

Good evening, my name is Bill Klish, address 1864 Hunters Ridge Lane in the Hannaford neighborhood. My wife and I moved out from downtown Chicago 11 years ago to raise our family. all hours of the day in downtown Chicago, we see a few cars go by each hour. This provides is exactly what we were looking for when we moved.

Exhibit a

My father was involved in my New York hometown's Planning Commission for 21 years, serving the last 12 as Chairman, so I can directly appreciate the sacrifice you are making to serve all of us, and I appreciate it. My hometown is roughly double the size of Sugar Grove. Given the proximity to my home and magnitude of this proposal, I forwarded on the materials from the applicant to my father for review given his extensive background. He has written a statement that I will not read at this time, as some of his points were already raised by other speakers but will include as part of testimony in the record. He did raise what I believe is an important Planning Commission procedural concern. I know we were directed to not make this a conversation with the Commission, but many questions have been raised with the first twenty speakers without their being any formal replies by either the applicant, applicant's vendors or the Commission. So, I would like to ask will the public be receiving written responses to all the questions raised throughout the testimony prior to any decisions being made?

I am a business owner, and as part of my job the past 16 years, I write a lot of proposals for work that my company must go out and deliver. Given my experience of carefully choosing words in these documents, the proposal submitted by the applicant is incomplete and incorrect in several areas.

On page 32 of the Part 1 Packet, the collection of Kane County Property Identification Numbers only adds up to a total of 756.4 acres. However, on page 21, it is listed that the site total is 760.56 acres. So, is a PIN missing, or is the total 756.4 and not 760.56 acres?

On page 23, in the section Titled "STANDARDS for REZONING". Of the four questions that need to be satisfied, I must make it clear that I believe that the answers provided fail to meet or exceed the standards for granting rezoning.

As for the second question related to the development trend in the area, the applicant's answer states, I quote: **"Development has been dormant since the 2008 Great Recession"**. In the year 2018, the Hannaford Farm neighborhood that directly borders this property had nine building permits issued, to be built on ten lots. The build out of ten lots in a subdivision with only 66 available is substantial and not what I would classify as Dormant.

Further in the applicant's response to this question it is stated, I quote: **"The interchange construction is a trend setting development."** I completely agree with that statement. For those potential future residents that need to commute to the East, being able to quickly get onto I-88 is a huge selling point for our neighborhood and for all of Sugar Grove. My in-laws relocated out to Sugar Grove and into the 96 home Meadowridge Villas community a few years ago. This subdivision is located a few miles to the east from the proposed area and was completed by K Hovnanian homes and sold out very quickly. Like the property in question in this proposal, that subdivision backs to a highway, IL-56 in their case. Given how quickly that entire neighborhood was built up, I would like to suggest that type of Development, which is an over 55 active community, as an alternative use for the applicant to consider. According to the 2018 Urban Land Institute's Emerging Trends in Real Estate for the US and Canada, co-authored by PWC, it lists Senior housing as having the third best investment and development prospects.

As for the fourth question about altering the character of the neighborhood or being detrimental to the adjacent property, the applicant confirms that the proposed change will, I quote: **"The addition of the interchange changes the character of this area."** It absolutely will change the character of this area in many negative ways. The most important way is in the health and safety of the school children, parents, teachers and students that travel along route 47 to get to the Kaneland High School and Waubensee Community college each day. Not only will there be higher potential for accidents with increased traffic, there will be a larger increase in air pollution from all the additional truck traffic. According to data collected by the NOAA, the average wind speed since 2010 for Sugar Grove is 9.1 MPH. That is a lot of power to disperse the diesel pollution throughout our neighborhoods, with detrimental effects as Dr. Bajowala testified previously.

As a side effect if this zoning were to be granted, changing over this area to a corporate park will begin to lower the property values of all the surrounding homes. According to two expert witnesses who testified recently in a small Pennsylvania town that was discussing allowing a Developer to put up an 822,000 square foot facility, one fifth the size of that being proposed by the applicant, I quote **“surrounding homeowners will conservatively lose 11.5 percent of their home value.”** Two of the highest taxed Sugar Grove subdivisions, Strafford Woods and Hannaford Farm are adjacent to this property. Lower property values will mean lower taxes, impacting projected/expected revenue into the county, village and School District. Layering a TIF on top of this proposal will further magnify the potential money that village taxpayers will be responsible for.

The traffic study conducted by Kimley Horn is marked with a DRAFT watermark in the packet. Is this the final traffic impact study or is it still being reviewed and revised? If not final, when will the final study be provided? While I read through the report, I must admit that the amount of information was overwhelming without much in the way of conclusions in layman terms. I would ask that a straightforward and clear conclusion be added to the Final version of the report, so there is no ambiguity to what Kimley Horn is recommending.

Draft version or not, I have serious doubts about the validity of its contents. On page 10 of the traffic study it says that the peak traffic data was captured in June 2018. That is a very curious date to select as it is not representative of the worst-case scenario with peak traffic, which is what a valid impact study should represent. June 2018 is probably the time of the year in the village with the least amount of traffic running through the proposed area. Kaneland Schools completed the 2018 academic year on May 31st, 2018. So, all the bus, parent, teacher, administrator, coach and student traffic for high, middle and elementary schools would not be present on the roads for both academic as well as athletic practices and events. Furthermore, I bet many families like mine decided to take vacation in early June as many schools in other states are still in session, so the car volume was further reduced. Lastly, the other traffic that could not have been captured in this study is that from the snow plows that have been active of late around the roads given the winter weather we have been experiencing. I am not a traffic engineer, but it stands to reason for this area of the country, winter time, with schools in session would be the worst-case scenario for capturing accurate data for a traffic impact study's recommendation and conclusion to be valid and relevant.

At the August 21, 2018 Sugar Grove village board meeting a motion was carried to approve an Economic Impact Study for the applicant's Project. Given that it was approved five months ago, has this report been completed? If it has, when will that be provided to the Planning board and the residents? Specifically, I would like to know the impacts to the various Village Departments in terms of personnel, training, equipment and infrastructure. I don't think making any decision of this magnitude without all the details is advisable.

As stated by some of the other speakers, adding these types of structures will strain a village's infrastructure. The proposal states that the warehouse distribution centers can be five, six or more stories. That raises the following questions:

- The current Sugar Grove Building Code has a maximum of three stories allowed, so the applicant is asking for a variance, but I don't see that documented in the proposal.
- Can the Sugar Grove Fire Department protect a building of that height or is additional equipment going to need to be purchased?
- Internally to the building, does the current Sugar Grove water supply provide enough pressure/volume to support a fire sprinkler system?
- There is no mention of what the warehouses will be storing, so if in the event these warehouses are built, I request that restrictions be put in place to limit flammable, hazardous or other substances from being stored and risking the wellbeing and safety of the nearby residents.

As for the variance on open space being less than 40%, I agree with others that have previously testified that the 40% requirement is non-negotiable. A couple of years ago when we added some improvements to our backyard, Michelle, the former Sugar Grove Village inspector went around the entire perimeter of my landscape beds and other ground

cover with a tape measure to ensure we were still within that guideline with what was planned. I appreciate that it is a defining characteristic of the village that prevents overbuilding, so I hope the village does not even entertain for a second allowing Crown or any developer to do less. The applicant appears to be trying to squeeze as much out of their property as possible which does not align with the Comprehensive Land Use plan or character of the surrounding areas.

I was fortunate enough to make it early enough to the session on January 16th to get a seat and hear/see the presentation given as part of the applicant's testimony. These are the top five reasons I captured that the applicant provided for this being the right time and place for this proposal:

1. The type of project is needed because the world is moving to ecommerce and needs to have as many warehouses close by, as consumers no longer shop in physical stores
2. The project will bring construction and permanent jobs to the area
3. They were instrumental and have invested in getting the full interchange at IL-47 and I-88
4. Having a business park will help diversify the tax base and keep taxes in check
5. The developer has held onto the land for fifteen plus years and would like to see development happen

To these points I have the following counter points for the planning commission to consider:

- Based on the last twenty years of my career working with cutting edge technology, the next big thing that is coming is not ecommerce, but the Artificial Intelligence revolution, and along with that, displacement of jobs performed by humans. I believe the number provided in the applicant's presentation was four to five thousand jobs would be created by this Development. Not only are companies like Tesla, Volvo and Daimler working to build completely autonomous delivery trucks, but companies like the UK Supermarket Chain Ocado in partnership with Kroger are currently building facilities that require little to no human involvement to load and unload cargo at their warehouses. There was no timeline given with the applicant's proposal, but I would bet that prior to its completion, many of the promised jobs would no longer be required.
- According to the latest St. Louis Federal Reserve Bank's Unemployment rate data, as of January 3rd, 2019, Kane County is 4.6% while the national average is 3.9%. Although new jobs are always a good thing, it doesn't seem like employment is a driving concern in our area now. According to many studies of Amazon distribution centers created outside large cities, warehouse jobs are low paying, high stress and often sees some of the workers collecting food stamps due to low pay and benefits, which would be a further burden and stress on our village and county.
- Of course, Crown Development was instrumental in getting the full interchange going. They want their property to be more accessible, and therefore more desirable for development. However, just because they have a vested interest in accelerating the timeline per the Sugar Grove Board Report dated November 14, 2018 and are willing to contribute a little over one million dollars of an estimated 600 million-dollar project, shouldn't be a reason we need to rush the project ahead. What is the timeline and cost to the village if we don't rush the project and let it take its due course and follow the standard procedure? That answer was not provided in the Village of Sugar Grove Board Report. What is it?
- As for this development keeping taxes in check, looking back through my taxes paid the last ten years, they have increased an average of 1.09%. I don't think any homeowner expects it to go down, but this level of increase seems to indicate that our County, School and Village administrators are effectively keeping things in check. However, if taxpayers need to take on the burden of this 600 million-dollar project via a TIF, and the applicant is expecting not to pay taxes and receive additional concessions by our Village over a multi-decade period, I am confident that tax rate increases will be the only way to make up the shortfall.
- As for the developer wanting to rush things ahead with this development since they have been holding onto the land for fifteen plus years, I want to provide some financial context around their property. According to the Kane County Treasurer's Property Tax web site, the total taxes paid for year 2017 for these 756.4 acres was

\$46,481, or about \$61 per acre. Interestingly, three of the Kane County PINs submitted (11-32-200-005, 11-32-328-007, 14-04-100-030) representing almost ten acres of farmland have paid no taxes in any of the last fifteen years. For comparison, the average tax per home in the Hannaford Farms subdivision is close to \$20,000 per year for half an acre. Of the 756.4 acres, 687.34 acres are designated as Farmland. Each of the last ten years that we have lived nearby, corn has been visible growing in the applicant's property. According to the Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics at the University of Illinois, 2018 was an exceptional year for farmland yields. For 2018, predicted bushels per acre for corn was 207. Soybeans set a record for the highest ever yield in 2018 of 64 bushels per acre. University of Illinois economist Gary Schnitkey projects 2019 "operator and land returns at \$228 per acre for corn and \$225 per acre for soybeans". Based on that, the income from the farmland would be around \$155,000. Sorry for all the numbers, but the point I want to make clear is that the applicant has not been losing money on this property the last fifteen years. I am sure they either have received rent for the land or a percentage of crop sales. Sitting on the land a little longer is economically not a hardship for them.

I want to close with my recommendation for the Planning Commission. Instead of rushing this proposal through, I propose that you recommend denying the applicant's proposed rezoning at this time based on the incorrect information in the proposal, inconclusive traffic report, missing economic impact report and failure to satisfy the standards for rezoning. I think it best to wait for the interchange to be completed before entertaining any proposals for this property.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bill Klish". The signature is stylized and cursive.

Bill Klish

1864 Hunters Ridge Lane

Sugar Grove, IL 60554

2/5/2018

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

My name is William Klish. I live in Johnson City, New York with a population of 15,000. For 21 years I served on the Zoning Board of Appeals (5 years) and then the Planning Board for 16 years, I was elected as the Chairman the last 12 years for the Planning Board and retired in 2008.

During my 21 years of service, hundreds of applications came before our board(s) from developments to residential variances. My son, Bill Klish is a resident of Sugar Grove and has asked my review of projects being proposed in the Village. Most recently he has made me aware of the Crown Project and wanted my opinion based on my years of experience. I was glad to see the Sugar Grove Planning Commission was holding hearings and allowing residents and others to provide input before any recommendation is made on this project. Your written and verbal responses to points of concern and questions are vital to the future of Sugar Grove.

I would believe that a similar process

(2)

exist as we followed in the village of Johnson City where each Dept. Head would review the application(s) and note their concerns or no impacts in writing back to the Planning Board. Also, applicable County and State government dept.'s, I did not see any responses in the data sent to me by my son, but assume this will occur and be shared with the residents and public.

My assessment of this project based on years of reviewing applications note the following concerns:

1. Impacts on Village Dept.'s:

- a) Additional manpower required,
- b) Added equipment (police cars, trucks, etc.)
- c) Increased water supply, waste treatment, storm sewer, and garbage disposal capacities needed.
- d) Special training for many personnel to handle emergencies.

2. Application Information Lacking:

(3)

2. a. Traffic Study needs to be summarized into layman terms showing impact of number of tractor trailers on various roadways at various hours of the day, especially when children are going to school or home by bus or car. The study should be updated for months when school is in session.

b. Economic Study - Will this development broadcast impact to the Village?

c. Safety and Security - What are the increased dangers to the Village with the massive number of tractor trailers coming from around many states.

The above items do not appear or in the case of the traffic study needs update before a final decision is made. I will be looking forward to hearing your answers to concerns posed by the residents and those noted by me.

Respectfully submitted by;
William Klish

Acknowledgments

The taking of an acknowledgment consists of positively identifying the signer of a document. The signer need not sign in the notary's presence but must personally appear before the notary and state that the signature on the document is his or hers. Acknowledgments may be taken in an individual capacity or in a representative capacity (as an authorized representative of another -- for example, as officer of a corporation for and on behalf of the corporation or as an attorney in fact for another person). These short form certificates are sufficient to meet the requirements of the law.

Acknowledgment (in an individual capacity):

State of Illinois
County of Kane

This instrument was acknowledged before me on 2/6/19
(date) by Kristin Sudol (name of person).

(seal)

Kristin Sudol
signature of notary public

