



MINUTES

President and Board of Trustees
Village of Arlington Heights
Virtual Meeting
Arlington Heights Village Hall
33 S. Arlington Heights Road
Arlington Heights, IL 60005
September 27, 2021
7:00 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

III. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

President Hayes and the following Trustees responded to roll: Bertucci, Tinaglia, Schwingbeck, Grasse, Scaletta, Baldino, Canty, and LaBedz.

Also present were: Randy Recklaus, Hart Passman, Charles Perkins and Becky Hume.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

V. APPROVAL OF ACCOUNTS PAYABLE

VI. RECOGNITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

President Hayes recognized the last day of racing at Arlington Park. He said it was a beautiful day to celebrate what the racetrack has meant to the community for almost 100 years.

The last two days of Arlington Alfresco are today and tomorrow.

October 1st and 2nd is Harmony Fest, the Arlington Heights Block Party.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

VIII. CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

Melissa Cayer proposed we change the meetings for Boards and Commissions to business hours so we do not impose upon government

workers to work after hours.

President Hayes said the Board and Commission members are volunteers who work during the day making this idea difficult. Board and Commission meetings will continue to be held in the evenings.

IX. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Crescent Place - 310 W. Rand Rd. - PC#21-010 Approved Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan from "Commercial" to "Moderate Density Multi-Family", Rezoning from the B-2 District to the R-6 District, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision to consolidate the subject property into one lot

Mr. Perkins addressed some questions that came out of the Board meeting of 9/20/2021.

Community Meetings-Residents asked for Board or Staff presence at the neighborhood meeting held by the developer. The Village is unusual for requiring developers to hold extra meetings to receive community feedback above and beyond and in addition to all required public meetings by the Village. The goal is to make sure developers take into account public input prior to making their final submittal to the Village. Staff and Board members do not attend by design. President Hayes said when staff or Board members are present, they circumvent the process. It is important for the process to go forward without the Board at the early stages.

Taxes-For property taxes, residential is assessed at 10%, commercial is assessed at 25%. But that doesn't mean residential developments pay less, it depends on income, size and use of the property. Five of the top ten tax payers in the Village are residential developments. Stonebridge and Hancock Square are in the top 10 taxpayers in the Village. The top tax payers are on the north side of the Village.

Site history-marketing-Mr. Perkins showed a database of property listing dates. The property was first listed in 2010 for \$2 million and listed again in 2015. It was under contract in 2019-2020, but that fell through and then it came on the market again in 2020.

Rand Road commercial vacancy- The Marketing material from Newmark-Grubb was shown giving an overview on the site history. The company sent the materials to every broker in their data base and other commercial and retailers entering the market place. Four impediments were noted: depth of property, narrowness of frontage on Rand, and lack of a traffic signal. The only serious interest came from a car wash. Newmark-Grubb believed residential was highest and best use.

Rand Road commercial corridor- There is 1.8 million square feet of commercial space with an 18.2% vacancy. The area is the highest sales tax

generating in the Village but has significant vacancies.

Spacing setbacks from properties- A typical distance between front windows of homes is 116 ft. Here it will be 800 ft., on an angle 520 ft. The project will not have a view into homes.

Existing traffic- School release times show a surge in the late mid-afternoon which dissipates after ½ hour. There is game traffic at the park, but it is typical throughout all the parks in the Village.

Resident Comments

Callers in support of the project were: Linda Waycie, Jack Scapin, George Motto, Ann Gillespie, Leon Intrater, Ann O'Brien, and Keith Moens.

They cited the following reasons for their support: the Village needs affordable housing, entry level workers should be able to live in the Village, the LaSalle criteria were met, the zoning is consistent with the area, will allow fixed income seniors to live in the community, it will help businesses retain workers, will improve diversity, will bring in tax dollars, will put to good use a vacant lot, will help current residents with housing cost challenges.

Callers against the project were: Ann Marie Lundstrom, Tom Dineen, Chris Dineen, Tony Carlino, Marie Hine, Stefanie Brown, Pam Horwath, Mr. Horwath, Donald Nathan, Beth Nathan, Derek Czerbya, Renee Czerbya, Connie David, Marge Kakerny, Gail Baumster, Sheldon Baumster, Murray Lewison, Jen Hoffenkamp, Kathy Karavitis, Nadine Wolverton, Marzena D., Illiya Fishman, Demetra Bubaris, Maris (no last name).

They cited the following reasons for their opposition: Danger to the new residents being so close to the ComEd substation, the builder is not certified by the BBB, the neighborhood is opposed, traffic, the traffic studies were flawed because they were taken during Covid and in the summer, the potential increase in crime/gangs/shootings, the Village has enough affordable housing, the neighborhood did not know about it soon enough, the community meetings were held too far away, keep it commercial for the potential tax revenues, no guarantee that Village residents will get priority, it would be better as a park, it is ugly, they cannot regulate the number of people in the units, the area needs a dog park, it's not close to public transportation, its pre-emptive to rezone it before the "Uptown" improvements have been made, the site was not for sale for the entire 20 years, developer does not have any risk, the property will be lost forever to residential zoning, the neighboring property values will decrease, the developer is dictating what happens there-not the Village or its residents, the Village should be more creative and reimagine the area, just because there is an idea-doesn't mean it's the best one, the Board made up their mind before they listened to the residents.

The Village Clerk read the comments from the following residents which

were emailed.

Those in favor of the project were: Connie and Tim Wayman, Karen and Rick Klicki, Jonathan Mendel, Bonnie and Ronald Bussiere, Daniel Carroll, Chris Farnsworth, Elizabeth Schild, Laura Fry, Trevor Drezen, Chelsea Barnes, Jane Drezen, Chris O'Hara, Jessica Berzac, Abigail Stone, Christi Wessel, Erin Carney, Lorri Grainawi, Philip Geier, Christine Organ, Sue Uhlarik, Marc Adelman, Priscilla Mortland, Trisha Rich, Mary Kay Walsh, Sandy Bourseau, Ann Shibayama, Jean Walker, Barbara Taylor, Anne McClure, Juliet Bergner, Jan Tossman, Amy Chihiro, George Shibayama, Cynthia Greenwood, Wendy Dunnington, Allison Anderson, Dwayne Anderson, Robin Paul, Kathy Gudonis, Rick and Kathy Phleegeer, Melissa Wright, Ruth Van Witzenburg, Steve Manst, Jeff Pasieka, Sandy Pifer, Diane Mier, Patricia Crusius,

Those against were: Alice Stepanek, Roger Berg, Michael Stepanek, Alice Sylvester, Gosia Olszanski, Iwona Romanowski, Arthur Romanowski, David Romanowski, Joan Heveran, Martin and Linda Ascot, David Fasola.

Karen Stern recommended that N. Chestnut, south of Applegate be made One Way Only to exit on Rand where only right turns are permitted. If that doesn't work she would like a speed reduction or 'not as a thoroughfare' designation.

Board Discussion

President Hayes addressed the concern that the Board entertains comments from people outside of the Village. The Village is not allowed to restrict public comment, it is a legal obligation to entertain any and all public comment. The Board can tell when someone is speaking outside of the community and that is factored into their decisions.

Trustee Bertucci asked if the Arlington Economic Alliance had been asked their position on the rezoning. Mr. Perkins said that commission is not involved in zoning issues. Their purpose is to provide council and advice on business and economic development matters and they receive updates on vacancy rates and trends. It is a commission appointed by the Mayor and the Board, but does not have regulatory authority. The normal sequence for this type of project is: Housing Commission, Design Commission, Plan Commission, then Village Board as that is the path with public meetings and hearings. To add another step would be cumbersome. Mr. Recklaus said the Alliance and most commissions are not regulatory, they are advisory in nature and they talk about abstract issues. These cases are regulatory. Trustee Bertucci said he thought it made sense to reach out to the business community and business partners when considering changing commercial zoning.

Trustee Scaletta asked for clarification on the intersection ratings system's letters of A-F. The ability of an intersection to accommodate traffic flow is expressed in terms of level of service, which is assigned a letter from A to F based on the average control delay experienced by vehicles passing

through the intersection, with F being the lowest score. The Chestnut/Rand intersection has some of the lower ratings and there is no reason to believe it will get better.

Mr. Perkins said for improvement, changes to the intersection would need to occur, but the traffic would be worse with a commercial development. Trustee Scaletta said there is a need for more affordable housing in the suburbs, but the impact of this development must be considered. Mr. Perkins said IDOT would need to approve a signal, so studying the traffic after the development is in place could help meet the 9 warrants that must be met. The intersection has to exceed 150 vehicles per hour in the peak hours. This intersection has 59-68. Accident data comes into play, but there were fairly low accident volumes, so it didn't meet the thresholds. Altering the flow of traffic by precluding a left turn, would shift vehicles through the neighborhood. Restricting movements can have unintended consequences.

Mr. Perkins offered to consult with Public Works and Engineering and evaluate it again to see if the data has changed in a year or two, but the decision is IDOT's. Trustee Scaletta noted that in this area, there are not a lot of alternate routes. Mr. Perkins said the Village could commission a study at any time and make recommendations. It's a challenging intersection.

Trustee Scaletta said he wants to make sure the traffic gets addressed. He asked how the proportionate share to pay for improvements was calculated. Mr. Perkins explained that 25% of the cost is given to each quarter of the intersection. Staff estimated that 10% of the traffic might be from this development, which is probably high, but the developer is agreeing to contribute that amount. The remainder would be the Village's cost. Mr. Recklaus said if there is an increase in traffic after Covid, the percentage share this property is responsible for would be less than is estimated now. If the property generates more traffic, than their percentage would go up.

Trustee Schwingbeck said there are controls we can make as a Village. He asked if the Village could help the neighborhood cut down on cut through traffic with signage. Mr. Recklaus said any time you put a sign up, you push folks to a different location, and the consequences could be greater. One of the questions is what constitutes cut through traffic. Trustee Schwingbeck said we do it in other parts of the Village, and he would like for it to be looked at here. He said if we are looking at a traffic study and the corridor study, we should engage with the neighborhood, conduct some outreach and engage with the residents to try and solve the issues in the neighborhood.

Trustee Schwingbeck asked if Village residents or workers would have preference in applying for the apartments. Mr. Zunamon said they have asked for IDOH to permit that preference. They will also market to local residents, as they want them to be first in line. The tenant selection plan must be approved by IDOH. But the company makes the decision on who is accepted, and they will take it into consideration.

Trustee Schwingbeck asked if the Village does not require an onsite manager or someone living there, will they do it anyway? Mr. Zunamon said they will to make sure the property is appropriately staffed. He said they will have an onsite resident manager whether IDOH approves it or not, either they will hire someone that makes under the threshold, or provide the unit rent free to the manager.

Trustee Bertucci suggested connecting the owners of Arlington Plaza and this lot so they could marry these properties and then the Village could prevent Chestnut exiting to Rand. You could get a connection into a commercial development and then force only right-hand turns. For those turning left, they could go through the shopping center. Mr. Perkins said it was possible, but the two property owners would have to come together. Trustee Bertucci said the Village needs to be proactive versus reactive and he didn't see a strategy. He said it is being reactive to the proposal, versus looking at it as a total. Mr. Perkins said anything is possible, but it is often difficult.

Trustee Grasse said she after speaking with the neighbors she sees the decision as a both/and not an either/or. Crescent Place on its own, is well planned, well designed, fully funded, has a good appearance, will help flooding, and provide housing for those low-income earners. She comes to it with a strong belief that it is infrastructure, a basic component of our society. On its own, this looks great. It also addresses 6 of the Board's 9 Strategic Priorities. The neighborhood is clearly active and vibrant and close to great businesses. She heard the resident's voices and recognized this neighborhood is locked inside 53, Rand, Arlington Heights Road and Hintz. There is only one good southbound outlet at Chestnut. The residents have been waiting and hoping for the Uptown project to begin. These neighbors have big issues that were already present. She asked if staff could plan to have some community conversations with Berkley Square. Can we find solutions to their legitimate concerns and needs? She supports the Crescent Place project and supports addressing the needs of this neighborhood. Mr. Recklaus said we have heard things we need to listen to. It's hard when IDOT is in charge on access to the thoroughfares.

Mr. Perkins summarized the current situation with the Uptown revitalization. In 2016, the plan was approved and funding was put into place. The Village retained a consultant, and Phase 1 was for up lighting on Palatine Road. After a series of meetings with IDOT, they rejected multiple plans, multiple times. We did a test in November, and it wasn't to our satisfaction. So, we put a hold on it. The next project was the gateway signs, IDOT rejected those too. So, we have retooled the signs and have 6 monument signs we are hoping to place on easements. The Village is in negotiations with the property owners for their approval. Staff is hopeful we can implement these. The Village is also looking at pedestrian improvements. Staff is receiving estimates for them and hopefully they will be implemented within the next 2 years. The cost is \$50,000 – \$75,000 per intersection. The last phase will be landscaping along the corridors.

Trustee LaBedz said she received dozens of emails from residents of the community, not just those outside. They were in favor and opposed. Some concerns raised were about the potential for an increase in crime, others said we don't need more affordable housing because we already have enough units in the Village. She said she lives 3 blocks from three, 3-story buildings, that were affordable for decades until just recently. There wasn't a crime problem, and she checked the crime maps to be sure. Most people don't even know it was affordable housing. She knew the single moms who lived there and wanted to stay in the school district after a divorce. A few years ago, it was purchased and it is now market rate. Those residents had to leave and they couldn't find anything in the Village. They had to find affordable housing in other communities. Even though there were units in the Village, they were full. She's seen this scenario play out first-hand.

Trustee Baldino said the resident input was valuable and made the project better. For him, it came down to rezoning the property from commercial to residential, part of the plot was already residential. He decided it was better to not hold out for the possibility of something happening in the future and taking something that is known. He said he will vote to approve.

Trustee Tinaglia said many of the people who wrote in were in favor, and those on line were against it, not everyone is comfortable calling and getting on line. His in box was full and the responses really were 50/50. There are very passionate people on both sides. He lives two blocks from Parkview which has 45 units, and is 7 stories of affordable voucher residential living. When it happened, there was a lot of fear. As a neighbor, it's been fine. If you walk down the street, you would never know there was anyone different living inside the building. It is all about management, taking care of the building and the residents. Parkview's management has done it. He said he is a strong advocate of keeping the staff recommendations #6 and #7 in the motion, especially since this owner wants to do it too. It's an important part of the success of the facility, and will keep the landscaping nice and the hallways clean. He said he'll take the tax revenue, the diversity and the economic engine rather than have nothing.

Trustee Schwingbeck said he would like to see meetings set up to really hear from the residents what the struggles are and try and resolve some of these issues.

Trustee Schwingbeck moved to amend the motion to put back in staff conditions #6 and #7.

6. Property owner shall provide an onsite property manager or maintenance supervisor, Monday through Friday during business hours, approximately 9am to 5pm and provide emergency contact for non-business hours.
7. The property owner shall provide one onsite residential unit on the subject property for occupancy by either a property manager or

maintenance supervisor in order to provide an extra set of eyes for community watch and contact for the residents, unless otherwise prohibited by IHDA. Property owner shall ensure that the property is appropriately staffed at all times.

Trustee Tinaglia seconded the motion.

Trustee Canty said she was uncomfortable with 6 and 7, but she won't let the not perfect to get in the way of the good. She worried the Board is showing this development particular treatment and placing a burden on this developer that we have not on others. She said with the number of residents on Block 425, it would benefit from on site management, but we didn't require it. We are responding to what might be, because of the type of development. If we do this with this development, we should do it with future multifamily developments too. She is not in favor of the amendment, but will follow the will of the Board.

President Hayes said he didn't think it sets a precedent, but it addresses concerns of the neighbors and the developer is willing. He is in favor of the amendment. Each development can be handled on a case by case basis.

The vote was called on the amendment to the motion.

Ayes: Bertucci, LaBedz, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia, Scaletta, Hayes

Nayes: Baldino, Canty, Grasse

The motion: Passed

President Hayes said no one considered this a done deal. A motion and second were made. We have had many situations where Board members have changed their minds during public comment. It is a critical part of the democratic process. That is why he was intent on making sure everyone was heard. Your comments made the project better.

President Hayes said he does not live in the specific neighborhood, but he lives very close, just across Arlington Heights Road and he has spent a lot of time in this area, at games, the school or visiting friends. He always bases his vote on what is good for the entire community. There is a development in his neighborhood like this one. The difference is that variations were required in it for density, square footage of the units and for parking. The concern in Northgate was for traffic and safety. Being less than a mile from this development, none of the issues the residents were concerned about came to fruition and the new neighbors have been great additions to the Northgate area. This project doesn't have any variations. The only reason to vote no is because of traffic. It is apparent that there is a problem, but no matter what you put in this parcel, it will be exacerbated. There will be a minimal increase to traffic from this proposal. There are many things you could put there that could worsen the problem, including a park. Imagine soccer games there, during the night or on the weekend? For those reasons, because there are no variations, and the property has been vacant for 19 years, it did not develop, and we have a high-quality proposal before us. He said he didn't think it would significantly exacerbate the

problems.

Trustee Mary Beth Canty moved to approve as amended 1. Final Plat of Subdivision approval shall be required. 2. Impact fees in accordance with Chapter 29 of the Municipal Code shall be required for each unit within the development. 3. The Applicant is responsible to ensure that the subject property is and remains in full compliance with the requirements of Article XVII of Chapter 7 of the Village Code, being the Village's Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance, and the Village's Inclusionary Housing Guidelines, including, without limitation, the following: A. Providing in perpetuity, at a minimum, two actual on-site affordable one-bedroom units and two actual on-site affordable two-bedroom units within the development, which units shall be in compliance with Section 7-1707(B)(3) of the Village Code; B. Ensuring compliance with all other provisions of the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance and Inclusionary Housing Guidelines as applicable; C. The developer shall submit a request for residency and local working preferences to HUD and IHDA in order to seek approval to incorporate Arlington Heights' Inclusionary Housing Ordinance tenant preferences in the tenant selection plan for this development consistent with their regulations; and D. Even if not required, for any units the developer is making available as affordable, that the developer will make reasonable efforts to make those affordable units available according to the tenant preference in the Inclusionary Housing Guidelines (i.e. not only shall the four Village required affordable units be rented according to the tenant preferences in the Inclusionary Housing Guidelines but the developer shall make reasonable efforts to lease the remaining 36 affordable units to preferred tenants as outlined in the Inclusionary Housing Guidelines). 4. Compliance with the May 11, 2021 Design Commission motion shall be required. A. A requirement to remove the 3 blue panels and replace them with the material surrounding it. B. A requirement to continue the brick at the southwest corner on the third floor, per the May 7, 2021 elevation. C. A requirement to incorporate the white 4-inch wide trim at the windows within the blue colored fiber cement panel elevations, per the May 7, 2021 elevations. D. A requirement that the metal colors for the doors and the louvers match the material that is adjacent to them, and that the actual samples be re-submitted, along with the actual materials for the fiber cement panel and the brick, for staff to review and approve based on the commissioners' requirement to match the colors. E. A requirement to remove the white backing on the canopy address at the entrance, and only have the colored fiber cement along with singular letters that would be a proper contrast to meet fire department regulations. F. A requirement to submit material samples for the fiber cement siding panel colors for staff review and approval. G. All signage is required to comply with chapter 30 sign code, or seek variations. 5. At time of Final Plat of Subdivision, the Petitioner shall provide additional details on the light fixtures as well as a revised photometric plan that conforms to all code requirements for review and approval by Staff. 6. Property owner shall provide an onsite property manager or maintenance supervisor, Monday through Friday during business hours, approximately 9am to 5pm and provide emergency contact for non-business hours. 7. The property owner shall provide one onsite

residential unit on the subject property for occupancy by either a property manager or maintenance supervisor in order to provide an extra set of eyes for community watch and contact for the residents, unless otherwise prohibited by IHDA. Property owner shall ensure that the property is appropriately staffed at all times. 8. The subject property shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the Security Plan dated 8/31/21 and attached as part of this Ordinance. 9. The subject property shall be operated in substantial conformance with the initial Tenant Selection Plan dated as revised 2/2021 (subject to IDHA final approval) and attached as part of this Ordinance. The maximum occupancy as outlined in the plan shall be restricted to no more than two individuals per bedroom. 10. In the event that future traffic warrants are met for any traffic improvements to the intersection of Rand Road and Chestnut Avenue, the subject property owner shall contribute their pro rata share or 10% whichever is greater, of the costs for any such warrant study, design, and construction of improvements to this intersection. 11. The property owner shall implement any driveway modifications if determined necessary by the Village. 12. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations, and policies. Trustee Nicolle Grasse Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Canty, Grasse, Hayes, LaBedz, Scaletta, Schwingbeck, Tinaglia

Nays: Bertucci

X. CONSENT AGENDA

CONSENT OLD BUSINESS

CONSENT REPORT OF THE VILLAGE MANAGER

XI. APPROVAL OF BIDS

XII. NEW BUSINESS

XIII. LEGAL

XIV. REPORT OF THE VILLAGE MANAGER

XV. APPOINTMENTS

XVI. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

XVII. ADJOURNMENT

Trustee John Scaletta moved to adjourn at 11:00 p.m. Trustee Richard

Baldino Seconded the Motion.

The Motion: Passed

Ayes: Baldino, Bertucci, Canty, Grasse, Hayes, LaBedz, Scaletta,
Schwingbeck, Tinaglia