROSENTHAL: Okay. Thank you very much.

NICOLS-ALONZO: Thank you.

ROSENTHAL: Anyone else to speak in opposition?

OLDENBURG: Yeah, Dan and Kathy Harms will be next.

ROSENTHAL: Okay, great.

OLDENBURG: There we go.

Dan Harms, 308 Elk Street, Galena:

HARMS: Okay. Dan Harms, 308 Elk Street. I'm kind of in the middle ground. I commend Jim and Jon for the work they did and the alterations they made in their new plan. I guess I am concerned on two points. And I know that this is not a final plan. The first thing is putting a flat roof on the building, as I said in the previous meeting, is completely counter to making it part of his historic setting here. We have the church. We have St. Mary's School, and then a building that will become part of this campus.

I realize there are problems with stormwater retention, and Jim knows that I'm aware and have dealt with that before. So I think it is a solvable problem. One other area that has come up that I thought of that I, concerns me is that if this type of housing is considered primarily for downtown workers, and that is considered to be contiguous to their workplace, then someone is going to be responsible for getting them there. And if they drive, they defeat the purpose of having it close. So therefore, some provision for adequate pedestrian traffic, either down to Franklin or up to and along Elk Street should be part of the plan. Thank you.

ROSENTHAL: Thank you very much, sir. Anyone else?

OLDENBURG: Sorry, April Wagner will be up next. Okay.

April Wagner, 342 Franklin Street, Galena:

WAGNER: Okay. Hi. I too was at the neighborhood meeting, and I really appreciate . . .

ROSENTHAL: Miss, Miss, Ma'am, I don't want to interrupt you. Please state your name and your address for the . . .

WAGNER: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, my name is April Wagner, and I am at 342 Franklin Street. I'm the last house below the model. And I, I stated at the neighborhood meeting, I really appreciate them having the neighborhood meeting. That was really helpful, and I also appreciate the alterations that were made out of consideration from the input that they received. I, I really like the work, I, that Jon's corporation does.

I'm, I would be excited about it except it's Elk Street. And not only that, it's at that, it's that part of the street, which we've noted in the neighborhood meeting is notoriously dangerous area. It's dangerous to drive. It's dangerous to walk. I walk my, I walk up there frequently, and it's not safe. And I can't imagine that increased traffic is going to improve that. I've also stated, I'm not a visionary, but it's just hard to imagine that much happening on what looks like not a whole lot of space.

My other thing is, I understand, gosh, if anybody understands, I think I do, the emotional attachment to a school building. Growing up in St. Louis, I not only attended my school, my family lived in the building as caretakers. And so most of my memories are of that building. And a couple of years ago, that building was torn down. It didn't, it no longer served the purposes, and it was too expensive to rehabilitate. And so they tore it down and built a new school facility on top of it. So I understand that attachment and how that feels, and I get that.

And I appreciate that, in Galena, we try so hard to maintain our historical buildings. The fact of the matter is that they keep, as they saying, it's not economically feasible or responsible to attempt to do it on its own. So we have to have this income or this other way or providing the funds. And I, I don't think that that site can support it. I don't think, I've stated drainage. I

appreciate that they're looking into ways to collect storm runoff, but Franklin is scary during storms.

And there is lots of debris that washes down. And I know other people on Elk Street have talked about how much of their yards and gravel driveways wash away each year because of runoff. And I, I just think there are some significant concerns, and I haven't heard any fixes about that. So I'm less concerned about lighting. I mean, it's an issue, and I'm less concerned about views, obviously, since I'm down in the bottom, and I don't have one. But I am still concerned about the danger for runoff and erosion and the traffic are my primary concerns. So I am against this project. But I really appreciate all the work.

ROSENTHAL: That it?

WAGNER: That's it.

ROSENTHAL: Thank you very much. Anyone, any questions? Matt, who's next?

OLDENBURG: Next, we'll have Bill Meeker.

Bill Meeker, 418 Elk Street, Galena:

MEEKER: My name is Bill Meeker. My husband, Bob Richards and I own the property at 418 Elk Street in Galena. And for the December 9th public hearing, which was continued, my neighbors and I submitted a letter signed by everyone on the 400 block of Elk Street, outlining our concerns regarding this project. I am appreciative of the reduction of the number of units of the project, reducing the density. However, this is still a rather high density that's encroaching within a single-family neighborhood and does appear to be somewhat of a spot-zoning type approach.

Just as a little background, I'm a retired city planner with 40-plus years of experience. So I do understand this process. Additional concerns that we have relate to the supply of parking, and you have enhanced the oversupply of parking a bit for residents and visitors by reducing the number of units. But I know my neighbors do still have concerns about the adequacy of that parking. You could have couples living with the project, even though they are one-bedroom units, that may work in different locations in Galena and qualify for those units, who may have to have two cars in order to each get to their respective jobs. So that still remains a concern for us.

And because of the fact that you're considering placing a planned unit development overlay on this property, you are essentially writing a new set of zoning regulations for this property. And that does give you the latitude to impose additional restrictions that can mitigate any potential impacts upon the neighborhood.

An additional concern that I have regarding the traffic flow into and from the property is that, yeah, Elk Street is seen as a tertiary access to the property, but I, having lived in the area for a short period of time, I use Elk Street and Dodge as my primary access to the property and find the High Street access that is seen as a secondary access to the project as being perhaps a little more problematic than Elk Street and Dodge because of the very steep grade and the narrowness of that street, which is not going to be changed from upper Elk Street to the 400 block of Elk Street. It'll still be very much like a goat path, a single lane with a very steep grade.

So I think after a while, people would tend to avoid that and perhaps take Elk and Dodge. Once you figure out how to traverse that intersection and get onto Elk Street, you can do it fairly

easily. I also want to note that 26 of the parking spaces for the project are accessed solely from Elk Street, and we have very limited parking in the 400 block of Elk Street as it is. And any overflow parking would certainly be parking on the 400 block of Elk Street if the parking lots are full. That might be visitors. That might be people who have excess vehicles that they need to store.

And that, the 400 block of Elk Street is quite narrow, though it is quite a bit wider than High Street at that point. But it still is rather restricted in terms of your ability to drive through there and providing adequate parking for the residents of that area. There are six single-family homes within that block that use that street as primary access and parking for their vehicles. I'm very appreciative of Mr. Baranski's commitment to ensure that any parking, any lighting for the project is designed in such a manner that it doesn't create any adverse glare upon the neighborhood, and I look forward, if this project does move forward, in seeing details of that as the design moves forward.

And finally, I'm just looking back at our letter to make sure that I hit everything that we had a concern about. I believe that is everything that we have expressed concern about in our letter, and I just want to make sure that those comments are raised and that are considered as a part of this deliberation. Thank you.

ROSENTHAL: Thank you, Mr. Meeker. Any questions? Anyone else to speak in opposition?

Jim Digman, 408 Elk Street, Galena:

DIGMAN: I would say something.

OLDENBURG: Okay, we'll bring up Jim Digman. Just a moment please, I'll get your video going.

DIGMAN: Okay.

OLDENBURG: There we go.

DIGMAN: Okay. Jim Digman, 408 Elk Street. I'm the closest person to this project. I wasn't able to attend the last meeting. The reason for my green background is that's the view across the street from my house, where you guys would put a parking lot. I've been at my house for 25 years. It's a historic house also. And I'm opposed to this project because I would have that lower lot next to me be a parking lot, which I've been cutting the grass on that since 1997. And then I'd also have parking across the street from me plus all the added traffic.

I mean, if there's 40 parking spots there, and even if one person drives their car to and from work or picking up their kids from school or going to the grocery store, that's like 80 cars going up and down the street. I mean, there's days where I only see one or two cars in our street. So I think the amount of traffic would be amazing compared to what it is. Another interesting thing I think when you look at the blueprints or the overhead view of the plans, you show no existing housing there.

You show that little parking lot across the street from St. Mary's, but you don't show that there's a house in between the parking lot and High Street, or you don't show where my house is. I mean, these plans make it look like you could stick it out in the middle of a field somewhere and go, oh, isn't that nice? There's tons of room for that stuff. But you should have those plans, you should show the existing structures in the neighborhood to realize how tight it would be.

Also, with the drainage, I agree with that. That ditch that comes down to that small parking lot is, looks like a rapid river sometimes when it rains, and that lower parking lot, that little 11-spot parking lot across the street, that is been had, you know, 4" or 5" of water on, like a small lake when it rains really hard. So there would have to be some kind of drain or drainage put in there because that floods every time it rains hard.

Also, in the proposal, they suggested that the downtown workers would live in this place and park their cars and then alleviate traffic or parking on Main Street. Well, I have the 2019 parking study, and according to this, in the downtown area, there is 1,322 parking spots. So if every person that lived in that apartment parked their car and walked down there, that would only be 3% of the parking spaces that would make a difference.

And my wife has worked downtown for ten years and has never walked downtown once because after standing on her feet all day, the last thing she wants to do is climb up that very steep hill at the end of the day. And then we have 117 rain days in Galena, and then you got snow days, and then you got hot and muggy days. So I don't really see people leaving their cars just to walk downtown and come back. Also, I have a question. I'd like to know what the rents are for these apartments. I mean, they're, you said they're affordable housing. I'm just wondering what the prices would be. They got . . .

ROSENTHAL: They can respond to that when we're done with the . . .

DIGMAN: Okay. Because I, I think the density is crazy to go from what we are to what you're proposing. When my house, when I bought my house, the previous owner wanted to make it a four-plex, and the City said, no way. We can't have that many more cars and that much more traffic on that street. And that was a four-plex. And you guys are trying to go to this thing you're doing now, which I think is crazy. You know, and the steepness of hill, High Street going down, I was always told when Valenti was trying to do his things to get this thing done, they also said that still, the hill is too steep. They can't keep the blacktop on it, and that's why it's been closed for all this time. I don't know what's changed with that. I mean, the street hasn't gotten any less steep. So I don't know what the City engineer says about that. I'd be interested to know. So I guess that's all I have to say for now. Thank you.

ROSENTHAL: Okay. Thank you very much. Anyone else to speak in opposition?

OLDENBURG: Going to bring up David Albee next. Okay, I think you're ready?

David Albee, 320 Elk Street, Galena:

ALBEE: The house that is shown in all of the exhibits as not being able to see it, and I wrote a letter. I stand by it. I'd like to, I don't want to read it here. You're grown men. You don't need to be read to. You can read it yourself. Hopefully, you will. I'm opposed to this project. For many decades, the old St. Mary's School Building has been abandoned, neglected, and allowed to deteriorate to the point now where it is a public nuisance. It is nothing more than an empty shell, a pile of bricks. I moved here with my family 25 years ago. We purchased our home in the historic district. It's a nice old home. We're situated immediately above this proposed project.

An examination of the items disclosed by the City to date demonstrates to me, I've been an attorney for 43 years now, that should this project proceed, it will amount to and constitute actionable private nuisance and continuing trespass, not only to me but also to many others

adversely impacted. I have quite a bit of legal experience in this area. Please consider increased FedEx, DHL, UPS, USPS deliveries to and from 35 residences.

Please consider numerous garbage dumpsters overflowing with refuse for parishioners to experience on their way to Mass. Cutting down all the trees along Elk Street to make green space is absurd. Fire trucks will have to back in. Lights from 35 apartments and three parking lots will pollute the night sky for miles around in every direction. Imagine 35 Weber grills, music, mufflers, oil slicks in the parking lots, not to mention strangers and crime. High Street will become High Way.

Is this the historic district? We have ordinances in place to preserve and protect our neighborhoods. Our City is responsible for enforcing them. There is other land in Galena already zoned HDR. What good are our ordinances if they are to be repealed willy-nilly at the behest of connected developers. Saving St. Mary's does not save anything. Their rallying cry merely serves as a pretense, a subterfuge for impropriety and greed. The proponents vision to use tax credits, which is nothing more than imaginary, fake money, demonstrates that they are undercapitalized from the get-go.

If it's just St. Mary's, it's not worth it. That's a quote from Mr. Davidshofer, the vice president of Economic Growth. At what point do residents have to give up their quality of life in order to save an abandoned, dilapidated, worthless building that no one heretofore cared about? The City of Galena, us, we, you would be well advised to stop this folly before it is too late. And that's my statement. Thank you very much for letting me say it.

ROSENTHAL: Thank you. Anyone else to speak?

OLDENBURG: Yes, I'm going to have Diana Pitstick speak next. Here she is.

Diana Pitstick, 405 Hill Street, Galena:

PITSTICK: Hello. Diana Pitstick, 405 Hill Street. I'm going to partially read the letter I had submitted with a few additional comments based on the revised plans. We currently reside at 405 Hill Street, just off the intersection of Hill and High Streets, having purchased this as a second residence ten years ago. But we've transitioned to primary residence for both our son's schooling for eight years and for employment.

We chose this low-density single residence, LDR, historic district, for its more rural natural, natural buffering from busier high-density residential downtown areas, HDR, where townhome or apartment or condo complexes and other areas of Galena, the Galena territory or other areas. There has not been a change or character in the area. We have several concerns about this proposed development.

Development of a ten-unit parking area directly below and adjacent to our outdoor deck, where noise levels tend to travel uphill. A new view of the overwhelming amount of vehicles and night light pollution as well as noise pollution. The increased, not decreased amount of traffic that would come to an already high traffic set of intersections. The intersection coming from Elk to High and Hill has no traffic stop. And cars come rapidly uphill and around. When the fire signal rings, an increase of high-speed traffic proceeds down to the fire station. This would not be altered by opening up High Street to Franklin.

The problematic junction, again, at the lower intersection, where a single line of traffic comes up a steep grade from Elk to High Street with no traffic stop at an already reduced lane width. Traffic proceeding downhill on High Street towards Elk Street must cross over while cars are coming from behind a curve with limited visibility off the curve on Elk Street. While it's

suggested that most traffic will use the connection at Franklin Street as an egress, the narrow, already-congested traffic currently at this area and intersection, with the resumption of church attendance, especially would seem prone to traffic connecting up to High and Hill, making a left-hand turn crossover to the 300 block of Elk Street or taking a shortcut through the narrow alleyway between High and Dodge Streets.

While proposed parking previously at 39 for a 35-unit development on the basis of one car per one bedroom plus visitor parking, the reality of populations these days as evidenced by units on Bench Street or other areas is if there are two adult workers, there are often two vehicles. It would not address Goal #3 of the City, address downtown parking issues, as it would not alleviate issues with tourist or customer parking. While St. Mary's development will provide a long-term community issue of Goal #5, needed housing types and/or mix and Goal D, provision of affordable housing, it will not address a long-term community issue of reduced traffic demands nor three a greater quality and quantity of public and private open space.

The proposed high-density unit, which you previously had in the first proposal at 2.35 times the usual high density residential, if the development, even with the 11% reduction, you're still at a 2.10 times the HDR, the high density residential units. So I would suggest the lower density of perhaps one and a half times at 24 to 26 units instead of in the 30s. While this development may address Goals 3, 4, and 5 of Galena's housing under the City's Comprehensive Plan, the aggregate high density residential and increased traffic seems to focus on a high-density development, in a limited space, in an already congested low-density residential area.

It sounds like you're addressing the proposed setback, taking it back to the 10' instead of 5'. But I, we urge you to consider existing neighbors to increase visual blocking of the development parking areas. In sum, while the proposition of affordable housing for low-wage workers and the elderly is a laudable, necessary goal, the number and factor of rezoning deviations being requested, the increase in HDR, MGD, and setbacks, and the increase in light, noise, parking, and problematic traffic issues should be reevaluated. The concerns of long-term and new full-term LDR owners and residents who would be affected should be taken into further consideration. Thank you.

ROSENTHAL: Thank you very much. Anyone else, Matt?

OLDENBURG: Yes, I have Larry and Tara Campau. I'll bring them up next. There you are. Just trying to get her unmuted here.

Tara Campau, 321 Hill Street, Galena:

CAMPAU: There we go. Thank you. My name is Tara Campau. My husband and I live at 321 Hill Street, the corner of Hill Street and High Street. While I am in support of saving old structures, as many of you know that my husband and I saved a structure that was up for demolition. So I'm very much in support of Galena's saving old structures. I'm also in support of the housing of low-income people. But I don't, I am speaking here to object to the proposed changes that are being requested for St. Mary's. And I am objecting on two grounds.

I'll try to go quickly because I think they've been stated. But the first is the change from the low-density category to the special exception high-density category. The jump from low density of 6 people per acre to 16 per acre might have had a small, if any, impact on our community here, our neighborhood. But going from the low density of 6 people to the special exception of 33 people is an, in an established neighborhood that hasn't seen new construction in over 50 years should really be unacceptable to the zoning board.

It has been stated that this project would be nestled into our neighborhood. I argue that putting 33 people in a place that is meant for 6 is not nestling. It is wedging on a level that's much more like a clown car than a neighborhood. That 31 number for zoning also really could reach a 62 people or more if the units have more than 2 people in them, a husband and wife, a parent and children. It wouldn't be 1 person per unit, and the 33 would go up pretty quickly. So I don't know how that affects the decision of that zoning because it's not being approved for 33 people. It would be more than that.

At either number though, it is unprecedented, is an unprecedented number of people to wedge into such a small lot in any established neighborhood. But I don't feel this is any established neighborhood. It is part of Galena's historic district. It's a neighborhood where people take pride in their home ownership and where they take pride in their neighbors' homes. It is a neighborhood where people incur substantial expense to keep up and/or restore the historic homes they live in at the high level that the City sets for us.

Changing the population dynamic of this neighborhood with such a drastic increase of residents is a Pandora's box of unknowns that I think should not be unleashed on the residents of this neighborhood. The image of Pandora's box leads me to my second objection, the opening of High Street through to Franklin. The St. Mary's project mentions opening High Street like it is an inconsequential detail of the larger project.

But I argue that it is the most consequential detail of the project. The opening of High Street would not only open our neighborhood up to the 38-plus residents of St. Mary's and all of their friends, relatives, delivery drivers, and contractors. It would also open the neighborhood up to the whole world. High Street would immediately become the best route or the shortest route to get from one side of town to the other for all northbound traffic. Dodge Street currently holds this distinction and has been designed by the City to accommodate the through traffic. It has wider roads on the street for parallel parking, no stop signs for quick pass-through, etc.

High Street, on the other hand, has none of those accommodations for through traffic. High Street's oddities and obstacles are many. There's a very steep slope on the Spring Street side. There's a four-way intersection where only three ways stop at Green Street. There's a blind lopsided four-way intersection where only two of the different ways stop at Hill Street, a blind intersection with Elk, and two blind intersections with alleyways.

It narrows down slightly to more, it narrows down to slightly more than one lane near Grant's Home. There is a small but potentially dangerous cliff across the street from Mr. Parisor's(?) house. It has my odd driveway that exits into the middle of the intersection at Hill, public parking, where the low-income residents and tourists of this neighborhood back into traffic that is either climbing a hill or going through an intersection. Our neighborhood deer herds that use the streets and sidewalks more than the residents do. Urgent volunteer firemen rushing down to the firehouse, and, of course, when the tours are flowing, we see tour trolleys stopping in the intersection and blocking the narrowest portions seven days a week.

So even your board member, Mr. Baranski, noted at the 12:30 meeting that High Street was, and I quote, a horrible street. So opening High Street up to the Franklin side is not going to make this street less horrible. Even with High Street being a dead end of sorts, all of the neighborhood residents can tell you stories about the crazy stuff that happens because of the oddities in this road. So the Pandora's box there is the impact of opening High Street to Franklin.

Another very steep hill with very little flat stopping room at the bottom of Franklin, you know, is that a snowy accident just waiting to happen there for the residents of this property? You know, the hill is actually so steep that the fire chief has stated that the trucks would have to

take a longer way around back, and then back down High Street in order to get to this location for an emergency. That's wasting a lot of valuable time if there is emergency.

You know, having Google divert all the lost and confused tourists from downtown, trying to find a parking spot, up through this neighborhood as the quickest route to get back to where they want to go. Having contractors and grain trucks and 18-wheelers following their GPS as fastest route through this neighborhood, that might sound like an exaggeration, but this summer, with Main Street closed, I sat at my desk, looked out the window, and I saw five 18-wheelers try to make it down High Street. The only one that didn't come back, and I didn't read about it in the newspaper, was the FedEx 18-wheeler. Everyone else had to back up High Street, block the whole thing, because their GPS told them that going down Elk got them into downtown somehow. So that would be happening more often.

You know, will the City have to cut down the catalpa tree that's in front of Grant's home because the road is too narrow for the increased traffic? Will trolleys have to limit their routes because the congestion is too great or the slowdown complaints become too many? You know, how many fender benders are worth it all for the odd intersection of this road? So I could go on and on, but I will stop there. In conclusion, we were told at the 12:30 meeting that this developer has not considered any other locations in Galena, but that they are open to other locations.

They stated that they regularly build completely new construction developments not only developments that repurpose old structures. I ask this board to reject this zoning change in an effort to encourage the City of Galena and this developer to look for a more suitable spot for additional low-income housing. I ask the zoning board to reject this project in favor of the people who already live here and put their hearts into this neighborhood instead of approving a project for people who are currently just on paper and a building that has been about demolished by neglect for over 46 years. So please, don't open this Pandora's box and change this neighborhood forever. So thank you for your time and consideration.

ROSENTHAL: Thank you. Next, Matt?

OLDENBURG: Don't see any other hands up or any chat. As part of COVID measures, we do accept for public hearings if somebody wrote in a letter, that we would read the letter for them. So I do have a letter that I need to read.

Amy Alderman, 314 Elk Street, Galena:

ALDERMAN: Matt, I'm sorry to interrupt. This is Amy Alderman. I don't have the option to raise my hand, but I would like to say . . .

OLDENBURG: Okay. I'll turn your video on, Amy.

ALDERMAN: Thank you.

OLDENBURG: We only see a camera, but . . .

ALDERMAN: I'm okay. I'm okay with that. I don't need to be on camera. So this is Amy Alderman. I live at 314 Elk Street. I merely want to echo what my neighbors have spoken and who are against this project. But first, I would like to say we are all neighbors here. And I would like to think that we are here with good intentions, that all of us in this meeting are here

with good intention. Obviously, what you are seeing here is an overwhelming majority of people who are against this project for a vast number of reasons.

If you truly want to construct a building for more than 30 apartments to serve the elderly and poor, then please find a place which can truly serve them safely. There are swaths of land available in the City, which could provide a safe environment for our residents and neighbors. Here, next to a nearly one-lane street, where a steep incline makes the space unsafe for people with disabilities, especially, this is not the answer. I am a fan of a theory called Occam's Razor. It means the simplest answer is the right one. And here, nothing seems simple at all. It is complicated because so many exceptions to rules are being requested. Those rules, under our zoning guidelines, were written for good reasons, to keep people safe, to keep our land beautiful, and to serve our community.

This request for a change to our zoning ordinance goes against every mark, safety, beauty of our land, diversity in housing, preservation of a historic neighborhood. As one of your constituents, I ask that you listen and that you are guided by the in-trust safety and needs of your neighbors and not by the promise of a developer, with a misleading front of historic preservation. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

ROSENTHAL: Thank you very much. Go ahead, Matthew, like to read that letter now for the record?

Zoning Administrator Matt Oldenburg read a letter from the following in opposition to the request :

Lynn Gallagher, 320 Elk Street, Galena (by written letter):

OLDENBURG: Okay. This is from Lynn Gallagher, 320 Elk Street. Dear members of Zoning Board of Appeals, the proposed St. Mary's project being considered for the Galena Zoning Board of Appeals does not meet the goals of the City of Galena Comprehensive Plan, nor does it meet the criteria to amend the zoning map. Although the plan states it meets Goals and Objectives 3.0 Housing, 10.1 Economic Development, and 10.2 Housing, it utterly fails to meet any of them.

3.0 Housing, the developer has not conducted any survey study analysis, assessment, review, or inspection of potential tenants, neighbors, or businesses to determine opportunities nor constraints. If they claim to have done so, they have not shared any of the results with said potential tenants, neighbors, or businesses. To ask the Zoning Board of Appeals to approve such a project with such poor forethought and planning is preposterous. I live with 250 feet of the proposed apartment complex, and I have never been contacted about the impact said apartment complex would have.

Section 10.1 Economic Development, work to provide housing opportunities that suit needs of employees and owners of current and future businesses in the City from the Comprehensive Plan. Again, the developer has not conducted any survey, study, analysis, assessment, review, or inspection of potential tenants, neighbors, or businesses that determine what if any needs of employees and owners of current and future businesses in the City would be addressed. Where is the population projection survey? Where is the economic employment survey? Why would owners of current and future businesses in the City have any opinion or bearing on where their employees live?

Next section is 10.2 Housing, development of additional condominiums to preserve increasing number of elderly residents. In quotes from my memo, although it's not proposed

condominium per se, it serves towards housing for elderly individuals. Where is the data? How many elderly persons live in Galena now? How many elder persons are planning to move to Galena? How many need alternative affordable housing? Excuse me. How many would like to live off the side of a, live on the side of a cliff?

Once again, if the developer had taken time to research the plan and build an apartment complex in the side of a steep bluff, they and we would know. Because they failed to do the bare minimum in asking the questions, there is no definitive answer. The City goal is to develop additional condominiums, not apartments. Additionally, if said elderly residents do not own a car, how in the world are they going to walk up either High Street from Franklin or down High Street from Elk? It's a very steep grade.

Not only did the developers fail to survey, study, analyze, assess, or view or inspect, they wholly failed to acknowledge the American with Disabilities Act. Anyone with any impairment of mobility will not be able to access this apartment complex without a car.

Goal # 4, encourage the development of additional housing that accepts funding systems for families and the elderly population from the Comprehensive Plan. Given all 35 apartments are one bedroom, families are not even being considered for affordable housing. The developer was asked about families occupying the apartment complex, and his answer was that they did not think any families would live there due to the size constraints. What kind of neighborhood development eliminates families? The elderly population was never even asked if they needed, wanted, or would consider moving to a one-bedroom apartment on Franklin Street.

Mixed-income neighborhoods should be the goal for Galena. Everyone benefits from mixed-income neighborhoods. This project segregates those who are income qualifying from those who are not. And it warehouses them in an institutional setting. The State of Illinois is moving away from large aggregate settings, not building more. No one wants to live in an institution, and this apartment complex is just that, a large, self-contained institution designed to keep them away from us. This is not a mixed-income project. This is just another way of keeping income-qualified individuals segregated.

Goal #5, from the Comprehensive Plan, the development of additional affordable housing options for the residents of Galena. Affordable housing options are vitally important to Galena, but a segregated apartment complex is not what has been demonstrated to be successful. As mentioned above, affordable housing should be the option for all residents of Galena, not just those who fit into a one-bedroom apartment.

Section 10.3 Transportation, Goal #2 from the Comprehensive Plan, develop new streets that promote interconnectivity and reduction of number of newly created dead-end streets that hinder traffic flow, accessed by public safety services. New streets will not be developed, but a very treacherous street, one that was closed to vehicular traffic due to its inherent danger, will be reopened. High Street between Franklin and Elk Street is hazardous, and anyone who drives it, drives at their own peril. It is closed for a reason.

To open that section of High Street will also open a corridor between Franklin and Highway 20, causing undue increased traffic. When asked about emergency vehicular access to the apartment complex, it was revealed that much discussion has already taken place about the need for fire trucks to back up from Elk Street around the corner onto High Street. This will take place on a street that is just a bit wider than one lane. This area also contains only, the only thoroughfare for volunteer firefighters to access the fire station on Bench Street.

If a firetruck is backing up around the corner to access the apartment complex, no other vehicles will be able to pass. Firefighters will have to consider alternative paths to the fire station, and people in buildings will suffer due to the delays caused by this construction. As one participant of the information session also noted, GPS devices will now route traffic from

Franklin to Highway 20 and vice versa via High Street. Cars, trucks, UPS, USPS, FedEx, etc. will now have a highway across town directly tunneling through the historic district.

Goal #3 addresses downtown parking issues. There is no guarantee that residents of the apartment complex both work downtown and wish to walk to work. Again, had the developer done their due diligence to determine the needs and wants of the good residents of Galena, they and we would know if this is a valid outcome. And why would we put the burden of a burgeoning parking problem on the backs of income-qualifying individuals? Instead of warehousing them and making them walk to work, perhaps the City could address the parking problem instead. There are numerous other sites close to downtown where parking could be provided and not place the onus on the good people who only want to go to work.

Following are the criteria for the amending the zoning map. Determining whether the proposed zoning map amendment shall be approved, the following factors should be considered. Number one, whether the existing text of zoning designation was in error at the time of adoption. If the zoning designation was in error at the time of adoption, why has it taken so long for it to be addressed? Number two, whether there has been a change of character in the area or throughout the City due to installation of public facilities, other zone changes, new growth trends, deterioration, development transitions, etc.

I have lived at 320 Elk for 25 years. There has not been a change of character in the area or throughout the City due to the installation of public facilities, other zone changes, new growth trends, deterioration, development transitions, etc. In fact, due to the designation of historic district, there has been no change in the last 25 years. To the contrary, the construction of this apartment complex would unalterably change the nature and character of the neighborhood and not for the better.

Number three, whether the proposed rezoning is compatible with the surrounding area and defining characteristics of the proposed zoning district, or whether there may be adverse impacts on the capacity or safety of the portion of street network influenced by the rezoning, parking problems or environmental impacts that the new zone may generate, such as excessive stormwater runoff, water, air, or noise pollution, excessive nighttime lighting, or other nuisances.

This project will adversely impact the capacity and safety of the portion of the street network influenced by the rezoning. Parking will be atrocious. There is already a significant lack of available parking in the neighborhood, and adding 35 to 70 more vehicles will only exacerbate the problem. Stormwater runoff is already a problem on Franklin Street. The noise emanating from 35 apartments and 35 to 70 vehicles will have a deleterious effect on human health, wildlife, and environmental quality. The lights from the parking lot will increase the light pollution and will have a disruptive effect on natural cycles, both human and animal.

Number four, whether the proposal is in conformance with and in furtherance of the implementation of the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, other adopted plans, and the policies, intents, and requirements of this code and other City regulations and guidelines. As noted above, this apartment complex is not in conformance and furtherance of the implementation of goals and policies that, of the Comp Plan.

Number five, whether adequate public facilities and services are available or will be made available concurrent with projected impacts of development of the proposed zone. There are legitimate concerns about water runoff, sewage, garbage pickup, and emergency access. A dangerous street is being considered for emergency access. There are homes in the neighborhood that do not have sewer access or limited sewer access. There is not enough infrastructure to support this project. The good citizens of Galena will have their taxes increased to pay for the tax credits being requested by the developer.

Number six, whether there is an adequate supply of land available in the subject area in the surrounding community to accommodate the zoning and community needs. Perhaps a small playground is adequate in terms of what can be built, but at what cost? To cram a 25-unit apartment building into a playground seems a bit cramped. Additionally, two lot, parking lots need to be built to accommodate the cars that the tenants will not be driving because the developer insists they will walk to work.

Number seven, whether there's a need in the community for the proposal, and whether there will be benefits derived by the community or area by the proposed rezoning. No one knows if there is a need in the community for this apartment complex project because the developer has not done their due diligence to ask. This is a big and. The project must meet needs one through seven above and the seven criteria below to be considered for amending the zoning. This is going to the Plan Unit Developing criteria.

Number one, more efficient infrastructure does not apply. This project does nothing to improve the infrastructure of the neighborhood. In fact, it will detract from whatever infrastructure is now in place. Additionally, this is not a high . . . land development. This was thrown together posthaste to get it through Zoning Board of Appeals as quickly as possible as shared by the developer during the December 30th meeting.

Number two, reduce traffic demands, absolutely applies, and the traffic demands will increase and not be reduced. Number three, greater quality and quantity of public, and/or private open space. Again, absolutely applies, and the quantity of public and/or private open space will decrease. Number four, other recreational amenities, none. Number five, needed housing types and/or mixed. This is not a mix of housing types. This project does not address the needs of the community.

Number six, innovative designs, not applicable. Number seven, protection of preservation of natural resources. The developer and architect noted that natural resources will be cut down. Trees that now line Elk Street will be cut down. Wildlife that live in the area will be forced to relocate or die. This apartment complex is a dream for the developer. They will request funding due to the historic nature of the original St. Mary's School Building. Tax credits will be applied for, and the good citizens of Galena will foot the bill for this. If the project only included the original St. Mary's School Building, there would be less opposition. But it does not.

The developer said in the informational meeting, if it's just St. Mary's, it's not worth it. When they asked how they determined number of units, the answer is, or it was, that's how many we need to turn a profit. There was willful disregard for the opinions, needs, wants, and expectations of the community. The developer only wants to build the additional apartment building to turn a profit as whose expense? The neighborhood is now zoned LDR or Low Density Residential. This means there can be six domiciles per acre. HDR or High Density Residential is 16 domiciles per acre. This project is asking for a variance for 39 domiciles per acre, almost 7 times the number of domiciles per acre that there are now. This is absurd.

If the Zoning Board of Appeals is considering amending the zoning determination, at least wait until full studies are completed and shared with the community. The developer should conduct a traffic impact study, employment current and future study, needs assessment, and others as deemed necessary and share the results with full, open, and honest communication with the residents.

For . . . at least 25 years, the old St. Mary's School Building has been an eyesore, a nuisance, an accident waiting to happen. If there is so much heart around this building, why has it been neglected for so long? It is great to preserve history, but this building is not even a building anymore but a pile of bricks. Do we save a pile of bricks and destroy a neighborhood?

Do we save a pile of bricks and destroy the beauty that is Galena? You can see my house and the surrounding area from Horseshoe Mound as you are driving from the east. My children used to make a game of it, looking first for the water tower and Cemetery Park and then just slightly downhill to our house.

If this project is approved, you and every visitor coming from the east will see an apartment complex instead. To quote Joanie Mitchell, they paved paradise and put up a parking lot. Sincerely, Lynn Gallagher.

Jerome Russ, 412 Elk Street, Galena (by written letter):

OLDENBURG: That's . . . and then when Mr. Meeker spoke on behalf of the 400 block of Elk, he covered all of their letter comments, I believe. But Jerome Russ added some comments as well. And I just wanted to hit those quick. There's only a few points. Jerome Russ, I'll have to look up his address, but he lives in the middle of the 400 block across from the old school.

He concurred with the block letter's comments and wanted to add that current sewer can barely handle the area. With such a large population increase, sewer capacity needs to be improved. Next bullet is St. Mary's School must be renovated first before the other constructions, the apartment building and parking lot begin. That way, they can show good faith by the developer.

The proposed parking lot next to 410 Elk Street must have drainage to prevent erosion of Elk Street next to the parking lot. This lot is part of an intermittent stream bed that floods early spring and summer rains. And lastly, the entrance to the proposed apartment building must be enlarged to accept fire engines to include a ladder truck. That's all I have for letters.

ROSENTHAL: Okay. So that's everybody that is going to speak in opposition then, Matt?

OLDENBURG: I believe so. We can give anybody else a chance if you want to unmute yourself and just let us know please.

ROSENTHAL: Would Jim and the developer like to come back and respond to any of this?

OLDENBURG: Okay, and their video and . . .

Testimony by the Applicant in response to the opposition:

ROSENTHAL: Yeah. Go ahead, Jim.

BARANSKI: Well, Jon, why don't you start with some of the points in that last letter? You can maybe clarify some of those things.

DAVIDSHOFER: Yep. So real quick, one of the questions was the amount of rent. And so while that number always fluctuates because we do have the majority of our units being affordable and income restricted, I can't give out the exact rents right now. But I can just say that the proposed model that we have right now, the average rent is about \$570. And then from the perspective of the letter, you know, a couple of things.

One thing, the utilization of tax credits does not increase anyone's tax burden or the amount that they would pay into something. These tax credits are already available. You know, they're federal dollars, so it wouldn't impact any of the homeowners there. And actually, the

project itself would, you know, benefit the tax base. You know, currently, the, I believe the structure generates about \$2,800 a year in real estate taxes. And, you know, what we're proposing is going to increase that by almost \$20,000 annually. You know, obviously, it's all going to depend on what the final numbers come back at.

And then from the perspective of doing our due diligence and having research and market data, you know, we obviously did a market study and appraisal and some other reports when we did Coatsworth Apartments. So we do have a lot of data from when we did that project. And then we continuously have to get a lot of demographic and population data and income data because we also applied for single-family rehabilitation funding from the state agency. And so that actually requires us to look into the single family and multifamily housing stock within the counties that we serve.

And so one of the counties that we do serve with our single-family rehabilitation and our home accessibility program is Jo Daviess County. So we are very well versed in, to what the needs are within the community. Obviously, you know, that will need to be updated if this project does move forward just because that is a requirement from our lenders and from, you know, the funders of the project, and so that's a standard. We would also have to supply our funding sources with a project needs assessment, which is basically a review of all construction costs and the timeline and all the repairs that are going to be needed over time.

So, you know, our hope is obviously to work with the City to, you know, prepare those final drawings. Obviously, there was some concerns about, you know, what the vegetation is currently. And I can just say that, you know, when we submit our application for funding, one of the things that we have to address is, you know, X amount of external amenities that are on the site. And, you know, that includes architectural guidelines that you have to follow as far as, you know, the number of trees or the placement of perhaps a picnic table or a grill for then tenants. You know, so we wouldn't really be looking to remove a significant amount of vegetation that's currently there.

And then from the standpoint of, you know, runoff, we've already talked through the draining and how it's going to, you know, impact not only the project but those within the community. When discussing affordable housing, you know, this is a mixed income because this isn't all affordable housing. As I mentioned before, we do have the mixed income component, so there are, as of right now, three units that are market rate or unrestricted from an income standpoint. But, you know, in our units, you're not going to have any idea who's who. You know, who we're targeting and who is going to live there, you know, it's going to be a wide range of tenants and individuals. This wouldn't be institutionalized, I believe, is what was said in the letter. That's not what we do. That's not going to be the case.

These are going to be high-quality units, highly constructed. You know, from the standpoint of applying for funding because we're not well capitalized, the issue is, is construction costs are at an all-time high. Construction costs are not getting any lower. Well, when you're constructing in rural areas, you're unable to get the rents that you would charge, you know, in Chicago or Springfield or in our case, the Iowa side of the Quad Cities. Well, construction costs are the same wherever you go. And so the issue is, is trying to make your units available to people who will rent them.

Well, you know, unfortunately, you can't charge \$2,000 of rent for a one-bedroom apartment in the community. So this isn't a case of, you know, the capitalization levels of our organization. This is strictly, if we want to charge what would be market rate, we would have 0 out of 31 units leased out. So the utilization of tax credits doesn't have any burden on the homeowners there. It really is a way to provide affordable housing. That's the structure of the

credits, and that's how the program is utilized. I think I hit everything that came from the letter. Okay.

BARANSKI: I have one thing to add. I think that that last letter, the person who wrote it said that the reason that Economic Growth didn't wouldn't do a project if it was smaller because they wouldn't make enough profit. They probably missed the part that Economic Growth is a nonprofit community developer. So they don't do these projects for profit.

And that's why, in my estimation, you're the perfect kind of developer to do this kind of a project because, you know, their goals and objectives are very, very different than working with other developers. I've worked with both kinds, and so I understand. And so that concept that, you know, they're not doing it. They just have to be able to pay their bills. And they have to be able to manage the project and not actually go out of business. And so that's where those numbers come in. It's not having to line the pockets of the developer with profit money because they don't, they're a nonprofit company, so.

ROSENTHAL: Is that it, Jim?

BARANSKI: Let me think, John. Hold on a second.

ROSENTHAL: Take your time.

BARANSKI: Yeah, there was some talk about that kind of density in that location. I should just note that Franklin McCoy is right across the street, and I believe it has more than twice the density of what we're asking for or very close to twice the, existing, so there is precedent. That is in the neighborhood. This is not something new to the neighborhood. It's been there. Yes, we're up the hill a little bit, but it's still a stone's throw. I think that should be pointed out. I would disagree with the assessment about the Comprehensive Plan. I think this project meets the goals of the Comprehensive Plan on many levels. And, you know, the provision of affordable housing, number one, and that's a problem everywhere.

And it should be pointed out that the American Planning Association recommends that affordable housing projects like this, multifamily housing projects like this are located in low-density residential areas, just for that, that's for that, you get that mix, the dynamic mix. So that is the thing. And technically, there was some question about whether this is spot zoning. In Illinois, in order for it to be spot zoning, it needs to also meet a second criteria, which is if it's not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. And I strongly believe that this is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. So this technically would not be considered spot zoning.

ROSENTHAL: Okay. Anything else?

BARANSKI: No, I think that's it, John.

ROSENTHAL: Any questions of the Board to the developer or to Mr. Baranski?

BOCHNIAK: Yeah, Jim and John, what about the concern about traffic?

DAVIDSHOFER: So we, we talked to, Jim and I have talked about this quite a bit. You know, obviously, we already understand that there's traffic concerns there. And what we would do is obviously work with the City to the best of our ability with concerns of traffic. You know,

obviously, with the lighting, with the final plan, with the landscaping, with the drainage, you know, these are the types of conversations that we're going to have with the City to ensure that we are respectful and sincere on areas of concern and taking in, you know, those comments for what people have expressed.

And so any way that we can alleviate some of those traffic concerns, we're definitely open minded and, you know, willing to work with the elected officials who think this is the best way to go about it.

BARANSKI: Yeah, and also, I think that the concept of opening up the street up to the, up to Elk, there's some question about whether it should continue on up to Upper Elk. I think that's a conversation with the City. And if it did go to Upper Elk, it's a very narrow road. Maybe that should just be one-way. The goal is to get people up and down from the project right down to Franklin. And I think if you try to go over on Elk and over to High, I'm sorry, to Dodge, that transition from, from, is a difficult for any car.

So I don't think people are going to be going that direction all the time because every time I drive on it, my car bottoms out. So I think that this link will go up. People will go to their, you know, their units, whatever, and then turn around and come back down to Franklin Street. So I, you know, I submit that the idea of it increasing the traffic on that east-west portion that is going back over to Dodge, I think, is probably less a problem because of the way that intersection is at Dodge.

I would say that, you know, most of the traffic is going to go up and down Franklin Street, directly from the project. Now whether they, we connect through and up to the upper part, that's a question that we want to work out with the City. If we did it, how would we do it? It's a very difficult, it's a very narrow, it's steep. It's kind of got a little side-slope to it. There would be quite a bit of work that would have to be done to it. To make it two lanes would be very, very difficult.

To make it a usable one lane, which means you can only go one direction, so either you have people going up or people going down, but it can't be both. And we don't know which is better. We'll talk with the City about that if that even needs to be done. Otherwise, you know, just opening up to the lower part of Elk is, will provide access to the cars that are going to be there, and then they could head right back down the street.

ROSENTHAL: Any other questions?

MAN: Yeah, I have a question for John and Jim. You mentioned that this is for elderly housing, and definitely people with disabilities could be, this could be a housing unit for them. What do you have in plan for people with disabilities and the elderly to be safe, since this is located on such a steep grade?

DAVIDSHOFER: Yeah, real quick, I'm going to let Jim get to the accessibility and the adaptability pieces that we have to abide by from not only the Illinois Architectural Guidelines but also from the Illinois Housing Development Authorities Guidelines. But I think perhaps there was some confusion. These are not elderly units. These are non-elderly units, meaning these are open to whomever. You know, it's not a, if it were elderly, it would be restricted to those 62 and up. So these are, these are non-elderly.

I don't know if it was submitted as elderly. If so, that would be incorrect. But, you know, these units are, while we're, quote, unquote, targeting the service workers, you know, these would be made available to anyone who would like to rent if they are looking for the

income-restricted units, obviously, they would have to income qualify to ensure that they would be eligible. But I'll let Jim go over and talk through the accessibility.

BARANSKI: Yeah, I mean, the accessibility, so we will have to have a certain number of accessible units based on ADA(?) requirements. I think it's 10%, so we'll have at least three units, between three and four units that will be accessible. However, the way it works is that all these units have to be either accessible or adaptable. Obviously, when, both these buildings are going to have accessible parking. They're both going to be, both have elevators, right? So there will be an elevator in the Old St. Mary's. Okay.

There will be an elevator in the new building. There will be accessible parking spaces, and then the, if there are, there will be accessible units. Those are what are called Type A accessible units. They will be fully accessible, meaning they will have, you know, fully accessible bathrooms and kitchens and all of the necessary clearances. However, all of the units will be Type, you know, if they're not Type A unit, they'll be a Type B unit, which is what's called an adaptable unit, which is still by and large an accessible unit, but not to that same level. It could be convertible. But we will have the necessary amount of handicap or accessible units and parking to go with it.

ROSENTHAL: Anything else? Any other questions?

WOMAN: I have a question. I have a question of, I'm living in an apartment at 4th and Franklin. I wanted to know what the next step in the process of the application is.

ROSENTHAL: The next process is once we come out of the public hearing, then the board will, there will be a motion made on whether to approve or deny the request. And from that point on, it goes to the City Council, correct, Matt? You're muted. Oh, there you go.

OLDENBURG: The board, after the close of the public hearing, will make a recommendation to the City Council if they want to recommend to approve or deny or approve with conditions. And then that goes to the City Council for their discussion and possible action. If they approved it, then the preliminary phase and potentially the rezoning would be handled at that point.

Afterwards, the applicant would go through a design phase and go through all of the site development and building development concepts and a final detail with lighting and accessibility and all those, and stormwater and all those, you know, final level detail. And that comes back to the Zoning Board of Appeals for another public hearing after the public has had a chance to review those plans, and we would have another one of these hearings like we are tonight.

And that is approved at the Zoning Board level, whether or not that meets their preliminary PUD guidelines that are being established in this phase. If that gets approved, they also have to go through Historic Preservation review for the building and site improvements. And they also need to meet all of the international building code standards, fire, life, safety code standards, ADA accessibility standards, which are all reviewed through the Building Department and the staff. So there's quite a bit yet to do.

WOMAN: Thank you.

BARANSKI: Yeah, and just so people know, it would, by the time, and I think I might have mentioned it before, but it could, it probably wouldn't be starting construction on this because of all of the gauntlets that have to be run and, you know, sometime in the middle of 2023.

ROSENTHAL: Okay. Do we have any other questions of the applicant or the Jim? If not, I'll entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

COOK: I'll move to close the public hearing.

OLDENBURG: . . . hand up, Mr. . . .

ROSENTHAL: What's that, Matt?

OLDENBURG: We have a hand up from Dan Harms. I think they want to ask a question.

ROSENTHAL: Okay, go ahead.

OLDENBURG: Didn't catch it, sorry. When I get their video up here.

HARMS: Okay. Dan Harms, 308 Elk Street. This is just a couple of questions. As I understand it, Matt and the, what you've put out, part of this is a PUD application.

OLDENBURG: Yes.

HARMS: What is the area of that planned unit development?

OLDENBURG: The current property lines are comprised of a total of approximately .93 acres. They do want to ask for a vacation of part of the street right of way in order to get the retaining walls on the uphill side of the new building within their property as well as potentially the parking spaces in front of the St. Mary's School Building. So that process would also, I didn't mention that in our explanation earlier, but that would be concurrently requested with the Council at its subsequent council meeting, whether or not they could vacate that. And that would be considered in this preliminary phase as well when it gets to the council level in concept, so.

HARMS: The other, one other question I have does the City have standards and requirements as to stormwater runoff and site water handling engineering?

OLDENBURG: Yes, that's required to be designed by a licensed professional engineer in the State of Illinois. And they have to design to a 100-year storm event for the return period, and it needs to meet 115% of that capacity. They have to demonstrate all of the runoff discharges, all of the routing for the conveyance of that. You know, it's, we make sure that it's completely covered in that regard.

ROSENTHAL: Is that it, Dan?

HARMS: Yep, thank you.

ROSENTHAL: All right, thanks, Dan. All right. If nothing else, again, I will entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

MOTION: Cook moved, seconded by Jansen to close the Public Hearing for 20PD-01.

Motion carried on voice vote.

MOTION: Janson moved to approve the request as proposed; motion dies for lack of a second.

No other motions were made.

NEW BUSINESS

None

OTHER BUSINESS

None

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

MOTION: Bochniak moved, seconded by Cook to adjourn the meeting at 8:27 pm.

Motion carried on voice vote.

Respectfully submitted by

Matthew Oldenburg
Zoning Administrator