



## MEMORANDUM

To: Vijay Gadde, AICP  
Director of Planning & Zoning  
Village of Homer Glen

From: Konstantine Savoy AICP, President, Savoy Consulting Group  
Todd Vanadilok AICP, Principal, Egret & Ox Planning

Date: December 18, 2020

**Subject: Response to Public Comments and Resident Survey**

The completed draft of the Homer Glen Comprehensive Plan Update is currently going through the formal review process, which started with a Public Open House and Public Hearing held on November 19, 2020. Members of the general public were able to provide their comments on the draft plan at these two events, as well as via email, Zoom chat, and on the project website. Given the high volume of public comments provided through these various methods, the comments were summarized and organized into a two-part response. Part 1 is organized into categories to relate certain responses to questions and comments that had a similar focus. Part 2 responds to the resident survey initiated by Matt Konieg.

The issues and responses provided below represent input from both residents and members of the Village Board as important policies to be considered during the planning process to guide Homer Glen's future. For instance, recommendations in the Plan to provide more housing options were the result of input received by the consultant team from Village officials and stakeholders who indicated a concern for these deficiencies. The role of the consultant team was to identify areas of need and identify options that could remedy some of those concerns.

Plan revisions can still be made in response to the comments and public input received. Updates to the draft will be prepared after the Plan Commission reviews the current version and makes recommendations at their next meeting, tentatively scheduled for January 7, 2021.

### **PART 1**

#### **RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT**

##### **CATEGORY: HOUSING**

###### **HS1: Comments:**

Multiple community members voiced their disapproval of adding multi-family housing, particularly apartments, to the local housing stock. The reasoning primarily hinged upon the viewpoint that such uses do not add to the Village and go against the appeal of Homer Glen. Others noted they just do not want apartments whatsoever in Homer Glen. Residents also had a concern about the impact of apartments on adjacent property values. [Public Hearing, Open House, Project Website]

**Response:**

The concept of a diverse housing stock enables a person to stay in one community throughout their life, regardless of their budget, needs, family structure, or life stage. A diversity of housing options helps to meet varying budgets, individual and family needs (e.g., proximity to jobs, close to relatives, grew up in Homer Glen and wish to stay in town, no lawns or small yards, etc.), family structures (e.g., single parents, divorcees wanting to live close to their children, grandparents living with families, etc.), and life stages (e.g., families, childless couples, single individuals, empty nesters, seniors of varying abilities, etc.). Not all residents who wish to call Homer Glen home can afford or wish to own and maintain a single-family detached house. A single-family detached home may also not align with a person, couple, or family's life stage. On the other hand, a townhouse, condo, apartment, senior living facility, or duplex may fit their budget, needs, family structure, and/or life stage, while also providing them with the opportunity to call Homer Glen their home. Furthermore, the Comprehensive Plan has the following recommendation (see Action Step DG4 in Chapter 12: Implementation Plan): *Adopt design guidelines for landscape improvements and architectural standards for non single-family residential uses.* The intent of these design guidelines will be to specify the design elements (e.g., landscaping, buffers, building materials, colors, architectural features, window, and door treatments, roof forms, façades, etc.) that the Village expects of all developments with non single-family residential uses. With a set of design guidelines in place, the Village will require developers to build to a high standard of quality. High-quality design for all forms of residential development – from single-family detached homes and townhouses to condos and apartments – will generally have a positive effect on property values.

**HS2: Comments:**

There were some concern and opposition to the Missing Middle housing concept, particularly viewing it as a threat to Homer Glen's single-family detached residential identity. [Public Hearing, Project Website]

**Response:**

Chapter 4 outlines a variety of development typologies recommended for Homer Glen, including the concept of Missing Middle housing, which is an emerging approach to diversify a community's housing stock without significantly altering the character of existing neighborhoods. For a community with mostly established, built-out neighborhoods, there is probably a greater likelihood that Missing Middle housing would be integrated into a new development than into an existing neighborhood. Regarding Homer Glen's identity as a primarily single-family residential community, the Future Land Use Plan assures that this type of housing will continue to be the predominant form, with 96% of all residential uses being comprised of single-family residential. In addition, 63% of all land uses will be comprised of single-family residential.

**HS3: Comments:**

There was a suggestion to add a chapter to the Comprehensive Plan focusing on the Age-Targeted/Age-Restricted senior living typology, with an indication that this type of development would do well in Homer Glen. [Public Hearing]

**Response:**

The Comprehensive Plan will allow for Age-Targeted/Age-Restricted senior living or any other senior living options in the Multi-Family Residential and Mixed-Use land use categories. These uses are also referenced as part of the development typologies described in Chapter 4.

**HS4: Comments:**

One community member was completely opposed to “low-income housing,” specifically asking if the Village can offer a guarantee that it will not accept government-issued Section 8 housing vouchers. [Open House]

**Response:**

The ability of a person to use housing vouchers and the acceptance of such vouchers are governed by Federal housing law. Furthermore, zoning law does not allow local governments to distinguish between ownership and rental. Additionally, any attempt to zone out or prohibit low-income residents in a community is illegal and is considered housing discrimination. Land use is blind to how someone pays for their housing. Additionally, both Federal and State governments require every community to have an affordable housing plan. Illinois State statute requires that each community provide that a least 10% of its housing is affordable. Homer Glen is currently non-compliant.

**CATEGORY: MIXED USE****MU1: Comments:**

The plan needs to clarify what is mix-use and the viability of these types of development. New housing types are needed to provide for an increasingly more diverse population, but concerns were expressed over losing the character of the Village. Concern was expressed over the intent and controls over the 159<sup>th</sup> Street corridor to prevent it from being overtaken by multi-family residential projects, as approximately one thousand (1,000) acres is dedicated to mixed-use. [Public Hearing, Open House]

**Response:**

The recommended mixed-use development approach to development for the 159<sup>th</sup> Street corridor is based on an understanding of the evolution of similar corridors across the county. Initial approaches to corridor development were based on the idea of ‘all things commercial’ resulting in single-use, unattractive, and undifferentiated retail areas that are congested, lack safe access for pedestrians and are not supportive of transit. Communities have tried to address this by developing programs relating to brand identity, improved access, and beautification; however, these efforts eventually did not stem the continuing decline of many corridors that we see today. Development trends and best practices recommended by developers and planners recognize the long-term success of corridors must be based on a more balanced and integrated approach that includes: allowing a mix of uses, providing densities that encourage multi-modal access, and offering opportunities to address housing affordability while creating better living spaces that encourage walking. This is a response to failed models of the past that are not sustainable and lack diversity which has led to an over-retailed economy resulting in many centers with outdated, underperforming, and vacant storefronts.

Making corridors sustainable over the long-term is based on the idea of permitting supportive land uses. The benefits of non-retail uses include providing needed services, providing a customer base for local businesses, and help with safety and maintenance (eyes on the street). Integrating non-retail uses such as offices, service business, and residential uses, while protecting important commercial nodes at key intersections, contribute to a strong retail environment and tax base. Residential uses should only be considered when a part of larger mixed-use planned developments, and in locations where larger retail uses are not well suited. Communities can limit the amount of residential in mixed-use projects as part of a planned

development review.

As highlighted at the end of Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan, mixed-use development comes in a variety of forms, but most typically consist of several separate uses arranged on a site that provides for well-integrated traffic and pedestrian system and creates opportunities to provide welcoming public gathering and community-oriented spaces, such as can be seen in projects in Burr Ridge, Orland Park, Deer Park, Willow Springs, and many other projects. This trend is also evident with the reinvention of many outdated malls which now include housing, entertainment, office, and hospitality uses. The redevelopment of Randhurst Mall in Rolling Meadows and the massive redevelopment of the Motorola campus in Schaumburg into a mixed-use village center are notable examples. These developments have added vitality and enhanced the character of these communities.

In response to community comments, consideration could be given to focusing the Mixed-Use land use designation only along the 159<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor, and re-designating current Mixed-Use areas beyond 159<sup>th</sup> Street with specific land uses, such as the area at Cedar and Bruce Roads. The ultimate control over the location and type of uses allowed will be governed by a set of new zoning standards that ensure that the corridor is not all multi-family residential uses, as this would be counter to the principal goal of the mixed-use corridor to promote commercial development. Also, of note is that a significant portion of 159<sup>th</sup> Street is already built out with a diversity of uses, including commercial, residential, and public/institutional uses.

## **CATEGORY: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

### **ED1: Comments:**

There was a recognition that new businesses are needed, with support for sit down restaurants but mixed feelings about big box stores. [Project Website]

### **Response:**

Chapter 4 outlines a variety of development typologies that would be appropriate for Homer Glen, including a variety of commercial businesses – from cafes, breweries, and sit-down restaurants to a specialty grocer, artisan and boutique retail, and agribusiness – that would help diversify the local business mix and provide offerings that may help refine Homer Glen’s image as a unique place to visit. However, the value of big-box stores should not be discounted. They provide important sales tax revenue to the community and bring people to the community. The additional traffic generated by big box stores is also an advantage to the smaller businesses, as it provides patrons and customers to Homer Glen that might otherwise not visit the trade area. The retail market strategies in Chapter 7 also identifies potential demand for certain uses that would likely come in as big-box retailers, e. g., office supply stores, grocers, and furniture. The Village is also committed to the development of better design standards for commercial projects, as discussed in part in Chapter 11: Design Guidelines for Sustainability and Development.

**ED2: Comments:**

There was a comment that empty stores should be filled first before new ones are developed. [Public Hearing]

**Response:**

The Village constantly works with property owners and potential businesses to fill vacancies. While many vacant spaces do get filled, some spaces take more time to find a new tenant or user due to a variety of reasons, such as economic conditions and market demographics. Vacancies may also become more prevalent in a highly volatile economy such as the one being faced today with the pandemic and the forthcoming recovery. Filling vacancies and attracting new development does not need to be an either/or proposition for any number of reasons. For example, a vacant space may require exterior or interior improvements to attract new tenants, which takes time and financial resources, but is still a worthwhile endeavor if the property is in a prime location. However, a developer may be able to provide tenant spaces in a new development that already provides modern attributes that attract new businesses or services to Homer Glen. Maintaining 100% occupancy of available commercial spaces at all times is difficult for most shopping centers, even under favorable economic conditions. As described on page 42 of Chapter 6, Homer Glen’s vacancy rate of 3.87% is less than the regional average of 5.19%. However, the Village puts itself in a more practical position with an approach that balances filling vacant spaces with seeking new developments that bring new goods and services, value, and character to the community.

**CATEGORY: WATER UTILITIES**

**WA1: Comments:**

There was a recognition that water costs are extremely high. [Project Website]

**Response:**

The Village’s water situation is discussed in Chapter 10 of the Comprehensive Plan, particularly describing the current conditions and outlining potential approaches to transition the community’s water infrastructure from a privatized system to a municipally owned and operated system.

**CATEGORY: HOMER GLEN’S CHARACTER**

**CH1: Comments:**

Residents expressed the need to retain the appeal Homer Glen has as a peaceful open space and wonderful small-town feel, and overall single-family residential character that is the Village identity. New development needs to support these qualities, including maintaining ordinances that protect the residents and the environment [Project Website and Public Hearing Comments]

**Response:**

The new Comprehensive Plan, particularly Chapter 11, recommends the preservation of natural areas, supports the continuation of the existing tree preservation, and conservation design regulations with modifications, and will not change any existing land use or neighborhood. The Plan provides for about 1,900 acres of parks and open space. All new land uses are intended to provide appropriate transitions between existing and new uses, including recommendations to create a new landscape code and building design standards to ensure Homer Glen retains its character and ensures high-quality development.

Below is a comparison of parks and open space acreages showing what currently exists in the Village as indicated on the Existing Land Use map, and new proposed increases shown on the Future Land Use Plan:

	<b>Parks</b>	<b>Open Space</b>
<b>Existing Land Use</b>	410 acres	1,385 acres
<b>Future Land Use</b>	472 acres	1,429 acres
<b>Difference</b>	+62 acres	+44 acres

**CATEGORY: OPEN SPACE AND TREES**

**OS1: Comments:**

There was some concern about the potential loss of open space and trees. [Public Hearing, Project Website]

**Response:**

Chapter 11 of the Comprehensive Plan is devoted to strategies regarding the protection of open space and sensitive environmental features. In particular, the Village’s Conservation Design Ordinance provides for substantial protection of open space in Homer Glen. Chapter 11 also discusses strategies relating to the protection of trees, particularly in relation to its Tree Preservation standards and status as a Tree City USA community. The potential to establish landscaping guidelines is also outlined in this chapter, providing additional standards that aid in the protection of trees. It is important to note that the Future Land Use Plan doesn’t show wetlands, large tree masses, or other sensitive environmental features (only floodplains are shown); as a result, while these elements may appear as residential or commercial uses on the map, careful precautions will be undertaken to protect these elements from development, in accordance with the strategies outlined in Chapter 11 and the related municipal ordinances.

**CATEGORY: VILLAGE GROWTH**

**VG1: Comments:**

There was concern about how the Village would handle servicing the community in response to growth, particularly impacts on police, a park district, etc. [Public Hearing]

**Response:**

Chapter 8 of the Comprehensive Plan addresses Homer Glen’s various community facilities and assets, including Village and Township facilities; public safety; historic sites; religious institutions; healthcare; schools; parks, recreation, and open space; equestrian culture; and agritourism and agribusiness. The chapter also outlines recommendations that will be used by the Village to continually monitor the impact of growth and development on these facilities, as well as coordinate with appropriate agencies to ensure the adequacy of their respective facilities, including the potential for improvements, expansion, or construction of new facilities. One recommendation of note is the potential to create a Park Department.

## CATEGORY: SCHOOLS

### SC1: Comments:

One suggestion that Homer Glen should be in more control of local schools. [Open House]

#### Response:

Schools are under the jurisdiction of school districts, of which three districts operate schools within or close to Homer Glen. The Village has not had nor intends to exert any level of municipal controls over the local schools, particularly since such an arrangement would present various conflicts of interest. However, as the Village grows there will be an increasing need for more local schools which provides an opportunity for the Village and school district officials to work together in the long-range planning for such facilities.

### SC2: Comments:

One comment voiced worry about the impact of population growth on local taxes and allocation to schools. [Public Hearing]

#### Response:

Amendments to tax allocation is a policy discussion beyond the purview of this planning process. Such a policy discussion is best suited to be led by Village officials, along with all affected taxing bodies like the school districts.

## CATEGORY: CONSERVATION DESIGN SUBDIVISIONS

### CD1: Comments:

Several developers and real estate agents active or who have attempted to undertake development in Homer Glen expressed problems getting a project approved due to overly restrictive and anti-development ordinances. Commonly cited reasons include the requirement for reserving 20% of the gross land area as a minimum open space and that 90% of the lots must adjoin open space. Other factors that discourage development is the minimum lot size for single-family homes, of 12,000 sq. ft. or 15,000 sq. ft. The trend of development for over 10 years has been for smaller lots. It is important for the growth of a municipality that it allows development because an increase in population will also increase commerce within the Village. [Public Hearing]

#### Response:

Since the adoption of the Conservation Design Ordinance, there has not been a subdivision of 10 acres or more able to meet the standards of the ordinance. This has resulted in very little growth in new residential development in Homer Glen. As part of the planning process, we have provided the Village with a comprehensive set of recommendations to improve the function and administration of the Conservation Subdivision code, which are summarized in Chapter 11 of the Plan.

Below is a summary of the key recommendations, many of which are in support of the public comments received. Other issues identified above will be more fully addressed in the update of the Conservation code. Conservation Design standards should:

- Apply to Open Space Plan Conservation Districts to be established by the Village (emphasizing the preservation of significant natural resources).
- Be permitted as an optional form of development with density incentives to encourage the use of this approach to development rather than a requirement.

- Exclude the mixed-use parcels along the 159<sup>th</sup> Street Mixed-Use Corridor.
- Allow for greater flexibility in lot size standards.
- Encourage conservation subdivisions to be designed as ‘density neutral’ developments.
- Provide flexibility in the ability of developers to arrange units. With greater flexibility, more open space preservation is possible. The required open space should not be restricted to adjoin 90% of the residential lots within a subdivision.
- Consider reducing developer fees in conservation subdivisions as an incentive.
- Provide flexibility as to when conservation subdivision design is required, such as allowing development of a site with less than 10% tree cover under standard subdivision regulations, while maintaining a minimum open space requirement of 20% of the net land area. This should be applied to all residential zoning districts. The current open space requirements ranging from 20% to 50% of the net lot area is overly restrictive as it is required in addition to land set aside for a park. Park land may be counted toward the required open space requirement provided the land dedicated to the park is usable and does not include any environmentally sensitive areas.

We have previously addressed the issue of the mixed-use designation for the 159<sup>th</sup> Street corridor above.

## **CATEGORY: SUGGESTED EDITS TO THE FUTURE LAND USE PLAN**

### **LU1: Comments:**

One comment asked why two sections on the Future Land Use Plan were marked for multi-family residential. [Open House]

#### **Response:**

The two areas marked for Multi-Family Residential – (1) the area east of Lemont Road between 143<sup>rd</sup> Street and the ComEd right-of-way; and (2) the area north of Marian Village (south of 151<sup>st</sup> Street between Cedar Road and Parker Road) – are mapping errors and will both be changed to Single-family Residential Moderate Density.

### **LU2: Comments:**

Multiple comments were provided to keep the rural residential land use designation from the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, particularly as it relates to retaining the identity of Homer Glen. [Public Hearing, Open House]

#### **Response:**

The Single-family Residential Estate land use designation (lot size of 1 acre or more) in the current Comprehensive Plan Update includes both the Rural Residential (lot size of 2½ acres or more) and Estate Residential (lot sizes of 1 to 2½ acres) land use categories from the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. This designation in the proposed Comprehensive Plan update provides a general development policy for a large area of the Village and does not change the Village’s current zoning ordinance or map for properties included in this land use category. The Comprehensive Plan affirms that the overall goal of the Village is to preserve the rural character of existing large lots, rural properties identified in the Plan, without any intent to change existing zoning or encourage the division of large estate lots. The Zoning Map and standards set forth by the Zoning Ordinance will remain unchanged with the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.

**LU3: Comments:**

There was concern about the recommendation of commercial development around the Cedar Road/Bruce Road intersection, with a suggestion that land along Bruce Road should be preserved as open space to connect Messenger Woods. [Public Hearing, Open House]

**Response:**

The Future Land Use Plan will scale back the intensity of development along Bruce Road, particularly recommending less coverage by commercial use and clearly defining the rest of the area for residential development. Given the development pressure from New Lenox to the south and the visibility provided by the Bruce Road/Cedar Road intersections, some level of commercial development would help meet potential demand on the Village’s southern end, particularly for neighborhood-oriented businesses or services. The Mixed-Use designation will be replaced with specific residential land use designations to provide clarity to the type of land uses anticipated for this area. Regarding connectivity between Forest Preserve properties, the Transportation Plan indicates potential trail linkages along Bruce Road and through open spaces that follow the floodplain.

**LU4: Comments:**

A map was presented showing areas where the Future Land Use Plan increased density, which was viewed as undermining one of the founding principles of Homer Glen to be a low-density community. [Public Hearing]

**Response:**

Certain revisions will be made to the Future Land Use Plan to reduce the intensity of residential development in certain spots (as identified on the map provided by the resident), particularly as reflected in the response to Comment LU1. However, the residential land use designation for other spots will be maintained as shown by the current Future Land Use Plan, particularly in alignment with the response to Comment LU2.

**LU5: Comments:**

One comment requested no commercial development along Cedar Road and Parker Road. [Open House]

**Response:**

Regarding commercial land use along Cedar Road, the commercial shown at the 159<sup>th</sup> Street intersection on the Future Land Use Plan is comprised of existing businesses. For the proposed commercial uses at the Cedar Road/Bruce Road intersections, please see the response to Comment LU3 above. As for Parker Road, the Future Land Use Plan does not recommend any commercial along this road.

**CATEGORY: SUGGESTED EDITS TO THE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

**TR1: Comments:**

There is significant concern about the Transportation Plan recommending a segment of Cedar Road north of 143<sup>rd</sup> Street to be designated as a Secondary Arterial, with particular comments about the impact a road with this designation would have on the safety and character of the neighborhoods along this stretch of Cedar Road. [Public Hearing, Open House]

**Response:**

The Secondary Arterial designation for the segment of Cedar Road north of 143<sup>rd</sup> Street is a mapping error and will be removed. As a result, the segment of Cedar Road north of 143<sup>rd</sup> Street will continue to be designated as a local street. There are no current plans to designate Cedar Road as a Secondary Arterial or anything other than a local street.

**TR2: Comments:**

One comment noted that the Transportation Plan does not show the proposed bike trail on 151<sup>st</sup> Street. [Open House]

**Response:**

The proposed bike trail along 151<sup>st</sup> Street is shown on the Transportation Plan. However, the green trail is sitting on top of the blue Secondary Arterial designation line for 151<sup>st</sup> Street, which makes it difficult to see. The Transportation Map will be adjusted to ensure these the green dotted line for the proposed bike trail is situated above or below the blue Secondary Arterial designation line for 151<sup>st</sup> Street. This change will be made for other trails and road designations that interfere with each other to improve map readability.

**TR3: Comments:**

There was a suggestion to add definitions of the different roadway designations, such as arterial, minor arterial, collector, etc. [Open House]

**Response:**

The Transportation Plan will be revised to provide brief definitions of each roadway designation (e.g., Highway, Principal Arterial, Secondary Arterial, Collector, Local Street).

## **PART 2**

### **RESPONSE TO RESIDENT SURVEY (KONIEG)**

During the public hearing process to review the draft Comprehensive Plan update, the Village was presented with the results of a web-based survey prepared by Matt Konieg from 803 residents. The Village requested that the Savoy Consulting Group review the resident survey and compare it to the National Citizen Survey (NCS) results prepared by the National Research Center in 2017. The National Citizen Survey is the premier scientific survey service from the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) and National Research Center, Inc.

#### **General Observations**

It is our understanding that the resident survey was made available to residents of Homer Glen and made available to residents on Homer Glen who use Facebook. Additionally, we understand it was posted on Facebook community sites, such as the Homer Glen Village Square. The resident survey was created via the SurveyMonkey web-based application and is not statistically valid or representative of the entire Village. In contrast, 1,500 households in the Village were randomly chosen by NRC to participate in the survey. NRC survey recipients were chosen using a systematic sampling method that was applied to a list of households previously screened for geographic location within the Village limits. Furthermore, the demographic characteristics of the survey sample were compared to those found in the 2010 Census and American Community Survey estimates in the Village of Homer Glen. The primary objective of this weighting or comparing the survey data is to ensure the survey sample reflective of the

larger population of the community.

Other issues to consider regarding the resident survey and other surveys of this type include:

- The way questions are worded or structured can be misleading, particularly if respondents are not familiar with terms or concepts, or larger community goals.
- No information is provided on how the survey was distributed, and what if any information was shared that may have biased the results. An indication from a posting by Amy Konieg suggests that participants may have been influenced by a biased viewpoint and incorrect information.

Although we identified several potential issues with the resident survey, we accept and acknowledge that a general, non-randomized survey can be a valuable tool to gather public opinion but should not be the basis for decision making. This should be included as part of several successful community-wide outreach efforts we have made during the entire course of the process of creating the draft Comprehensive Plan, including the HomerFest booth, Stakeholder Focus Groups, Public Open House, Subarea Concepts Design Workshop, the results of the NCS survey, and on-going opportunities to learn and provide comments on the project website.

### **Resident Survey**

In addition to some of the general issues discussed above, we find that the resident survey did not provide sufficient information to evaluate the difference in responses based on the demographic profile of the participants. Only one question established how long participants lived in the Village, with approximately 60% having resided in Homer Glen for over 10 years. No other information is provided regarding income levels, ages, or household status which may impact responses as was seen in the NCS survey. There is a very limited range of narrowly focused questions, with no related questions to test the understanding of more complex issues. For instance, should Homer Glen allow for new types of housing such as multiple-family development for young families, households without children, and senior residents who do not want to maintain a single-family home? Typically, these groups of people either cannot afford traditional single-family lots or do not want to maintain them. Other issues have to do with specific questions including:

- Quality of Life. There was a preference for low-density development and more parks and open space, without defining what is low density, and without an understanding of the impact that low-density development has on the Village's ability to bring in new business desired by those who responded, and what impact this could have on taxes.
- Desirable Uses. Most residents desire a downtown area (65%) but did not support the idea of mixed-use development (21%). However, the fundamental concept of what makes a downtown work is the mix of uses present and relatively high densities needed to support businesses.
- Missing Middle Housing Options. This question mischaracterizes what is 'missing-middle' housing types in traditional single-family areas which is defined in the Comprehensive Plan as not including apartments. The survey does reveal that 40% of participants support two-family housing which is a type of missing-middle housing but does not indicate where this type of housing is appropriate.
- Lower Quality Standards. This question infers that the Village is considering relaxing building codes and allowing lower-quality materials in reference to allowing more dense forms of housing. Nowhere in the Comprehensive Plan is this a stated objective, or have we been a part of any conversation where this is being contemplated. References to housing options in the Plan have emphasized maintaining high-quality materials.

- **Priority Issues.** Among the priority issues is lowering taxes (79%). However, no information or questions address how to accomplish this. Lowering taxes is typically done either by adding new commercial development and rooftops or providing fewer services. Participants also desire more businesses (64%) but oppose adding housing with multiple-family options (86%). Businesses locate in an area in response to market demand/potential. Without more housing choices, particularly multiple-family options, Homer Glen will not provide the population base that desired businesses need.

### **National Citizen Survey (NCS 2017)**

The NCS survey was administered by a third-party group as a statistically valid study of the attitudes, opinions, and desires of all of Homer Glen residents. The NCS survey results include separate cross-tabulation studies that examined the significance of the location within Homer Glen and the demographic profile of participants in how these factors influenced their response. For instance, it is noted that as much as a 10-15% difference exists within certain questions based on where participants live. The place of residence of a participant is shown to result in a 20% difference in opinion regarding the built environment with reference to the provision of varied housing options and the availability of affordable housing.

The NCS survey explores issues of quality of life and housing desires in greater depth, with the following results:

- Similar to the resident survey, there is a high desire for expanded commercial areas, with 77% supporting high-quality commercial development.
- A desirable place to retire – 44% responded positively, which is below the national benchmark average.
- Affordable quality housing – 53% responded that such housing is available.
- Housing options – 65% desire more housing options.
- Vibrant downtown/commercial areas – 70% see this as a deficiency in Homer Glen.
- Housing cost stress – 30% are under financial stress in relation to housing costs.

When demographics characteristics are included the NCS survey finds a significant difference in responses regarding the above issues, including:

- Participants older than 35 years see Homer Glen as a much less desirable place to retire. A 20% variation exists between the group that is younger than 35 years. This difference is likely due to the lack of housing options for seniors. Participants were almost two times more likely to rate Homer Glen as a good place to retire if they rented vs owned their housing.
- Regarding support for a greater variety of housing options, the age of the participant made a significant difference, with almost a 20% variance between those people over 55 years old and those between 18 and 34 years old. Younger professional people supporting more housing choice is likely due to cost issues and lifestyle preferences for affordable and maintenance-free housing. Support for housing variety also varies by ethnicity with a 13% variance between white residents being less supportive when compared to other ethnic groups.
- The desirability of providing more affordable housing options also differs by age group between the older and younger populations, with younger people more supportive of affordable options. This gap also appears between renters and owners (15% difference).