

Comments to Sugar Grove Planning Commission re Crown Development proposal for the development of 760 acres at the I88/Route 47 interchange.

Mary Ochsenchlager
maryoxie@sbcglobal.net
630 643-4922
February, 2019

I am focusing my comments on Zoning Lot 4 and Seavey Creek and its floodplain only. Zoning lot 4 is located in the southeast quarter of the interchange. This property contains the only high quality wild area in the Crown Crossroads Corporate Center proposal. This fine, mature oak and hickory woodland, along with Seavey creek is a rare, remnant, natural area. It functions as a buffer for the nearby homes and for those driving on Rt. 47. It screens the tollway and muffles the constant noise a tollway brings. Just as importantly it offers welcome visual relief in what will become a jarring sea of roofs and paving. Most important of all however are the functions this natural area provides for the community.

Functions of intact natural systems

- Improves air quality by absorbing carbon dioxide and producing oxygen.
- Improves water quality by filtering and absorbing stormwater
- Recharges aquifers by holding and absorbing precipitation
- Provides flood storage by holding and absorbing precipitation
- Provides wildlife habitat.
- Provides soil conservation by holding the soil and buffering raindrops.
- And provides a place for humans to renew their spirits.

This is the only area in the whole proposal that provides those important functions. It provides them now and should continue to do so in the future when they will be needed even more.

These functions cannot be replaced by any man-made facility.

These functions, especially in this critical location, are invaluable. The \$193,000.00 (as referenced in the Staff Report p. 16 &17) that is being

Exhibit T

given to the village for permission to destroy this woodland will not begin to replace the value of this woodland to the community.

A study done for the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning or CMAP titled Green Infrastructure Vision gives actual values for some of the functions provided by woodlands systems in the Chicago area. These include values for flood control, water purification, ground water recharge and carbon storage. Using the median dollar value given, which is described in acre/year, I calculated the partial functional value of this approximately 35 acre woodland. It comes to \$100,695 per year - year after year. To sell that for \$193,000 is like killing the goose that laid the golden egg.

As described in the Staff Report (p.16) this development falls below the 40% open space requirement. 40% isn't just a nice number to be ignored if it is inconvenient or expensive. Instead it addresses the limits of impermeability beyond which there are serious water quality, water supply and flood risks.

I propose that the Sugar Grove Planning Commission recommend to the the President and Trustees of the Village that they remove Zoning Lot 4 from the Planned Development District and that they recommend it to be designated open space and fulfill the 40% open space requirement

I want to go over the Standards for Rezoning that this commission reviews when considering map amendment requests and how they pertain to this parcel.

The first standard asks whether the proposed action will promote public health, safety and comfort.

Removing this forest and replacing it with commercial businesses will do the opposite, as air and water pollution will increase without the cleansing functions of the woodland. Clearly not healthy.

Another standard asks if the proposed use is more suitable for the property than the current zoning allows.

Once again the answer is no. Although it would be a shame to remove any part of the woods, estate housing would at least leave portions intact to do some of the important work the woodland now does.

And a further standard asks if the proposed use will change the character of this neighborhood or be detrimental to adjacent property.

Clearly the answer is yes. The removal of the woods and building a commercial development on Zoning Lot 4 will remove the buffer the neighborhood enjoys between it and the tollway. As far as changing the character all you have to do is get in your car and drive north from here for a short distance. As you go around the curve the woods comes into view - visualize instead a gas station, a multi-story hotel, McDonalds, or any of the myriad businesses that might be built there.

The best course of action for the Village will be to remove Zoning Lot 4 from the Planned Development District and protect it as open space.

Mary Ochsenschlager
Feb. 6 2019

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE VISION

VERSION 2.3 ECOSYSTEM SERVICE VALUATION

FOR VALUATION OF ECOSYSTEM SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE
NATURAL RESOURCES INCLUDED IN THE CHICAGO WILDERNESS
GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE VISION

Final Report

Prepared by The Conservation Fund

Will Allen, Ted Weber, Jazmir Varela, CMAP Technical Committee
November 2014

Prepared for the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning
CMAP CONTRACT #C-14-0041

Point of Contact:

Will Allen

Director of Strategic Conservation Planning

The Conservation Fund

410 Market Street, Suite 360

Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Phone: 919-967-2248

wallen@conservationfund.org

<http://www.conservationfund.org/strategic-conservation>

ECOSYSTEM SERVICE	LANDSCAPE TYPE					
		Woodlands / Forest	Prairie / Grassland / Savanna	Wetlands	Natural Floodplains	Lakes
Water Flow Regulation/ Flood control	Selected	\$1,603	\$16,000	\$22,000	\$6,500	\$37,000
	Median	\$1,415	\$16,000	\$4,900	\$3,700	\$43,000
Water Purification	Selected	\$1,300	\$57	\$4,350		\$0
	Median	\$1,060	\$57	\$3,429		\$0
Groundwater Recharge	Selected	\$269	\$269	\$660	\$4,806	\$566
	Median	\$269	\$269	\$2,479	\$4,806	\$566
Carbon Storage	Selected	USED SPATIALLY EXPLICIT DATA FROM NBCD + gSSURGO				
	Median	\$133	\$82	\$136		\$0

Table Notes/Assumptions:

All numbers in \$2014/ac/year.

Selected numbers for flood control compared to detention ponds constructed in Cook County, IL, assuming a 50 year lifespan.

Given the lack of studies, we gave prairie the same value for groundwater recharge as forest.

For wetland water storage, we used the lower bound (1 million gallons/ac).

For prairie carbon storage, we picked the midpoint from Matamala et al. (2008) and avoided damages of \$2/tonne/year.

Wetland carbon storage would depend on the type of vegetation (see the literature review for more information)

We had no values for prairie wildlife value, so gave it the same as for woodlands/forest.

The recreation value from the studies for prairie seemed too low, so we gave it the same value as forest.

The following section provides a brief summary of each of the six ecosystem services researched and mapped for the CMAP 7-county region. The summary points are derived from the comprehensive literature review. The summary of why the service is important and the action steps to maintain and enhance the service were drawn directly from feedback at the public workshop in August 2014. The action steps are not intended to be comprehensive but simply an illustration of potential follow up activities that can be undertaken by CMAP and Chicago Wilderness partners. The opportunities to maintain and enhance services provided by the GIV are drawn from feedback at the public workshop and a review of the GIV data layers. More information on all of these products is available in the appendices.