**VILLAGE OF HAMPSHIRE**

**PLAN COMMISSION**

**MINUTES**

The Village of Hampshire Plan Commission convened a meeting on April 22, 2019 at 7:00 p.m.. Present were Chair William Robinson, and members of Bryan Mroch, Aaron Neal, Kenneth Swanson, William Rossetti, and Timothy Wetzel.

The minutes of the last meeting of the Plan Commission from January 14, 2019 were approved by voice vote.

The first order of business before the Commission was review of the Concept Plan a Planned Residential Development to be called “Hampshire Ridge,” a proposed gated, age-restricted residential development for property located on the north side of US Highway 20 at and near Gast Road. The Village Attorney made a short introduction of the project, and Mr. Michael Gazzola, Entre Commercial Realty, addressed the Commission. Gazzola identified the subject property as part of the original Hampshire Woods Business Park territory, and stated that since 1991 he has been unable to successfully market any development of the property for commercial/industrial uses, citing the unusual shape and the topography as hindrances to such development.

Mr. Peter Lappin, one of the owners of the applicant, 3001 Investment, LLC, then addressed the Commission and introduced two other members of his team that night, including Derek Fuller, his partner, and Monica Goshorn-Maroney from Weber Land Planning.

Mr. Fuller spoke briefly about the need for affordable, quality housing for senior citizens.

Ms. Goshorn-Maroney presented a series of slides depicting the land plan for the property, some of the detail for landscaping and improvements, models of types of homes that would be available, and a list of advantages provided to the Village by such development.

The development would consist of the Hummer Trust and Leone Trust properties, constituting approximately eighty-one (81) acres. There would be 278 dwelling units constructed on the site. . Lots would be approximately 55’ x 125’. The development would be gated; and age-restricted to 55 and older. The development would include 40% open space (parks; trails; and passive open space areas). Village sewer and water would be extended to serve the new residences; roads would be private.

Lappin explained the methods of taxation which would apply to the development. Sales of homes would be treated as sales of personal property, subject to sales tax. Lots would be leased to homeowners, for which the developer (as landlord) would pay an annual property tax (passed through to the leaseholder under a lease agreement). Special improvements to the premises, such as a garage, porch or deck, would be subject to real estate taxes as well. Homeowners would pay usual water and sewer monthly fees. Lappin stated that he had prepared a “fiscal impact” statement at the request of the Village President (although he did not present such a statement to the Plan Commission). The statement reported to the Village the amount of tax revenues that would be generated by the development.

Lappin also pointed out that pursuant to Village Code, certain impact fees and transition fees would be paid by the developer in the years following commencement of development on the property.

The Village has suggested to the developer that a back-up Special Service Area will be required to cover the potential future liability of the Village for maintenance of the roadways. In addition, the usual back-up Special Service Area would be required for maintenance of any stormwater facilities.

Lappin stated that the homes would be approximately 1,500 s.f up to 2,000 s.f. in size. He anticipated that the average sales price of a home in the development would be not less than $150,000; homeowners would have options for upgrades that could raise the price to 175,000 or even $200,000. The homes would be purchased from Clayton Homes (Indiana), shipped to Illinois, and sold locally. Lappin stated that a home in this development might appreciate in value. Homes would be available for purchase on an installment contract, although Lappin anticipated that many would be purchased for cash.

It was yet to be determined if rentals would be allowed. Gazzola stated that the issue of renting out a property might be reserved for Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for the development, and noted that knew as familiar with another development that allowed no more than 10% rental units. There would be a property owners association for the development.

Each lease would cover expenses normally covered by an association assessment, including the real estate taxes and any special service area tax. Lappin stated that the lease expense might be $700 - $800 per month.

The developer had not yet considered whether some open space should be improved as a playground for children. Children will not be allowed to live in the development, but may visit for up to one month per year.

Lappin stated that there were similar developments in Rockford, Michigan (outside Grand Rapids), and in Grayslake, Illinois.

Mr. Steve Gustafson addressed the Commission to make public comment. He stated that he was a member of the Board of Trustees of Hampshire Township, and this development would present financial difficulties for the township senior services programs, such as Dial-a-Ride, shopping outings, and other senior citizen programs, because of the small amount of property taxes generated by the development.

The Commission discussed the Concept Plan. Wetzel asked if playground equipment would be installed at any of the parks, for visiting children. Mroch noted that the Village’s Comprehensive Plan called for commercial/industrial uses in this area, as part of the Tollway Corridor. Neal was concerned that the Village of Hampshire would not be able to “absorb” the development if the developer failed or went bankrupt.

The Commission identified three conditions which ought to be considered further by the Board of Trustees in regard to this proposed development:

1. The developer should reach out to all the affected taxing bodies, and in particular, the Fire Protection District, and the Township, to identify and compare the estimated tax revenues with the cost of demand for services resulting from the proposed development;

2. The developer should construct all improvements in the development to the standards required by Village Code; and

3. The Village Board should consider establishing a transition fee for Hampshire Township.

On motion by Swanson, seconded by Wetzel, to recommend approval of the Concept Plan, subject to the three conditions listed above, the vote was 3 aye (Robinson, Wetzel, and Swanson), 3 nay (Mroch, Rosetti, and Neal). Motion failed.

The applicant briefly inquired of the Commission members why they voted against the proposal. The consensus was that there were ”too many unknowns” about the project, in particular about the fiscal impact of the project, for them to support it at this time.

On motion duly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m..

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Kenneth Swanson

Secretary