



Village of Arlington Heights
Plan Commission
Virtual Meeting
April 28, 2021
7:30 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

- A. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting is being held virtually, which permits the public to fully participate via their computers or using their phones.

To participate in the virtual meeting, please follow these instructions: <https://bit.ly/3tEOkp5>

Individuals who wish to comment or ask a question on an item on the Agenda may either participate virtually or send an email to the Village at jmschmidt@vah.com. Please limit emails to 200 words or less. To be shared at the meeting, the email must be received by 3:00 p.m. on April 28, 2021.

II. ROLL CALL

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. Arlington 425 - 3/31/21

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

V. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. Greenbrier Detention Pond - NE Corner Cambridge St & Yale Ave -
PC#21-004
Final Plat of Subdivision

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Persons with disabilities requiring auxiliary aids or services, such as an American Sign Language interpreter or written materials in accessible formats, should contact David Robb, Disability Services Coordinator, at 33 S. Arlington Heights Road, Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005, (847)368-5793 (Voice), (847)368-5980 (Fax) or drobb@vah.com.



**Plan Commission
4/28/2021**

Item: Arlington 425 - 3/31/21

Department: Planning & Community Development

ATTACHMENTS:

Description	Type
Arlington 425 - 3/31/21	Minutes

PLAN

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF A PUBLIC HEARING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
PLAN COMMISSIONCOMMISSION

RE: ARLINGTON 425 - HIGHLAND/CAMPBELL/CHESTNUT - PC #21-002
AMENDMENT TO PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting held virtually in response to the COVID-19
pandemic, which permits the public to fully participate via their computers or using their phones,
on the 31st day of March, 2021 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

TERRY ENNES, Chairperson
SUSAN DAWSON
MARY JO WARSKOW
JAY CHERWIN
JOHN SIGALOS
BRUCE GREEN
LYNN JENSEN
GEORGE DROST

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: This meeting of the Arlington Heights Plan Commission is called to order. In response to COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting is being held virtually, which permits the public to fully participate via their computers or use of their phones. The way to connect through that can be found on the Village website.

If we could do the pledge? If everyone that is here at this meeting would join us in the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, and Sam, would you call the roll please?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Here.

So, our first item of business this evening is the approval of the minutes from the last two projects that we heard on February 24th, the Hamilton Partners and the Greenbrier Detention Pond. All in favor? We'll do a roll call, but do we have anybody abstaining?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I would like to have those entered in; I make a motion to enter those.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Somebody needs to second it.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Sam, would you call that roll?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.
 MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.
 COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.
 MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.
 COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.
 MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.
 CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes.

So, that's a unanimous approval of the minutes from the last two hearings.

Our item of business this evening is Arlington 425, Highland/Campbell/Chestnut, PC #21-002, an amendment to the planned unit development, and a special use permit for a private garage for employees and customers.

The Petitioner is here I take it?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, the Petitioner is here.

Members from the Petitioner's team, if they can raise their hand on the attendee side? Then I can bring them in to be a part of this presentation.

(Slight pause.)

MR. HUBBARD: All right, Chairman Ennes, I believe everyone who had their hand raised has now been brought in, and I see Mike Firsel who is counsel for the Petitioner here in the panelist side.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, hi, Mike, good evening.

MR. FIRSEL: Hi, good evening. Good to see you all again.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: To you and your team.

MR. FIRSEL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: So, Sam, I take it we will proceed this evening by having the Petitioner present their proposal in regard to the amendment to the PUD and to the private parking garage?

MR. HUBBARD: Correct. The Petitioner will give their proposal. Staff will provide our Staff perspective, and then you can open the floor up for public commentary.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Mike, I would like to swear you in and your team, anybody that you anticipate will be speaking in. So, if they will all repeat after me? I think they should open their mics for this.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, so let's get started with your presentation.

MR. FIRSEL: Thank you.

Sam, I had a few issues. My computer broke down about 4:00 o'clock, and I was wondering if it is possible for you to allow me to screen share?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, you should have that ability, if you want to try and connect. That's open to you.

MR. FIRSEL: Share content, okay, except it's on a different computer. Okay, so Sam, I'm going to ask if you could open the site plan for us please?

MR. HUBBARD: Sure. Hold on a couple of moments.

MR. FIRSEL: And I will get this going. Terribly embarrassing, but thank you for your patience everybody.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Hey, Mike, I had that same fear this afternoon

that I have computer trouble for this meeting.

MR. FIRSEL: It is unfortunate, but we'll get through it.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes.

MR. FIRSEL: It's not difficult. So, basically, to bring everybody up to date, this matter was brought up in 2019. The Plan Commission reviewed this project in great detail. We had public meetings. We spent a lot of time on it. I believe we had two Plan Commission meetings, and it was unanimously approved.

Over the course of the last almost two years, we have attempted to obtain appropriate financing, equity participation in this project which costs in excess of \$100 million. It seems that over that period of time we had a little blip on our radar called the global pandemic, which put quite a crimp in almost any development. But even before the pandemic, the cost to develop this project far outweighed our ability to generate the income to even break even in developing it. I mean, it wasn't even close.

So, we had our architects, planners and the developer went back, and we determined one of the main reasons that the costs were so enormous is because of the tremendous cost of the parking garage that contained 454 parking spaces, on top of which we added six floors of residential units, 125 residential units, and an amenities floor. The additional cost of just the structure to support the apartments and the 454 spaces were exorbitant.

So, what we are proposing is the removal of all of the residential floors of the Highland building which was 140 feet in height, replace it with a four and perhaps five-story garage which will range in height from 40 to 50 feet, a reduction of about 100 feet on a four-story garage. Those 125 units, we have to replace a portion of them to continue to make the project feasible. So, the easiest way and the least obtrusive way of doing it was to remove all of the retail, office and restaurant space from the second floor of the Highland building and add a 10th story to the Highland building, increasing that height by about 15 feet. That is, you will see from the renderings, there are no, virtually no changes to the architecture of that building. It's as if we had just slipped the floor in the middle of the floor plates of the building.

In addition, we made the units in the Chestnut building smaller and added one story to that building. So, the Chestnut building is now five stories. As you are aware, the B-5 zoning, and even the master plan for the downtown and Block 425, which is how we got our name Arlington 425, calls for six to eight-story buildings. This one is five stories. So, we're certainly within the master plan as well as certainly within the code.

I'd like to also point out that this entire project has no request for any height variances, no density variances, and no parking variances. So, the simple fact of the matter is if you were to compare the two site plans, they would look identical. The site plan just hasn't changed.

Sam, if you could put up one of the renderings? Any one of them, it would be fine.

Okay, so what you have here is a view from the southwest, an aerial view. As you can see, and were you to compare the before and the after, you can see that based, and we tried to put this in context with the surrounding buildings, so the faded lighter look has nothing to do with other than trying to superimpose our renderings into the previous photo we had. As you can see, the mass to which many people objected of the Highland building is completely gone from this project. We had a comment last night about the sunlight going into the Metropolis building, and the removal of the mass of the additional almost 100 feet of two

levels of the Highland garage and the additional seven levels, residential and rooftop level, allows much more sunlight and air openness to appear to the east, in fact all around this project. So, this is a much less massive project.

If my memory serves me right, could you put up the Highland building please, Sam? Not the Highland, the Campbell building please. There we go. This gorgeous building is exactly as it was. Were we to put the two together, the nine-story and the 10-story, the only difference would be the view of one level. Nothing else has changed on the building, at the lower level or the top.

I would like to point out that the second level, as I said, that was retail, office and restaurants, and the western half of the first floor which called for retail, we've had absolutely no, not even nibbles to put retail in that portion of the building over the last year and a half. It is not a retail destination. It is too far out of the downtown area to be attractive to retailers. So, we are using that portion of the first floor for our amenities.

The bottom line is that of the proposed 28,000 plus feet of retail, office, restaurants in this building, we would have approximately 7,500 to 7,600 square feet of leasable square footage. So, it's about 25 percent if not less than the commercial, retail, office parking which takes up a lot of parking spaces. It's very transient and we felt that in order to replace some of the units that we were losing from the rental on top of the Highland building, that space would be much better used for the additional level of residential.

Overall, the whole project contains as much as 36,000 square feet of commercial which includes restaurant, retail, office space. This is the only space, the west half of the Highland building on the first floor that will have any retail or restaurant. There will be no office space anywhere in the building, any of the buildings. There is a small component of retail on the lower level of the Highland building that will no longer be there, and of course there was no commercial component of the Chestnut building.

You can see in the background the four-level garage. It has been designed to match the existing Vail Street Garage. We did receive a unanimous recommendation from the Design Commission last evening who felt that the structure was very symmetrical to the existing Vail Street Garage, and that's what we attempted to do.

Sam, could you please put up the Chestnut Street building at this time?

We can stay on this one for a moment. So, what we have here is the one, two, three, four, this is, one of the alternatives that Staff and we discussed was an alternative to accommodate parking, depending on how we use the Chestnut building, to make that a five-level building. You can see that this is a five-level parking deck. We will have a connection with the Highland building. This one is shown above the ground. It may be cost prohibitive, so we may request that that be put underground, but what we are requesting is approval of this one as you see here. Design Commission made various suggestions as to materials with which we agreed.

As you can see, it is even difficult to tell where this garage ends and the Vail Street Garage, which is off to your left, even begins.

Almost.

MR. HUBBARD: You can look for a different file if you want, or --

MR. FIRSEL: No, that's okay. Basically, if you take a look at the Chestnut building, you have all seen what was in the packet, that building has not changed at all either,

the walk-up type front entrances have absolutely not changed, the landscaping has not changed. The only thing that was changed is the height.

As it relates to height, the tallest building on this plan that was approved was 140 feet tall. The tallest building to the roof deck now is 111 feet. So, that's almost a 30-foot decrease in the overall height of the tallest building. The 10-story building, the Highland building, is in keeping with the height of the surrounding buildings. In fact, there are buildings that are even higher in the downtown.

One of the issues we have and have not come to terms with with Staff is parking. So, I'd very briefly like to mention what the parking requirements for this project are based on the Village Code. The total parking required under code, first of all for just the Highland building, is 255 spaces. That is based on the code requirement, and we are providing in the four-level deck 435 spots which exceeds code by 90 spaces or more than 35 percent above code. We know that's a lot of additional parking, but we wanted to build the parking deck instead of building a three-level deck or 3.5 level deck and keep adding to it. The cost is almost prohibitive.

So, knowing that we will use some of these spaces in this garage for the Chestnut building, we are proposing a 345-space, four-level parking deck. While we're at it, the parking deck will contain the number of spaces that I have stated, it will be four levels. We did receive some e-mails and drawings of a different configuration that we don't agree with. We will work with Staff and verify by the time we go to the Village Board that the representation of the four levels and the 345 spots will in fact be what we will build.

Our parking consultant is Walker Parking. They happened to design the Vail Street Garage. I don't know what other ones they did in the Village, and they are the biggest and the best in the city. They designed this deck. It will be almost identical in layout to the Vail Street Garage which has none of the issues that were brought up by one of the citizens who wrote several e-mails to the Village regarding our parking.

This building will contain 234 units as opposed to 182. The Chestnut building will contain up to 85 units if it's all rental; it will obviously be less if it's condominium. So, we have gone from overall 361 units to 319 units.

The parking demand is less. The density is less. The height is less. The retail, commercial is less. The amount of traffic will be less. So, we are very pleased with this design. Our architects are here; Mr. Adriani, the developer; our engineer is here. I just don't want to take any more time personally, and I would like to turn it over to Rob Losselyoung if you want to know anything about the architect, I may have missed Rob. If not, we'll turn it back to the Plan Commission so Sam can give his report. Thank you.

MR. LOSSELYOUNG: Thanks, Mike.

I think Mike did a fine job of describing the buildings still maintain the same character as the original approved designs. So, I will just pass it off to Sam and he can do his presentation.

MR. FIRSEL: Thanks, Rob.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, well, before we go to Sam, Mr. Firsell, I have one additional question of you. You have seen the redlined copies of the conditions from Staff for the amendment?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Have the two parties come to agreement on

those? Do you accept all those conditions?

MR. FIRSEL: No, we do not.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: At what point do you want to get into the conditions that you don't agree with?

MR. FIRSEL: Whenever it please the Chair. I can do it now; I can do it after Sam's report. We can do it after we hear from the public. However you would like to proceed, Mr. Chairman, we are fine with.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, let's go to Sam's Staff report. Once we see that, we may hit on some of his concerns in regard to the conditions, and then come back to you on that.

MR. FIRSEL: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Sure. Can everyone see the presentation?

(Chorus of yeses.)

MR. HUBBARD: Excellent.

All right, so everyone should be familiar with the property. It's the northern three-quarters of what we call Block 425 which is bounded by Sigwalt Street on the south, Campbell Street on the north, Chestnut to the west, and Highland to the east. It's been a long vacant lot on the edge of Downtown Arlington Heights. Recently there was approval granted to the Sigwalt 16 townhome/rowhome development on the southern quarter of that block. That project is well under construction and moving forward towards completion.

The action this evening is relative to, again, the northern undeveloped three-quarters of that block which is called Arlington 425. It was approved for a mixed-use development in early 2019. The property was rezoned at that time into the B-5 Downtown District. The majority of the site was already in that district. There was a small, I think it was like two or three single-family homes; the bottom portion of the site that was in the R-3 district. Those were rezoned into the B-5 district in 2019.

The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as suitable for mixed-uses. The proposed mixed-use development that was approved as a PUD in 2019 is compliant with that designation, and the proposed amendment as you've heard about this evening is also compatible with that mixed-use designation.

So, specifically, what the Petitioner is seeking this evening is an amendment to Planned Unit Development Ordinance 19-019 which would allow modifications to the previously approved development plan. Many of those modifications you've already heard from the Petitioner this evening.

Due to some of these modifications, it creates the need for a special use permit. This is in relation to the garage structure referred to as the Highland Garage on the east side of the development that was originally approved as a mixed-use tower. 13 stories that would have had a little bit of retail space, it was going to have residential units, and five to six floors of parking. Now that the tower portion above the parking deck has been removed from the proposal, and instead of 13 stories it's just a four or potentially five-story garage, it becomes a single use garage defined as a private garage for customers and employees, and therefore, requires a special use permit.

There are no additional variations that the plan modifications require. All of the previously approved variations would still apply.

I would mention, too, that the Petitioner received preliminary plat of subdivision approval back in 2019. They did request a year extension on that. A preliminary plat of subdivision approval is only good for a period of one year. So, they had requested and been approved for an extension, a one-year extension for that preliminary plat approval which is going to expire in June of this year.

The first extension request is only required to be granted and heard by the Village Board. Any subsequent request has to go before the Plan Commission, and then ultimately can be approved by the Village Board. So, as part of this PUD amendment, they're also requesting another extension to their preliminary plat approval given some of the hardships that they had finding financing, especially in light of the global pandemic over the last year.

So, that being said, the Petitioner has undergone several actions to date that gets them to the point they are at this evening. Back in November of last year, they appeared before the Conceptual Plan Review Committee to discuss their reduced scope project. I think the CPRC was generally favorable. They recognized that, you know, overall, the development was less intense under the proposed revisions to the plan. So, they encouraged the Petitioner to move forward.

Shortly after the Conceptual Plan Review Committee meeting, the Petitioner sent out over 500 invitations to a virtual neighborhood meeting that occurred on December 16th of last year where they answered questions from some of the neighboring property owners. On March 2nd, they appeared in front of the Housing Commission to review their affordable housing and inclusionary housing proposal. They did receive a unanimous recommendation of approval from the Housing Commission.

Just a quick summary. They will be providing 16 units which is five percent of the overall unit count in the development as affordable in perpetuity, and those 16 units would be within the development. Additionally, they will provide an approximately \$25,000 fee in lieu of adding additional units to the development, an additional eight units. They'll be providing that fee for in lieu of those additional eight units, and that will be just a flat contribution to our affordable housing fund. That number is going to go up every year by a measure of inflation until such time as the development has commenced to their obtaining a building permit for that development. So, that's kind of the high-level result of the Housing Commission. They got a recommendation of approval there.

Last night, the project appeared in front of the Design Commission and it also got a recommendation of approval. There were some smaller changes required by the Design Commission. They asked that all of the exterior utility meters be screened and that a larger canopy be added to the parking garage entry door, and some of the materials for the pedestrian roof bridge be revised. So, fairly minor I would say design requirements, but it did receive a recommendation of approval last evening at the Design Commission.

Then, of course, they're before the Plan Commission this evening for the PUD amendment, special use permit approval, and extension of the plat request. Then upon conclusion of this public hearing, they will move forward before the Village Board for final approval at a date to be determined.

So, I just want to outline some of the key changes to the plan from the first proposal compared to the proposal currently on the table. It's a reduction in units. They were approved originally for 361 units; now they're proposing 319 units. The bedroom mix has mostly remained the same, although there is a slightly higher percentage of studio, one-bedroom

units, slightly lower percentage of two-bedroom units. Again, the commercial and office square footage has drastically changed. There was about 36,000 square footage of commercial space under the previous proposal. Now, you're looking at just under 8,000 square footage, and all-office floor area has been removed from the proposal.

The heights of the building, as you heard, the Chestnut building would go up one story to five stories. The Campbell building would go up one story to 10 stories. Then, the Highland Garage would be built as either a four-story garage, or potentially there is an option Phase 1A where a fifth story could be built on the garage, yielding a total of 435 parking spaces. Under the four-story scenario, it would be 345 spaces.

When the Chestnut building is built, that would have the option of 44 spaces in the garage, or if the option Phase 1A fifth-story addition moves forward with the Highland building garage, then there would be sufficient spaces within that garage to where the spaces within the Chestnut building basement would likely not be constructed. There are still some back and forth as far as which organization and layout of these parking spaces would be provided in the Phase 2. But one thing for certain is we can assure that there would be at least 345 spaces within the Phase 1 construction of the Highland Garage and Campbell building.

So, overall, again, less units, less intense development overall. There's less density, less traffic, less commercial spaces. There's less overall height. The only real change is to the height of the Chestnut and Campbell buildings.

So, again, here is the site bounded by Campbell Street, Chestnut, Sigwalt, and Highland Avenue. Here is the footprint of the site. This is really identical to the previous approval. So, the only change was a minor change in the shape of this Highland Garage tower to Highland Garage building. Otherwise, access to the site is the same. It goes across through the site from Highland to Chestnut. There's a porte cochere feature on Campbell Street, the interior motor court with ample spaces for parcel delivery and drop-off/pickups, and then a landscape courtyard between the two buildings.

The Phase 1 development entails the construction of the Campbell building and the construction of the Highland Avenue Garage. That is what we call the Phase 1 development. The Phase 1A would be again the fifth-story addition to the Highland Garage which will be determined based on need. Then the Phase 2 full build-out would be the construction of the Chestnut building.

So, when we analyzed the changes to the building heights, we did so in the context of the Downtown Master Plan which outlines some key development parameters for Block 425. Specifically, it states that this block should be developed with buildings in the six to eight-story height on the subject property, transitioning down to four to six stories in height on the southern portion of the site which is being developed with the four-story rowhomes currently. In order to evaluate the compatibility of this development and the height changes, we looked at that plan, and we would note that in the context of the change in height of the 13-story Highland building being decreased to a four to five-story garage, the one-story increase in height on the Campbell building to a proposed height of 10 stories is acceptable. It's a little bit over the maximum building height as called for in the Downtown Master Plan, but it is compliant with the underlying B-5 zoning relative to height. It's compatible and harmonious to the buildings in the vicinity at this portion of the site which are both mid-rise structures to the north and to the east, and a vacant site to the west which will be likely developed with an R-7 use at some point in the future.

The one-floor proposed height increase to the Chestnut building which would yield an overall building height of five floors is reasonable and compatible with the height standards within the Downtown Master Plan. Again, it's five stories and then a plan appropriate for between six and eight stories. It's also compliant with the B-5 regulations for height. Given the kind of transitional location of this building being on the edge of downtown right where the B-5 district borders single-family residential districts, the Staff Development Committee would note that the height differential between the single-family homes and the Chestnut building is typical in this kind of transitional areas of downtown where you're going from one high intensity district to a lower intensity single-family district.

The building here is not only compliant with the B-5 district regulations, but it's also compliant with the R-7 district regulations which is an appropriate transition between downtown uses and single-family uses. So, in light of this, we found the height increases to be in the fabric of the downtown and transitional edge of downtown vicinity, and compatible and harmonious to the neighboring property development and land uses.

The developer and the Petitioner presented this exhibit. This shows kind of the lower impact of the height for the 13-story tower. This is as viewed from the western side across Chestnut Street from the development. You can see there is a lower building here but a taller building in the back which would be more visible from more angles across the street as opposed to the one-story height increase here. So, again, we find the height adjustments to be within what's considered acceptable given the location, and compatible and harmonious to the neighboring land uses in the vicinity.

Relative to landscaping, most everything remained as originally approved. One change I would note is this was originally to be used as a fire lane under the previous approval where a 13-story tower was located here. Given that this will be a single-use garage, what's one nice feature is that the courtyard in between the two buildings no longer has to serve as a fire lane and can be enhanced with landscaping.

Again, relative to traffic, not much has changed. I mean, the orientation of the site is still the same. You have a one-way entrance off Highland, two-way entrance to the porte cochere off Campbell. This is a resident-only in and out for the Highland parking garage which will be controlled by an overhead door and key fobs that only residents would have access to. This is one of the egress/one way out options out of the development, and then of course the ramp and the basement entrance to the potential underground parking in the Chestnut building.

I would point out that one of the previous conditions of approval for this development required the Petitioner to provide us with a lot more details on this actual egress point. When they move forward with this proposed Chestnut building, we would require safety features such as warning lights and possible audio sounds when a car is entering or leaving here. But this is something that we're, you know, we'll keep in mind as detailed plans are developed. We want to make sure that this entrance is designed to be safe and compatible with the pedestrian movements in the vicinity.

Again, relative to traffic, it wasn't a huge portion of the overall Staff analysis here, you're seeing a less intense development, less units, less commercial space, no office floor area. So, from a traffic standpoint, the previous proposal versus the current proposal, you can see there's a reduction across the board, less peak morning trips, less peak evening trips, less overall daily trips to and from the site.

So, this really brought us to parking which was one of the key issues when this project first appeared before the Plan Commission. Not only did we want to make sure that the development had enough overall parking for the sum of its uses, but we wanted to make sure that the parking within the development was allocated appropriately to accommodate for the expected peaks from each use within the development. So, the Petitioner has worked with Staff very hard these last several weeks trying to work together and come up with an acceptable allocation plan for the parking. Here is what we think to be acceptable.

So, this illustration shows the ground floor of the Highland parking garage. You see the Petitioner dedicated 56 stalls for "commercial only" parking on the first floor, and then at some point it would transition into "resident only" parking. That's leading out from the first floor throughout the remaining floors of the Highland parking garage. Again, we've heard about the additional phase, Phase 2 would be a potential addition of a fifth floor to the parking garage to bring that parking count up to 435 parking stalls.

But we really wanted to look at this in two ways. First, we analyzed it from a code perspective: Does the development meet code relative to parking requirements? Then, does it meet the expected demand that it will see based on expected peak uses, use times in the commercial, and expected peak uses in the residential portion? Because those peaks, and our code doesn't really, relative to the B-5 and Downtown Parking District, doesn't really capture adequate demand for parking spaces or expected generation of demand for parking compared to what the code requires.

So, based on code, the site and development conforms to code requirements, but code only requires about 1.12 spaces per unit for the development. The Petitioner's own parking study found that, on average, comparable downtown suburban residential rental developments provided parking at about 1.26 parking spaces per unit. Arlington Heights did lengthy studies during the first approval and found that in Downtown Arlington Heights, residential rental properties are typically parked at about 1.3 parking spaces per unit.

So, while it was meeting code, we wanted to see the developer install closer to 1.3 parking spaces per unit which would meet what we saw demand being for residential parking. We asked that they run an hour-by-hour analysis of when the peak demand from parking would occur based on the residential rental units and the commercial uses proposed in the development. At peak demand, we saw that there would be a demand for up to 60 parking spaces, peak demand for their commercial uses. So, we wanted to make sure that the developer had at least that, but then allocated the remaining number of spaces suitable to meet that 1.3 parking spaces per unit demand that we're seeing.

So, again, the Petitioner's allocation plan, you'll see they allocated 56 spaces for commercial only parking. This aligns with what we expect demand to be, close to 60 spaces for commercial only parking. In Phase 1 of development, that leaves, when you dedicate 56 parking spaces for commercial; that leaves 289 parking spaces for the remaining residential units in the Campbell building. That translates to a parking ratio of 1.3 spaces per unit.

So, they've hit the target pretty much right on the head for Phase 1. They have what we would consider to be suitable spaces dedicated for commercial parking and suitable spaces dedicated for residential parking. But things change a little bit as we move forward with Phase 2, as they're not proposing to build out quite as many parking spaces in Phase 2 when they build the Chestnut building. So, based on our models, we're seeing that

there would be at least a 55-space deficit possible under the Phase 2 development. If they were to go forward with the Phase 1 development which is the fifth story addition to the garage, that deficit is lessened because there would be more overall spaces on the property, but still doesn't quite meet what we forecast demand to be.

So, we're recommending approval of this project. One of the most notable conditions relates to proceeding with the parking and development of Phase 2. We're okay again with Phase 1, we think everything is appropriately built out and allocated. It's just when it's time to move forward to Phase 2, we're recommending a condition of approval that says the developer either has to reduce some of the units in the Chestnut building so that their overall on-site parking meets 1.3 parking spaces per residential unit in addition to the 56 parking spaces allocated for the commercial uses, or add additional parking so that they can meet that 1.3 spaces per unit with the 85 residential units proposed in the Chestnut building, or prove up that the demand based on actual usage in Phase 1 is not what Staff expects it to be and projects it to be.

If there is a surplus in parking, then, you know, we would have to present the data to the Village Board, and potentially they could allow less parking than that 1.3 spaces per unit. But it would have to be through an administrative process and would need Staff and Village Board approval so we would be able to, you know, take a look through it to make sure that there is not going to be an adverse impact to our public parking system and on neighboring streets for parking relative to this development.

So, that's probably the most notable condition of approval we're recommending. A lot of the other conditions of approval are going to remain from the previous 2019 approval. Some of them do get changed. I'm happy to go through the details of some of the conditions. They're outlined in the Staff report.

One thing that I'll just talk about real briefly, because I think I know where Mike is going to go with it, is the developer did propose a storage/refuse area on the eastern wall of the first floor building of the Highland Garage. Staff is asking that this be relocated to the north wall of the Highland Garage. We just don't see a real need for it in the location that it's being proposed at, and it would require the removal of some parking spaces within the Highland, or Vail Avenue Garage at that point, ground floor spaces in the Vail Avenue Garage which are some of the most popular and heavily-used spaces in the garage. So, we think there's alternative locations for this storage and refuse area within the Highland building, and we think the Petitioner can work to find a location that would not require removal of spaces from the Vail Avenue Garage.

I'll just show you specifics. This is the area that we're talking about. So, there's existing street parking here in the Vail Avenue Garage. If they were to build this refuse/storage area, it would require the removal of certain spaces. We think that there is suitable space to accommodate for this refuse/storage area here. They could have an entrance out this way if they wanted an exterior entrance that would allow loading inside and out, and it wouldn't require any removal of the storage spaces there.

So, I think Mike is probably going to object to that. I just wanted to state Staff's rationale and reasoning. We think there are viable alternatives, but that's our recommendation. I could go through all these, but otherwise, that will conclude our presentation this evening. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Sam, thank you very much for the Staff report.

Can we get a motion to approve the Staff report?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: And a second.

Sam, can we do a roll call?

MR. HUBBARD: Sure. Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes.

So, thank you again, Sam, on that.

So, Mr. Firsell, I hope that Sam was correct that that's the only point that you have a discrepancy with as far as the conditions.

MR. FIRSEL: No, we have a discrepancy with the parking requirements as well as that one point. Those are really the two areas in which we have any discrepancy. I believe there is a 20-page or so, I don't know how many pages this is, it's quite lengthy. Let's see, he's got conditions total, oh, about eight pages. It's only those conditions relating to parking and the excess in Highland Garage, off of Highland, to which we take exception.

If you would like to go through, as you requested earlier, Mr. Chairman, where we have a disagreement, I can certainly briefly tell you what our issues are.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Please.

MR. FIRSEL: Okay, so let's take first things first. So, I believe if we go through the conditions, number 11 which would be on page 13, the proposed storage area along the eastern side of the first floor of the Highland Garage should be relocated to the north side of the Highland Garage with access from the private drop-off area. We strenuously object to that and we're just not going to do it.

Number one, the access to the Highland Garage for loading and unloading, for storage, for refuse removal, for many things, especially the storage area where we have a lot of maintenance equipment for this project is imperative. Staff talks about the removal of three parking spaces from the Highland Garage. Well, first of all, were this building not built up to our property line and to across all the right-of-ways, thereby diminishing the value of the property, limiting our development opportunities, not to mention the views and everything else, this would not be perpendicular parking for 25 spaces which is what they have. So, at most, on parallel parking like you have on most of these streets, there may be 10 or 12 spots. So, taking

away something that isn't yours to begin with is hard for us to swallow.

In addition to that, the Highland Garage was built, and if you go out and look at this particular portion of the garage, the barricades or the western barricades are removable, anticipating that there would be access into this site. To have a loading zone along Highland within this garage is imperative for the operation of our project. Therefore, the loss of three spaces of public parking which by all rights may not have been there to begin with but for the construction of this deck is, it's patently unfair to penalize us. We've been penalized enough by the construction of this garage and/or the property line.

The other point is with regard to the parking. We have given all that we can give on the parking. One of the reasons we were unable to construct this project or afford to construct this project was the massive over-parking required when it was first approved. The reason I say that is that the Village has a code, it has a parking code. The parking code requires, let's start with the commercial.

Staff admits this even on their report, code requires 19 commercial parking spaces. They want 60. That's 60, more than three times the requirement of code. How is that plausible? They want all our guests, all our valet, all our employees for the retail and the restaurant to park in this garage. Where in Downtown Arlington Heights is there any requirement for any restaurant to self-park their entire guests, employees, valet, and to provide parking at their cost? This is a complete discrimination on how we are being treated as it relates to parking for commercial and restaurants by making us park everything on our own site three times more than required by code. It's simply absurd.

If we then go to the residential requirement, I understand where Staff is coming from, that they would like 1.3 to one. What that means is they want us to provide 30 percent more parking than code requires. There is nothing in this Village Code requiring any developer anywhere to provide more parking than your code requires. Voluntarily, to try to get this done, we are providing significant 90 extra spaces in Phase 1, 45 or 46 extra spaces in Phase 2 above code, and that is simply not enough?

So, the parking we propose would be approximately 25 percent more overall than your code requires, and that's not good enough. So, yes, we strenuously, we object to the parking requirements and demands, and we definitely object to the removable of those spaces and the access loading zone or loading point on Highland.

Other than that, the additional demands/requests we've gone through quite thoroughly with the Staff and we will definitely comply with everything else.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, so those are your two issues.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: The original proposal, and I don't want to be going back to that but rather just to address the amendment and the possibility of a fifth floor on the parking garage. But in the original proposal, there was this talk about the, you know, parking facility providing parking, a certain number of parking spots to non-customer residents. Is that still in the parking count?

MR. FIRSEL: No. Non-customer residents?

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: That other people from downtown could park in there.

MR. FIRSEL: No, it's a private parking garage.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, Commissioners, do you have any

questions of Mr. Firsell or Sam in regard to these two condition concerns? Just show me a hand. No questions about it?

Yes, Mary Jo? Your mic.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: So, when you came up with the 1.31 to compare them against, did you also take into consideration the mix of single to two-bedroom to see whether it matched what they're offering? Because I can imagine a single is not going to need as much parking as a double. So, if they have more single apartments, then what the average is for downtown that results in that 1.3, then I don't think it's necessary to make them go up to 1.3.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, so the 1.3 ratio was generally consistent based on, I think their unit mix is fairly typical of the downtown area. We don't have a per-bedroom, you know, ratio, but it's, you know, it would not be far off from what we have. Furthermore, I mean, their own parking study found that comparable developments in downtown suburban environments are parked at 1.26 spaces per unit, obviously with some greater than that. So, I mean, the 1.3 is supported by their own traffic and parking study, not only our own experience in downtown.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Can I ask why our code still is at 1.12?

MR. HUBBARD: It probably could use some updates.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Any other questions? In regard to the parking?

Mr. Firsell, a question I have in regard to this, the refuse/storage --

MR. FIRSEL: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: The refuse/storage is for your commercial customers and your tenants, the residents? Is that what that's for?

MR. FIRSEL: It's for the trash removal in the garage as well as the deliveries. Many deliveries will come through the garage. It also includes loading and unloading equipment. Our project manager who's been with us, Deb Smart, is on with us. She can certainly talk to the necessity of that area, but she has interviewed, she manages many buildings in Downtown Arlington Heights and has spoken to her engineer. Although what I'm saying is what we in the legal professional call hearsay, she can tell you directly that they need a larger area for storage of snow blowers, and this is a large garage. It's going to have several hundred cars in it. We have to keep it clean.

The top level of this garage is a parked area. It will snow. We have to be able to get our snow removal equipment up to that level. We have to store it somewhere. We will have to salt it, we'll have to have a place for salt. We will have a full-time maintenance person on site, so he will have to have a little office and a place to go.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: So, this is in regard to my question about the refuse/storage, you're indicating that where the Village wants it to go is where you'd be storing equipment for snow removal, maintenance and whatnot?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, it's not just refuse/storage, that's the point. It's for many, many other things. The refuse/storage will, obviously there will be in the Campbell building for the Campbell building, and the Chestnut building for the Chestnut building.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Is your current location for the refuse/storage more suited to the convenience of your tenants, commercial and residential or whoever is using it? Is that a better location for their use?

MR. FIRSEL: Sam, could you let Deb in? I think she can answer that a

little better. She is sworn in.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Hi, Ms. Smart.

MS. SMART: Hi, good evening. It is actually convenient both for the residents who will be using it as a spot-on refuse area, but more importantly, if you look at the drawing carefully, where Sam wants us and Staff wants us to relocate the refuse area will also eliminate one of our handicap parking spots. I know how we all feel about handicap parking. So, the reason we placed it there was also to maintain that one handicap parking spot.

But our engineer, they like to have a view of the entire floor. They don't like to be shoved at one end of the building versus the other. The gentleman that Mike was referencing has 30 plus years of engineering experience, and one of the things they like is the fact, if these are in the middle of the floor, they have the ability to go in any direction.

Mike is absolutely correct. We will probably be storing up to 150-pound bags of salt or salt material in the winter season alone. So, being able to have easy egress and ingress to store these kinds of equipments is important for us.

We do not take it lightly in the placement. We had long discussions with Staff. But this is really critical to the really harmonious operation of the garage.

MR. FIRSEL: Thanks, Deb.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, any other questions from the Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, just I have a question, Terry.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes, Bruce.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Sam, could you pull up the area we're talking about? Could you put the floor plan up there?

MR. HUBBARD: And just so that I'm clear, no one at the Staff level is saying that, you know, this needs to be eliminated. We're just saying that there is plenty of room to put it over here, and yes, it would cause one handicap space to be relocated here, but it's certainly feasible. I mean, we just haven't heard anything that, you know, causes us at the Staff level to understand why this is the best place for this storage/refuse area. We think it could be viable in other places in the building. I mean, that's just, I don't know, I'm not going to argue the point. That's our perspective. I mean, it's a disagreement.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, my question is when you say refuse/storage, these are roll-out, cans that are rolled out and then picked up and unloaded?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, no matter what, they have to leave the building. So, what you're saying is that for convenience, you have a door there that they just pull up to and unload the garbage and they're gone?

MR. FIRSEL: That's correct. They would be able to back in to this loading area, not block Highland Avenue, not going to the interior of the development to collect the garbage or the refuse. They could go in, it will be rolled out by our maintenance person, and it would be much less obtrusive than putting the trash or the refuse containers somewhere else.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, so if that door was no longer there and they were moved over here, they would be rolled out into the inner drive and loaded on to the truck and gone, isn't that correct?

MR. FIRSEL: As far as it is for refuse, if your question is specifically for refuse, yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, I'm just curious, you know.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes. Yes, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, so if the refuse was rolled out there, how many refuse cans do you anticipate, and how often is the garbage picked up?

MS. SMART: I can answer that if I'm back on.

MR. FIRSEL: You are.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, you are. Go for it.

MS. SMART: Okay, all right. A building the size of Campbell will have 15 major refuse cans which are the large green cans --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Right.

MS. SMART: -- that you see in many of the alleys. They will be picked up five days a week. So, this will be a major, major, major inhibitor for us in regards to labor. I also want to point out, we would actually be mimicking the exact activity that is happening for the Village's Metropolis building today across the street. We are actually mimicking what they do which is they actually back into the alley today to pick up their refuse right across the street. So, it's the most efficient and quick way to get it done.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, so you get it done five times a week then?

MS. SMART: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, and so let me just, I'm just trying to get a handle on it for my own use here. The space that you have allocated there which takes up what, three parking spaces?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, that's, you know, roughly 30 feet or less, if they're nine-foot spaces, it's 27 feet, whatever that is. So, in that area, can you put all those refuse cans?

MS. SMART: Yes, we're going to be using what's known as a canister caddy. It's a new technology which allows you almost to stack them. So, yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, no, I'm just trying to figure out the space, that's all. Okay, thank you for that, Debbie.

MS. SMART: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No more questions at this point. I'm just thinking out loud here, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thanks, Bruce. Bruce, that makes sense to you as an architect?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It definitely seems to. If there's that amount of stuff being picked up everyday, I can see where you wouldn't want to put it on the inner court. It's just, you know, it's garbage, so, you know.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: And to have that interfering with people who are parking every day of the week, morning or whatever.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes. In other words, it's always going to be there if it's five days a week. That's why I was asking how often does it get picked up. So, that's a large quantity of material to move and, you know, quite honestly, if you could, it's not a bad idea to unload it onto the Highland side street there instead of rolling it through the inner court.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: But anyway, that's just my feeling, that's all. I'm just trying to understand it.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Terry? A question, Terry, of Staff.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: What does Staff see as the implication for parking in the Vail Street Garage if they lose these three spaces on the first level? How significant is that?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, I mean, when the Vail Avenue Garage is at its peak, the floors, the first floor, second floor and third floor are pretty much fully occupied. It's not until you start getting up to the fourth and fifth floor that you start seeing vacancies. So, you're just removing some of the most convenient and heavily used parking spaces from the garage and making those space usages occur farther and farther away from what's convenient.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, how frequently are we at peak, you know, peak load?

MR. HUBBARD: How frequently are we --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, let me put it in a different way. So, we're causing, suppose I go over there and you're causing somewhat of an inconvenience to me and I might go over there once every two weeks, or somebody else might go once a week, but they've got an issue that has to be dealt with everyday. So, the question is we're weighing the inconvenience of having people to have to park at upper levels, which I have had to do and others have, too, versus the inconvenience where you have problems we're causing for something that is dealt with everyday by this development.

I'm having a little trouble figuring out the weight of the inconvenience we're causing residents versus the inconvenience on a daily basis or five days a week that we're going to be causing this developer.

MR. HUBBARD: But there is no, from Staff's standpoint, right, there is where it's currently proposed right here, right?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Right.

MR. HUBBARD: This is where we think it actually makes the most sense. So, instead of having a garbage truck pull up and block the public street, or back in on the public street to access their load, their dumpsters, that truck could come in here, back in on their own private street and not interfere with the public way, and access their dumpsters and so forth which would actually be closer now to the building that they're alleging it's serving. I would also point out that there are several loading areas and trash rooms inside this building already. So, unless the capacity is going to be so great that they're swapping back and forth containers hourly, then I would expect trash pickup as it was designed to be located for the Campbell building by the Campbell building trash room.

But again, putting it here, I have yet to see a compelling reason that shows it needs to be where it has been proposed. It seems like it could be viable both places. But that's Staff's perspective.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sam, then the other question is on the storage of the equipment, salt and other things. You're proposing that that also be done in the same area or what's Staff's thinking on that?

MR. HUBBARD: The storage of salt?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, the storage of all the other things. So, let's deal with both the refuse and as well as the storage of equipment and salt and other things, you know, to service this parking garage. So, as I understand --

MR. HUBBARD: The size of a room would be exactly the same. You're talking about three to four spaces across, and you're talking about three to four spaces across. So, the size of the room wouldn't change. The access to the room would. You'd have access from the courtyard, you know, the door, overhead door going out would be here as opposed to there, or there could be an alternative location that they can think of throughout the site.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, the only other point they make is that having it at one end of the building is not optimal compared to having it more centrally located so you can go in all directions as I understand their point.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I mean, this is a dead-end, so I don't know.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: I mean, so there's nothing much in this direction they really need to salt.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sam, I appreciate you expanding on Staff's point of view. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: The site plan really helps, Sam. I can see it on the site plan here, thank you.

MR. FIRSEL: Is there any chance we can respond to this?

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Please do.

MR. FIRSEL: Okay, first of all, we're spending millions of dollars on the area. If you could put the overall site plan back up, Sam? If you take a look at the landscaping, the roundabout, the entrances, the money we're spending on the facades of these buildings, and now you're saying let all these garbage trucks go through this area and make the front of our garage a garbage pickup location on the interior of this project? It's absurd. We can't do that.

You're taking away all of the exclusivity of a class A project where the Highland Avenue area should be where it goes to save three public parking spaces because it's more convenient for three people to not have to go up to the fourth level of the Vail Street Garage? What I don't understand, and I've done a lot of work in this Village, how Staff decides how we design our building, where we put our refuse, to the extent it doesn't interfere with the public, where we store things in our building.

Staff says they just don't get it. They don't have to get it. The sole issue is they want their three parking spaces back on to Highland, and that is really, to be quite honest, quite offensive to us. After the 25 spaces that are there building on to our property line, and now we want an entryway off of Highland, there were seven or eight driveways on this street right in this area where there used to be residences. So, the Village has now decided we can't use these three spots because it's inconvenient to three people to not be able to park there? Sorry, Commissioners, we strenuously object to making us go into the interior of this all-paver surface of this very expensive area of our development to drop off and pick up garbage. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Mr. Firsell, that makes sense to me, but would you tell me on the landscape plan here, on the Campbell Street building, these two loading areas, what are those? Are those going to be trash? How are those going to be taken out to the garbage trucks if they're trash?

MR. FIRSEL: Deb can answer that. That's more loading than just trash. We will have some move-ins/move-outs. We will have FedEx deliveries, we will have UPS.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: So, elevators and, is there an elevator there?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, there will be an elevator, sure.

MS. SMART: Yes, there is an elevator there for move-in and move-outs. It also is going to be an area where we're looking to put one of these package distribution centers that you've seen, these hubs for the prime carriers where they'll be delivering packages. That's where we're looking to try to put those trucks off the street and back them in there.

But the other thing I want to point out about this garage issue is there is a safety issue in regards to having those garbage trucks back up at that particular area. We're anticipating a lot of pedestrian traffic going through this nice area, as Mike told you. I would be concerned also of garbage trucks trying to make that turning radius to get into that particular area; I'm just going to be honest with you. But those little areas over there definitely are going to be, we are trying to defuse as much traffic off of the streets as possible, and we are really being quite aggressive regarding our package delivery, I will be honest with you.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: So, the inlet for the parking for the garbage, will the garbage trucks actually pull back into those spots?

MS. SMART: Exactly what they do over at the Metro Lofts building today, and also at Metropolis.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Will they be hanging in the street?

MS. SMART: Yes, they back right in.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Ms. Smart, will they be hanging out in the street or are they going to back all the way in?

MS. SMART: They will be pretty much off of the street. I'm not going to guarantee it's going to be a hundred percent, but it will be pretty close.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: It will be 18-20 feet, the length of a --

MR. FIRSEL: Right, that's correct.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, I have to say, Mr. Firsell, I agree with a lot of what you say, it makes sense. This is your building. Functionally, you need to be responsible or make the decisions as to how it operates. I could understand where the Village might want to back those in because then they're totally off the street. But I think it's your building, you need to look at it from a functional standpoint of how you want to run it.

Staff, any other questions regarding, or Commissioners, any other questions regarding this parking issue as far as the garbage, and then in regard to the parking issue before we go to hear what some of the guests that are out there watching this have to bring to us?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, can I speak? I've got a general question.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Please, George.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Which really relates to sort of the planning for the developer. On Chestnut, the comment was if we go condominium or if we go apartment, I'm assuming that Campbell is still going to be all apartment, going to be one and two's, and that Chestnut could actually become a condominium project. How would that impact the parking, that's number one question.

The second question with Sigwalt 16, now that we've got some tangible signs as to Sigwalt 16 really building out pretty well, was there any comment from either

Design Commission, this maybe goes to Sam, and how it integrates with the reduction on the proposed site of 425?

So, those are just sort of the general questions. Maybe Mike Firsell can answer the one on the Chestnut, and then does it have something to do with loan ability for the, you know, from your credit, you know, potential financing of this project on the Chestnut? Then on the aesthetics, maybe that goes to Sam.

MR. FIRSEL: Sure, I'm happy to answer that, Commissioner Drost. First of all, we did a comparison of the parking requirements for condos versus apartments. Within one space, if we were to do 50 condos instead of 85 apartments, it would be the exact same requirement within one space. So, if we do do condos, they will obviously be larger than the apartments. Even though we may do as many as 35 less units, it's not going to be any less parking if we go to the condos. So, it's just about the same, it's uncanny, it's about exactly the same number.

This all depends on what the market is, what financing requires. Keep in mind, one of the factors upon which we're going to base the decision on what to do is that when you sell a condo, you get cash, you get paid. You can pay down debt, you can pay back investors. If it's continued to be run as an apartment, you have to show that there will be positive cash flow, there will be continuing interest to be able to keep the rental rates up. So, it's all going to depend on demand.

So, what we have said we would do to accommodate the parking is come back at such time as we know what we're going to do to make sure that we satisfy the Village's parking requirements, but we can't park it 1.3 to one. It's not necessitated, it's not warranted, and it doesn't matter what we did in the past. We couldn't afford to build the building with the requirement that the Staff is putting with as much parking as they want. It would cost us approximately \$2.7 million of additional cost for parking spaces not required by your code. That's it in a nutshell.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Good, thanks. Sort of, another sort of tangential question is when you stage this project, are you going to start with the apartments first on Campbell or on Chestnut, you know, basically trying to take the pulse of the market?

MR. FIRSEL: Oh, yes, that's an extremely important and very good question. We are definitely building Highland and we're going to start building the Campbell building first. About maybe halfway through building the Campbell building, we will then start building the parking garage. It goes much faster. It takes about half the time.

So, we will, Phase 1 will be all the infrastructure of the entire site, everything except the area between the Highland building and the Chestnut building and the Chestnut building itself will be built first. We will be staging the project on the pad of the Chestnut building and what I call the parkway. That's why at the time we build Phase 1, we will simply grass over and we'll work with Staff to put some sort of landscaping on the parkway area and likely would fence off the pad for the Chestnut building. But it will be all grass.

Once that is all done, we'll see what our demand is. We'll see how fast we lease up the Campbell building. If there's a huge demand, we'll know it's destined to be apartments and we'll move forward with the apartments.

One thing that we may very well do, and that's why there is a Phase 1A out there, is we may build the five-level deck which will contain 435 parking spaces, okay. That's not enough for Staff. They want 450.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Now, do they know there's a train nearby?

MR. FIRSEL: Well, I'm glad Mr. Aboona is on the line with us and he can verify it. I believe, Luay, and please correct me if I'm wrong if you want to unmute, that in transit-oriented developments, the residential parking varies between 0.9 and 1.2 per unit in a TOD. They want 1.3. Is that correct, Luay?

MR. ABOONA: Yes, Mike.

Luay Aboona with KLOA. That is correct. The ratios could go considerably lower when you have alternative modes of transportation in a transit as well as in a downtown setting.

MR. FIRSEL: Thanks, Luay.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, Commissioners, any other questions?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, just for Sam on the aesthetics of 16.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, so if you can just address that? You know, is this, with the build-out on Sigwalt, this gives you a little bit more tangible, tactile feel for the development, and do you see that as a plus/minus? Any comments there, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I think this development fits in well with what's going on on the southern end of the block. You know, I think that the previous iteration had a, you know, five to six-story garage podium with a 13-story tower on top that would have been directly adjacent to the townhomes that are under construction now. Under the current proposal, it's going to be a four to five-story garage, not a 13-story tower directly abutting those townhomes.

So, I do feel that the proposed PUD modifications are, you know, provide better aesthetics to their neighbors than the previous plans.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and to that point, the construction site seemed to be very well organized with little interference or congestion to the neighborhood. Do we have any enforcement issues, any complaints?

MR. HUBBARD: I'm not aware of any, but they would probably not go through me if we did get them.

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, but if they were serious you'd know about them?

MR. HUBBARD: Probably, yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Good, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: One last call, any other questions?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Terry, it's Jay. I've got one, just a point of clarification.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: For Sam, if you would, Sam. So, in the plan, there was, kind of getting back to the parking count here, we're talking about, you know, Mr. Firsell's concern about the number that's being required. If you could explain really quick? My understanding is there's certain parking spots that are being off-loaded to the Vail Garage, maybe to kind of offset the affordable count? I believe there's 13 parking units that will serve this development, but then they're being off-loaded to the Vail Garage, is that correct?

MR. HUBBARD: Code allows 16 spaces will be made available on the Vail Avenue Garage to affordable tenants, one per affordable unit within the development.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay, how much, we're talking peak load, if

we're able to add 16 units in the Vail Garage, is there any capacity to add additional ones to off-load some of these concerns you have? Say for instance the commercial, if code will require, you know, 19 spots I believe, don't quote me on that but I think that's what it would be in the development but Staff is going for 56, I mean, can any of those spots be made up in the Vail, say for instance restaurant employees to be parked across the street just like the affordable units so that we can get closer to the parking gap?

MR. HUBBARD: During peak times in our studies, we found that, you know, there are times when the fourth and fifth floor are the only vacancies within the garage, so there is some vacancy. 19 spaces vacancy, it's hard to say. I mean, you're just pushing, you know, farther and farther people away from the destinations they want to go. We'll probably have a better idea as we continue to get data back from our new system that monitors the parking. But my understanding is that there is limited capacity in there. It's not fully used, but the only availability during peak times are in locations that are less ideal.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Well, and I get that and I agree with that. I mean, but for instance, like my wife who used to work in a downtown business, she would have to walk two blocks to park at the top level of a garage in order to, you know, park and work at that job. I'm thinking, you know, while it may be not as convenient for a resident, you know, for additional residents or retail or restaurant consumers, when you're talking about staff that's going to be parked there for eight hours during the day, that may be a solution that gets us to the point where we're not putting, you know, we're continuing to make this feasible and we're not asking the developer to go, you know, beyond, you know, what I guess the range would be as they just described in the traffic study and what our zoning code would require.

I mean, I would think that if we have excess space in the fifth floor, if we can accommodate it for a limited number of residential units, we should be able to accommodate it for staff, maybe even valet because I think it's better than having those spaces go unused. Like you said, they might be inconvenient to the average shopper or restaurant in the Village, but for employees or for valet, it may be a good use of that space. That's all.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, anyone else? We're going to move to the public portion of our hearing. I would, Sam, can you give me an idea how many people we have out there and maybe get, if they can show you hands if they want to speak?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, if there's a member of the public that wants to speak, please click the Raise Your Hand feature in Zoom. If you've dialed in by phone, you can dial *9 and it will raise your hand for me here. Once you make a statement, you know, your statement is into the record. It doesn't turn into a back and forth. If you have questions, you can certainly ask those questions and the Plan Commissioners will hear your questions and may ask Staff to address them. But the way it works is you make your comment and then you're done with your public comment.

I see four hands raised. I do have three items that I would like to read off before we go into public comment. These are other e-mails that were received from residents earlier today. So, if I may read those, Chairman? Then I will open up for public comment from members in Zoom.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, so really don't have that many indicating that they would like to speak. There's no reason to set a time limit on each person with just four people out there.

So, yes, Sam, please, if you can read those mail messages that

have been sent in to you.

MR. HUBBARD: Sure.

This was received from Roslyn Ryan, and she states: There is no need for the ordinance to be changed to include new floors and more residences. It will only result in more congestion and more inconvenience to current residents. Arlington Heights receives some of the biggest taxes in the state but has not shown fiscal responsibility on what those taxes pay for, so they don't need more dollars for better management. Density is the issue. I strongly submit there does not need to be an ordinance change for these two reasons. There's too much density in our area currently, and the taxes won't fix that. No more new residents in a one-block area.

Another e-mail comes from Scott Purley. He says: The downtown area is too dense now. Adding more residences will compound the problem. I do not support adding any new residential units to the number already planned. Regards, Scott Purley.

Also got an e-mail from Keith Allen, it says: During the first approval for Arlington 425, the Highland/Chestnut building was discussed and debated at every level of approval, from community meetings to the Design and Plan Commissions to the Village Board, the height of the building and its harmony and compatibility with the adjacent single-family homes being the item of most debate. In the end, the consensus of all vested parties was that a four-story building was most appropriate, and that was approved. There have been no changes to the residences on the west side of Chestnut. Thus, my question is twofold. Why has the Petitioner ignored the previous guidance to propose a five-story building that is not of a height that is harmonious and compatible with adjacent residences? Two, why has Staff ignored the previous guidance recommended for approval of a five-story building? It would be most appreciated if you could also play the video from Aaron Coon that shows the comparison of a four and five-story building as it will allow all those to see the context of the building in relation to the residences. Thank you, Keith Allen.

I got a fourth e-mail from Aaron Coon who had several e-mails from earlier today questioning the height of the proposed Highland Garage. Aaron says: In the response letter from the Petitioner with the parking level diagrams, Michael Firsell stated that the first level truly has 75 surface level stalls that do not form any part of a ramp and are not double counted. My question is, in a garage that's a 123 feet by 247 feet, how is it possible to fit 75 cars on a level parking surface and not have any cars within that count located on a ramp up to the second level? Where is the ramp from the first level to the second level located, and how does it provide vehicular access to a full second floor that is 123 feet by 247 feet with 91 parking stalls? The level one plan shows the ramp beginning in the west bay area at the north end of the deck; however, the level two plan shows the ramp going down to level one from the east bay at the north end of the deck. Please share this with the Plan Commission members. I've highlighted the west elevation to correlate with the sketch diagram from the Petitioner that I believe contains the incorrect assumptions of total parking counts.

That concludes all of the public commentary I received via e-mail. Now, I can open it up to residents with their hands raised. I see five individuals with their hands raised.

Let's start with Brian G. Brian, you should be allowed to talk.

QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE

MR. GARISH: Can you hear me?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes, Brian, what's your last name?

MR. GARISH: So, it's Brian Garish, and I live at 1 South Highland directly across the street from the development.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay.

MR. GARISH: So, first of all, I thank the Chairman and all the Commissioners. Mr. Firsel, I will go on record by saying I'm very supportive of the entire development. I think it all comes back to a couple of questions which I'm only going to just give commentary on the parking and the congestion.

I've heard many different studies, and I even heard Commissioner Warskow, if I'm pronouncing that correctly, ask about codes and is there updating of codes and things like that. One of the most recent developments that is going on in Arlington Heights which is very exciting and I think has put Arlington Heights Downtown on the map a little bit is the Al Fresco dining. I'm just wondering if that is being included in any of the studies since it's so recent. I do understand it's temporary and seasonal, but it does feel like this is going to be something, hopefully and I support that, becomes regular and ongoing. But it does add to the continued congestion that really comes to a head at Campbell and Highland and create the problems that I think a lot of the people are just nervous about, if the Commission is taking everything into account.

So, that's question number one, and I don't know, Mr. Chairman, if I should just list some of the questions I have which is about three of them and then leave it, or would you like to --

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Let's do that and we'll try to answer those.

MR. GARISH: Okay, so the second part of it is, you know, I actually support, and I live and would here that garbage truck come every morning or everyday, but I do think it does make more sense to have that on Highland than to pull into the newly created area for refuse. As much as I will be hearing it every single morning, it does make sense. But it does take several parking spaces away from what is probably the highest use, the most use commonly, parking spots for the retail area which is those perpendicular spaces underneath the existing Vail Street drive through on Highland Avenue. So, the question really becomes, again I go back to the codes of the existing parking lot on the Vail Street Garage, it does get extremely busy on weekends especially, and it does create a backup where, you know, I'm a permitted residential user on our floors which are two and three, and you commonly have people that illegally park in those spaces. So, I'm just curious, during these peak times, especially during the Al Fresco which again seems to be something that's going to be not just during the COVID, but it feels like it's going to be ongoing that adds to the congestion of Highland and Campbell in particular.

The last thing I have to say which I'm not sure if this is the right format or not, but it does seem like these parking garages are going to continue to be residential parking. I know the city has looked at this before, but it does seem like the future is more and more electric cars and the city has said we're not going to put electric in there. So, for residential users, maybe it's more of a recommendation to the current developer but I think you need to be forward thinking and put electrical charging stations in. Thank you to all of you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thank you, Brian.

Do we have any comment? Sam, can you provide any input as to the number of parking spots that are being taken up all day long in the Al Fresco because of the al fresco dining? Which is really a block away from this but that does impact the parking demands right downtown in the most important area.

MR. HUBBARD: Right. I mean, now is a very irregular time [due to CoVid] for parking in downtown so it's hard to find a true, you know, indication of what tomorrow's demand is going to be based on how parking is today. But most of the traffic when it leaves during peak times is expected to go southeast or come from the southeast. So, it doesn't necessarily come from the Campbell side where the Al Fresco is, so whether or not that continues into the future or not, shouldn't have the biggest impact on the traffic patterns from this development.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, can we go to our next, unless somebody has a comment on the two other two questions for Mr. Garish? Okay, can we go to the next audience member?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes. We have Keith Moens here.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Hi, Mr. Moens.

MR. MOENS: Hello, everyone. Thank you, Chairman Ennes. Yes, I just wanted to follow up a little bit on the Staff report on the affordable housing component of the project here. It looks as though the Petitioner has decided to go along with the new affordable housing ordinance and not some hybrid that we're talking about in the Housing Commission. So, I just wanted to verify that, if it's a strict, you know, compliance with our new ordinance.

If those 16 units, are they going to be proportionally between the Campbell and the Chestnut building? How are they going to be divided up in those two buildings? Do you know if the studios or one or two-bedrooms is a part of that affordable housing plan? That's basically my questions, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Mr. Firsell, do you want to answer that one?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes. Thanks for the question, hopefully to your satisfaction, Mr. Moens. We have agreed to comply with all aspects of the code which includes the allocation of the units, it includes the proportionate number of studios, one's and two's. It includes the proportionate locations. I can't say much more than we fully intend to and have committed to comply with the new Village Code in all respects. We have asked for no variations from that code.

Mr. MOENS: Right, I want to thank you for your effort on that. We really appreciate that, thank you.

MR. FIRSEL: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thank you, Mr. Moens.

MR. HUBBARD: Okay, next we have a Tom S.

MR. SAMADA: Hi, this is Tom Samada. I live in the Campbell building, 200 West Campbell. I'm just curious to hear the master plan, I know it's not the Village Code, but the master plan said eight-story buildings. Campbell is eight stories, and I think the Loft, the Metropolis Center is eight stories or seven, seven or eight. You approved nine, and now it seems like you guys are just approving 10 without really too much of a discussion on that. You were discussing the parking but not too much is going on about the extra stories on the Campbell building, and the Chestnut building you're also going higher right across the street

from houses and higher than the current townhomes that are going up over there. I don't see a lot of discussion there and it seems like having a building two stories higher than the neighboring ones is not harmonious, like the word that you guys like to use.

My other question is this refuse area in the parking garage. What garbage is going in there that they're walking and putting it 200 feet from the, or you know, 100 feet from the building into the parking garage to store there? And there's garbage inside the Campbell building, too, that's going to be picked up? I'm confused, what garbage is that? I understand it's storage for snow blowers and salt and all that kind of stuff, but garbage? Where is this garbage coming from?

MS. SMART: I can answer that.

MR. FIRSEL: Deb, please allow me --

MS. SMART: Yes, I got it.

MR. FIRSEL: Please allow me to answer.

MS. SMART: I got it.

MR. FIRSEL: Deb, Deb?

MS. SMART: So, the garbage comes from the common areas, the outside, and the garages themselves. If you go into any garage, whether it be public or private, there's garbage cans where you dispose your garbage. So, it's actually coming from the garage itself and the outside areas where we'll be collecting it.

MR. SAMADA: And you're going to have pick up everyday in five or six days?

MS. SMART: Yes.

MR. SAMADA: All right.

MS. SMART: We actually do recycling everyday in the Village of Arlington Heights six days a week. Just so you're aware.

MR. SAMADA: Seems like a lot of garbage.

MS. SMART: That's actually part of the recycling plan as provided by the Village.

MR. SAMADA: Okay, and do I have another one? No, I guess that's all I had, but I don't like the 10 stories.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thanks, Mr. Samada.
Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Okay, next we have Kari D.

MS. DWYER: Hi, good evening. My name is Kari Dwyer. We reside at 30 South Chestnut, so we are directly across the street from the Chestnut building that's being proposed. I have two questions.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Kari, could you spell your last name for me? I didn't quite hear that.

MS. DWYER: No problem. D-w-y-e-r, Dwyer.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Oh, sorry.

MS. DWYER: No, no problem.

So, two topics or two questions, first of which is parking but not related to the parking garage, so no worries there, but more so related to the street parking. So, on Chestnut, and Chestnut is one of the most narrow streets left in the city of Arlington Heights which is very problematic when we have traffic coming to and from on that street, especially if

there's any sort of delivery. I understand that they are being built and this development had agreed to create bump-outs in the street for parking. However, parking before the development that 16 rowhomes were being built, there was two-hour policed parking on our street. It was never policed, it was always a problem. Now, there is no parking on the street because there is construction taking place.

So, my question is what sort of restrictions are going to be in place for those new bump-outs that are being developed? Are those intended for residents? Are they intended for those visiting the downtown area? How is that going to be managed and how are we going to make sure that residents that live on Chestnut can easily get in and out of their driveways?

MR. FIRSEL: I can help there if you'd like.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Mr. Firsell, would you field that?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, sure.

First of all, thank you for your question; it's a very good one. We have had it before. These are not our parking spaces, these are public parking spaces. They're regulated completely by the Village. If the Village chooses to make them two-hour parking, that's certainly the Village's prerogative. If the Village chooses not to do anything, that's also their prerogative. The Village insisted on the bump-outs, so we complied with their request. So, all I can tell you is whatever the Village decides to do with those public parking places which we're constructing, the bump-outs, the landscaping, it's entirely up to the Village.

I do want to clarify they are not for the residents, we can't prohibit or make any member of the public, whether they live at Arlington 425 or not, park or not park there. But certainly, they are not reserved; they are not going to be signalized or anything else related to this project. So, purely public as far as we're concerned.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Sam, did you have any comment on that?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes.

So, they are being dedicated as part of the public right-of-way, so they will be public parking. So, the Village, you know, has the authority and jurisdiction to establish whatever regulations are most practical for that area. I don't know if they've been decided at this time. As we move forward through final engineering and final plat of subdivision, you know, we can have those conversations. But certainly, we'll have the jurisdiction to regulate what the most appropriate parking restrictions could be within that right-of-way.

It should improve the flow down the street because, you know, there's going to be a dig out for the parking to occur whereby resulting in larger lanes for travel down the street. Right now, the parking is just right on the side of the street, so hopefully this will improve things. I know there will be a loading zone likely in front of the Chestnut building, but these improvements will need to be implemented.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Are those cutouts from out of the Petitioner's property or they're just the regular street right-of-way?

MR. HUBBARD: They're required right-of-way, and the right-of-way is currently too short in that area. So, you know, they're dedicating some right-of-way.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, was there something, Jay, did you have a question there? No? Anybody else have a reply?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, Sam, was there anyone else in the

audience that wanted to --

MS. DWYER: I had two more things I hadn't gotten to, I apologize.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Oh, okay.

MS. DWYER: So, this goes back to traffic pattern. On Chestnut, there is a stop sign. There are no four-way stops between Chestnut and Campbell or Chestnut and Sigwalt. We have seen a significant amount of congestion now with Arlington Al Fresco although it is, you know, a wonderful addition to our downtown area. My question is people fly through that area and stop right before Highland when they realize that now there's a detour. So, is there any consideration from the Village to put four-way stop signs on Chestnut and Campbell and then also Chestnut and Sigwalt to help with that traffic pattern?

We are a short block, but we have over 10 kids that live on our block. So, it's concerning to think that there is not enough protected walkways for our kids to be able to cross over either one of those now very dense streets.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Sam, that sounds like a very important question, but is that something that should be taken to the Village for comment --

MS. DWYER: Yes, there's --

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: -- as opposed to this forum?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I mean, they will install some high visibility crosswalks at the Chestnut and Campbell intersection, but there is no warranted need for a stop sign. But certainly, if it is warranted, the Village can install it, you know, and we can examine that as part of final engineering as well. But yes, was there another comment you had, Ms. Dwyer?

MS. DWYER: Yes, so my final one is regarding the master plan and the addition of the fifth story on the Chestnut building. I know that we are looking at it in proximity to the overall development and now in proximity to the 16 rowhomes. But what we haven't taken into consideration is that on that master plan, all of our residential properties which are two stories are proposed to be three to four-story rowhomes. So, yes, by way of that master plan, are larger unit building made sense across the street from us. So, we were so pleased, the residents on Chestnut, when this Plan Commission came together and said we would not even consider something above four stories because it's not appropriate for the community and it's not appropriate for the density of this location. Now, to have all of that be reconsidered because it's more convenient for the developer, it's frustrating for the residents.

So, I just wonder is there any comments that the Commissioners can provide as to why you would be reconsidering adding a fifth story when there was so much conversation about why it wasn't appropriate the first time around?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I'm happy to provide my insight in that the developer has already said it's not financially feasible for them to remove the 13-story building and not have any additional units in order to provide revenue to offset the capital costs of building the development.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Sam, could you just add the, as far as what the code would allow on that side as far as height and stories?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I mean, up to 90 feet with bonuses of up to 140 feet. I mean, the largest tower was approved at 140 feet and I think in the context of the reduction in height, you know, Staff looked at the increase in height of the Chestnut and Campbell building in the overall context of the impact from the site with the removal of the tower. So, that was just our perspective.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Sam, wasn't the Comp Plan four to six-story? I'm trying to think, where was the four to six-story suggestion in the Comp Plan?

MR. HUBBARD: That's to the south of the site where the Sigwalt 16 building is.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, okay.

MR. FIRSEL: This was six to eight.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: This was six to eight.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Six to eight, yes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, so the four to six, I guess I don't remember saying that, you know, we would have maxed out with four on that when I know that was ultimate plan. But I don't know that I ever felt that it was, you know, infeasible or non-feasible to have something more than four. I think that's just where we ended up when they had a larger building at that spot. Now, that that's going away, as Commissioner Warskow said, in order to make the project feasible, one additional story here is sort of a tradeoff.

MR. FIRSEL: We made our own internal tradeoffs just for the sake of trying to not create a lot of controversy on this. It is, you'll note we had first thought, well, maybe we'll add two stories to the Chestnut building and leave the Highland building as it is. We felt that adding two levels, which would still be at the very minimum of what the Downtown Master Plan and well within the code allows, we felt to add on more level to the Highland building and only one level to this building would be a much more compatible and hopefully reasonable way to approach gaining back some of the units that we lost.

So, I hope, Ms. Dwyer, you understand that it is not our intention to try to negatively impact our neighbors, but we did, I said Highland, I meant Campbell building, it is not our intention to intentionally negatively impact your home. We respect you and hope that you will remain our neighbors, but we do have specific needs in order to make up these as Commissioner Warskow said, and we felt that this was the least impactful way on the residents at Chestnut to do it. Thank you.

MS. DWYER: I appreciate that context. So, just one last thing, and what wasn't mentioned, Sam, in the earlier comments that you made around the Design Commission was that the Design Commission did state that if anything were to change with the Chestnut building prior to being developed, that it would need to come back through Design in order for final approval. I think, you know, as a resident and knowing that this piece of a project is two to three years out, we would politely request that this Commission also give that same due diligence and request that if anything were to change outside of what is being proposed right now, that you would have another review of the project so that this way, you know, we can have these deeper dive of conversations because we'll know more about the density of the building that had been developed on Campbell. That's all, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, and there are specific guidelines that determine every project that comes before us if there's changes that are required. Thank you, Mrs. Dwyer.

I would like to throw out one other question. Sam, I'm not sure if the Village has done this, or Mr. Firsell, if the developer has done this. But this project is so important I think to this neighborhood, that piece of land has been sitting vacant for way too long, and this development is going to, I believe, have such a huge impact and benefit to the Village, all of our community, schools, from the property taxes it will provide, from the sales taxes that it

will provide, from the spending that's going to come from the residents that live there that are going to benefit all the downtown businesses. Has the Village or the developer done any type of an economic benefits plan that would indicate what kind of revenue, what kind of benefit this development is going to bring to town?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes. When we did the initial presentation in 2019, we had a full study done. I had not done an updated one for this project, but at the time it was several hundred thousand dollars of real estate taxes for the schools. It was about a \$1million a year at least in additional spending by the people who live there. The financial impact of this was enormous.

So, the good news is that we are reducing the density from 361 units to 319. So, you do the math, 361 to 319 is 43 units. That proportion will not have a very significant impact on what's before you now. So, the current property taxes is right, the estimated real estate taxes will probably be about, oh, 80 percent of that number. The impact fees will be less.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Of what number?

MR. FIRSEL: Of the \$1.5 million to \$1.588 million. Now, that is the Village's number, that's not our number. Our number on the real estate taxes were closer to \$2 million, not a \$1.5 million to a \$1.588 million. That's probably what they'll be now, at least in our estimate.

The impact fees of course will be less, and the residential spending of \$5 million within three miles, so that goes down to maybe \$4 million. I mean, it's a very significant impact all the way around.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, Sam, did you bring this up?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, that was from the last time of approval, so the numbers are going to be a little bit different. Of course this time, they're going to reduce scope that you had mentioned, Chairman Ennes, and so I brought that up from the last time that --

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: It should, yes, and thank you because it's such a huge, it will be such a huge impact and benefit to our town. Of course we don't want a few neighbors along that street to suffer from that, but I think this developer has done a tremendous job in coming up and meeting so many of the requests of the Village.

But anyways, if there's no other questions --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Terry? Terry, it's George.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes?

COMMISSIONER DROST: One question.

Is there the possibility, you know, with Mount Prospect development so many apartment units, is there some fear of cannibalization of the project in Arlington Heights, you know, as far as rentals? I know you guys have done your studies, you've done homework, but just to get kind of a pulse and then also looking forward, you know, as there's changes. I like the comment of Mr. Garish about the chargers. We're doing that in our building across the street. We've started putting in chargers in our building, and again, this is sort of getting ahead of the curve is basically what is sort of the direction of my question.

MS. SMART: I can take that actually.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay, good.

MS. SMART: Yes. I'm actually working with your building, George.

COMMISSIONER DROST: You are? Good for you.

MS. SMART: We're doing it together. Yes, I'm actually working on that project for the Campbell building also. So, yes, we have planned on putting in the option of charging stations, and that is actively something that this developer has been very aggressive about discussing. So, charging stations are definitely on the agenda for the Campbell building garage.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Right, but that's not subject to our approval. That's part of your development.

MS. SMART: Correct, exactly.

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, but it's sort of the evolution of the project.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Right, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER DROST: You know, are you going to get the Zipcars and, you know --

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

MS. SMART: Yes.

MR. FIRSEL: Thank you for bringing that up, Commissioner. We have also discussed in great detail putting in a Zipcar concession in the garage so that people don't have to have their own cars. Being a transit-oriented development, as Luay Aboona brought up, people don't need as many cars. So, if we can have Zipcars for people who rarely drive, in their own building, it would be a huge benefit to them and to us. So, we are also strongly considering that as well.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Sam, was there anybody else in the audience?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I see three more individuals. Let me bring in Lisa Doty.

Hi, Lisa, did you have a comment? Lisa, are you there? Can you hear us? We cannot hear you or see you. I'm going to try you back on mute and then we can try and bring you in at the end, hold on.

All right, we have a John. Do you have a comment, John?

MR. PACKUM: Yes, this is John Packum at 39 South Mitchell Avenue, which is just one block west of the development. I think one of the things I wanted to comment on was the electric cars, and I know you guys just ended on that. Great discussion, but I mean, it's not part of the plan. You know, you say you're considering it but, you know, I don't think that should be something that should be, you know, part of the influence of whether this is voted yes or no.

But my point is that the first residents mentioned this, and I thought it was a really good one because that's a way to bring in a more diverse age group to Arlington Heights, and I wanted to kind of link this to the parking ratio as well which is currently 1.12 per code but we were talking about 1.3. I think Commissioner Warskow, you brought up, you know, why aren't we changing this to 1.3 to make it part of code, which I agree with. You know, this is something that we've been talking about for at least five years, you know, definitely going back to at least the CA Ventures development which I think we are all familiar with.

My point is though with, you know, increasing that ratio, you know, I think it has a lot to do with, you know, the current trends of people moving out of the city and into the suburbs. We are not the city though. Yes, we do have a Metra Line that goes into the city, but we do not provide all of the amenities of the city. So, while you might not need a car within the, you know, well, a couple might not need two cars within a city, they're more likely to have,

you know, need two cars in a suburb like this. So, I just wanted to kind of reiterate that comment as it would, you know, provide a better diversity in Arlington Heights with our population.

The other comment I wanted to make, and this is a question, is regarding the Design Commission which was last night. You know, their guidelines I think talk about harmony and compatibility to the neighborhood, especially the transitions. We were not, with respect to the height of the buildings, and we were deferred to the Plan Commission to have that discussion about harmony and compatibility with respect to the neighborhoods. I think Keith Allen brought it up in the letter, that was one of the first public comments, and I didn't really get a good feel for what the feedback was from the Plan Commission on what that harmony and compatibility is, specifically with the Chestnut building and the increased stories going from four to five.

So, I'll leave it to you guys, and then I'll follow with one last comment after that.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, and that last comment?

MR. PACKUM: About harmony and compatibility of the increased story of the Chestnut building from four to five and how it affects the neighborhood, especially on that side which is single-family homes. I guess maybe I'll kind of elaborate. I was actually part of the earlier meeting, at the Conceptual meeting, and many of you were on that as well. You guys went through lengths to talk about harmony and compatibility of a development behind Northwest Metalcraft which is, you know, kind of just scaled down to that neighborhood and was really, you know, people were really against it including the Commissioners.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, well, that's not this hearing. But I can appreciate your concern, but I think the sense that I've gotten from the Commissioners, I'll let them speak for themselves, but I think it's pretty well summed up by the comment of the Petitioner that this change has reduced the overall mass of the property. The additional height on Campbell with the sunlight that comes down with the lower floors, there's very little impact there. The traffic and the density is going to be much lower. So, while there is a slight increase on Campbell, the overall change in the proposal is much less intense.

MR. PACKUM: I guess I'm just more concerned about the Chestnut side. So, I understand the mass on the Highland side, I mean, that's a huge reduction, I get that, but also on a side that's next to a parking garage, it's next to Metropolis. You also have the Campbell building which is going from nine to 10, that's right across from 200 West Campbell which I lived in 10 years ago. You know, that's also I think a nine-story building; I can't remember how tall it is. I know it has 91 units because I was on the board there.

But it's more about the Chestnut building going, you know, from four to five which is right across the street from 1.5-story bungalows, you know, one to two-story houses. It's about the aesthetics.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, thank you, Mr. Packum.

Do we have any comments or feedback from the other Commissioners or Petitioner?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Terry, if I could just make a comment? We get this a lot. Wherever you buy a house and you look across and you see the downtown developing with eight, nine, 10-story, we were going to go with a 14-story building, in other words, you can't, without that line going down the middle of the street, how do you have a downtown connected to a residential area? So, it's not like the downtown has just developed

overnight. It's been there for decades. So, somewhere you have to make the change from residential to the downtown area.

So, it's just, I don't know how to answer that. We have codes that allow us to go up to eight stories. So, I think that a four or five-story building there is well within the limits of what the developer could do and what he is doing. So, just a comment.

MR. PACKUM: I appreciate that. It's just, you know, it's something that as residents, you know, in the area that we've been talking about and going back and forth about it, and you know, when it gets closer to approval, a change is made. It's a bit frustrating.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Well, I think if I lived across the street from there, I would be happier that the 14-story building was not being built. That would be the first thing. That giant tower back there is one heck of a reduction just for the houses on that street to look at. So, it's an overall improvement, it's a tremendous improvement from a visual standpoint, from your standpoint and those houses across the street.

MR. PACKUM: Why didn't we approve that one in the first place then?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'm sorry, what was that?

MR. PACKUM: Why didn't we approve that one in the first place? I don't want to belabor the point. I mean, I'm not going to --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, it very well could have been five stories the first time around. They had enough units and they thought it was feasible.

MR. PACKUM: I'm talking about the tower. You're pitching it as like this huge benefit, but that was something that was approved. So, but okay.

Yes, my follow-up comment is a little bit of a constructive criticism. You know, as residents, we are here to, you know, listen to you, learn about this, and also provide input. You know, I've been up since 4:00 in the morning. I drove to the Eastern Time Zone to go see my mom. I listened to the first Conceptual meeting. I'm now listening to this meeting all the way to the very end and, you know, I'm looking at all the screens here. I just really question whether we should even have a vote because I'm concerned that some of you haven't even listened to our comments. So, I will just leave it at that.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Well, I disagree with that.

MR. PACKUM: Fine, I'll put pictures on Facebook.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, if I could make a comment?

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes, Commissioner Jensen?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: We have strayed quite a ways away from the rules.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes. Correct.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: The rules were that the people who have a public comment can make a comment, and we shouldn't engage in a back and forth. You know, it's getting kind of late. We're hearing the same thing over and over again.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Right, exactly.

MR. PACKUM: You should pay attention to the residents. That's what I'm asking.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, well, we do. Sam, are there any other people in the audience that wanted to discuss this?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, thank you for your comments.

MR. PACKUM: We're just not going to be happy tonight.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: We do, we do.

MR. HUBBARD: We thank you for your comments.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Whether you think we do or not, we do listen to these.

MR. HUBBARD: Okay, I'm going to bring in John. Are you ready to talk, John? Do you have a comment?

MR. PACKUM: I'm pretty sure you don't want to hear from me anymore. So, I'll lower my hand. I am sorry that I got a bit emotional.

MR. HUBBARD: It's okay. We thank you for your comments, John. We thank you for your comments.

All right, Nick, you have the floor.

MR. SARANTAKIS: Thank you.

Good evening. My name is Nick Sarantakis. I live at 1 South Highland Avenue, and I also wanted to ask about the parking garage on Highland Avenue.

Highland Avenue as it is, it's a narrow, high-traffic area with several things that are or will be on it, such as the public parking, the loading dock for Metropolis Place, the Vail Avenue Garage directly across the street, the Sigwalt 16 Townhome entrance, and of course the courtyard for this development. At peak times, summer weeknights, Friday and Saturday nights, the traffic in and out of the Vail Avenue Garage is very heavy. My neighbors and I call it chaotic.

My question is has the developer studied and considered how their garage will affect the other traffic on Highland at peak times with regard to pedestrian and driver safety as well as added noise.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, we have. Let me point out one of the points we made earlier. Is it okay if I address this, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes, please, Mr. Firsell.

MR. FIRSEL: Thank you. One of the most emphatic points I raised earlier which has a direct bearing and impact is the reduction in the total amount of retail and restaurant and office use in this project from 36,000 feet to 7,500 feet. Keep in mind that the residents have their own private entrance into the garage on the south portion of Highland that the public will not be able to access. In addition, the most direct way to get into the project off of Campbell will be through the porte cochere and again directly into the garage.

So, by having these two access points away from all the traffic out of Highland, it seems very unlikely that the entrance off the north portion of Highland into the courtyard area will be used to come in, especially if you want to go, if you're a resident which all but 7,500 feet of the users will be, by entering into your own private residential entrance. I think that with the elimination of all this Saturday night, Friday night usage of commercial, retail, restaurant development that will no longer be here, it is a tremendous improvement and stronger likelihood you will not have any traffic from this development interfering with those who want to enjoy all of the tremendous commercial benefits of the downtown on a weekend evening.

MR. SARANTAKIS: Thank you, and what street do you anticipate the majority of traffic coming from?

MR. FIRSEL: To enter into the development?

MR. SARANTAKIS: Yes, on Campbell or Highland?

MR. FIRSEL: I think most of the, if I'm coming from the south, I would turn down Sigwalt, go turn onto Highland, going north on Highland, go right into my private entrance. I would never come down to Campbell to use that access. However, you know, I'm just the lawyer here. We have one of the most experienced traffic consultants in the country, Mr. Aboona, and I think you deserve a professional response. So, Luay, would you care to address that? If I'm wrong, certainly feel free to correct me.

MR. ABOONA: No, Mike, this is Luay Aboona, you are actually correct. We do anticipate quite a bit of traffic coming down Sigwalt. Like you said, they'll be using Highland and then immediately turning at that private entrance off Highland and into the garage. Any traffic coming off Campbell, you know, could easily enter off the porte cochere and doesn't have to necessarily travel on Highland. But yes, the majority would be off Sigwalt.

MR. SARANTAKIS: Okay, I appreciate it. Thank you all for your time.

MR. FIRSEL: You're welcome. Thanks for the question.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thank you.

MR. HUBBARD: Okay, now we have Brad Doty.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Brad, could you spell your last name please?

MR. HUBBARD: Brad, do you have a comment? Are you able to unmute yourself?

MR. DOTY: Hello? Hello?

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes, Brad?

MR. DOTY: You go now, Lisa.

MRS. DOTY: Okay, hi. So, my name is Lisa Doty.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: I'm sorry, could you state your name and spell it?

MRS. DOTY: My name is Lisa Doty, D-o-t-y.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, Lisa. We can't hear you.

MR. DOTY: Lisa, you went on mute again.

MRS. DOTY: I don't --

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: We can't hear you.

MRS. DOTY: Can't you hear me?

MR. DOTY: Can you hear me? Hello?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: We can hear you, Brad.

MR. DOTY: You can hear me.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: We can hear Lisa, too. She's just --

MR. DOTY: So, now my phone is working, hers has stopped. I think it's her voice on mute.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: She's not on mute; she's just very distant. She needs to speak closer to the microphone.

MRS. DOTY: Okay, I'm sorry. Can you hear me now?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MRS. DOTY: Okay, I'm very sorry for all the technical difficulties.

So, anyway, I'm a long-term resident of this area is basically what I'm saying. I have looked at that empty lot for all of the time that I have lived here. That lot is a disgrace. It's an eyesore to the Village. With the Arlington Al Fresco, it's embarrassing for people to come from Campbell Street and come down and then be like, whoa, where is Arlington

Al Fresco? All I see is a vacant lot.

So, what I'm saying is I think that this development moves forward. I think that all the discussion over where the refuse goes and who picks up what and all these things, I think that everything has moved beyond this kind of discussion. I think the developer knows what they're doing. The developer, in my mind, I followed this project the entire time with the project proposal to everything. I've been at almost every meeting. I've contributed my voice to everything. This developer has done every single thing that the Village has wanted them to do.

They have gone above and beyond to make everyone happy and to take input, to do what is supposed to be done. To be quibbling with them now over where they're going to place their refuse, and the parking, having them take on \$3 million in additional parking when our code doesn't require that, that's the Village's problem for not having the code correct. It's not the developer's, it shouldn't be the onus on the developer to make up for the Village's shortcoming on that.

You know, the project, it needs to go forward. We looked at that economic impact. Look at how much money that project is going to be bringing into our Village. So, are we going to like just keep handicapping the developer and not let them move forward? I'd love to see them break ground on June 1st. I'm really just saying to the Commissioners, I think you should vote to make sure that, you know, this can go forward. Let's not worry about that additional parking that Staff wants. Let's not worry about the refuse problem at this point, and let's move this project forward so it can go to the Board and can be approved. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thank you for your comments, Lisa.

Sam, anyone else?

MR. FIRSEL: Thank you, Lisa.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, that's it. There was another individual with the name Lisa, so I'm going to assume that was you, Lisa?

MRS. DOTY: Probably me. Yes, that was me.

MR. HUBBARD: All right, thank you for your comments.

MRS. DOTY: Thanks.

MR. HUBBARD: All right, that's it for public comments. No more hands raised. So, if the Commission so chooses, we can close the public comment portion of the hearing.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Before we conclude the public portion, I just want to make one comment back to one of the speakers, John, and I think his last name was Packum. We do care about your questions. That's why we have this portion of the meeting. We do listen to it. We spend countless hours going over all these proposals and documents.

We all live in town. We care about this town which is why we donate our time to be able to sit here and try to make this a better committee. So, I don't want you to think we don't listen and that we don't care about your comments. We do. They help us in so many ways, but thank you for that.

I do want to close the public portion at this time. We're going to go, at this time there will be no other questions taken from the public. but we're going to go to the deliberation from the Commissioners. So, I'm going to open the floor to any Commissioner that wants to raise his hand. Did I see Lynn's hand fly up? Commissioner Jensen, come on.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I think we have said everything about each issue that could possibly be said.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: I agree with you, but Sue's got something to add.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Sorry, Lynn, I haven't had a chance to speak yet because I was so busy listening. Anyway, I just wanted to go back to the parking ratio comment that I think, Mr. Firsel, you brought up.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: On the, maybe, I was taking notes which may, because we're not in-person, it may appear to people in the audience that we're not paying attention but, you know, I've got two screens, I'm looking back over old comments and notes, and I'm taking notes, so my head is not always looking at the screen. But my notes said parking ratio, something about 0.9 versus 1.3 that the Staff is requiring versus what you see in an urban setting, correct?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes. Luay's report indicated that transit-oriented developments on average use between 0.9 and 1.1 or 1.2 spaces, and Luay is certainly welcome to correct me. So, less than one space per unit in a transit-oriented development. In fact, the general rule in the same report is about 15 percent less parking is used in a transit-oriented development than not transit-oriented development. I don't believe there can be any argument that this is not a transit-oriented development.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, I brought that up because, you know, this lot, there's the auto project that's next to this project. We went through multiple versions of that project which is not before the Commission now I understand, and that argument was raised and I supported it at the time. I'm just asking for Staff comment on, we've gone round and round and round about this concept of a building in an urban environment close to the train not needing as much parking, why are we still pushing for this higher parking count? Is it just because we haven't updated our code or is there another reason, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, we feel it's necessary to capture the expected demand from development. Our code doesn't require as much parking as we think is actually needed. What the Petitioner's parking study also, you know, agrees with us on is the required parking is going to be more than code.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, but not to the degree that Staff is requesting is what I'm hearing.

MR. FIRSEL: That's the argument.

MR. HUBBARD: Right, they don't agree that we think parking is what we think it is. We disagree on that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, when it comes down to it, are we assigning per unit of parking spaces, is that what we're talking about, right?

MR. HUBBARD: Right, we think demand is 1.3 spaces per unit.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, and I know that this concept has, I brought this up, and I agree with Mr. Firsel and I agree with the Petitioner, but I know that the Village and I know that it's gone to the Board and they have not agreed with this concept, but I just wanted to reiterate that if people are going to move in knowing they're only going to get one parking spot, you're attracting a type of person who doesn't feel the need to have two parking spots, doesn't feel the need to have two cars. You're attracting a more urban resident in this building.

So, I would agree that we do not need as much parking in these spots that we need to encourage and promote in the downtown area, that urban environment for individuals who will be using the Zipcars, who will be using bikes, which means that we need more bike racks. Commissioner Jensen, I'm just teasing you.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I have never complained about bike racks. It's a matter of who pays for them. It's who pays for them.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'm just teasing. I'm just teasing you because you and I always have a back and forth on it. Anyway, so I just wanted to raise that as an issue. It is a very important issue to our community, the parking. The downtown parking is very difficult in itself, and so I don't take that lightly. I don't agree with the comment previously stated that we've spent too much time thinking about where the refuse is being thrown out. Believe me, if it's thrown out the wrong place, we would hear about it, right? So, same as the parking.

But my feeling, I agree with the Petitioner on the situation that we do not need the higher level of parking. So, that was it.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thank you, Ms. Dawson.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I echo what Commissioner Dawson says.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Ms. Warskow?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I'd like to just add that maybe the Village should consider, since they do have some spaces open, and whether, you know, it's on the fourth floor or the fifth floor, how about adding a couple of our own Zipcars so that we can provide that kind of service and not everybody has to own a car and pay insurance and pay gas? That if they want to go to just every once in a while someplace a little farther out, that we do have that Zipcar option for them.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, I don't think that's in the plan, but a good idea. I think that would be a good private enterprise.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Mike, remind us what the ratio is that you are proposing. You're not proposing just the 1.12, right? You're above that or not?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, we are above that.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: What are you?

MR. FIRSEL: We are proposing, first of all, we're proposing in Phase 1 we will still build 90 more spaces than code requires. There is no argument or debate on that, okay. We are proposing a 1.14 at a minimum for the Phase 2 because if we build four levels, and we could be 44 spots under Chestnut, that's what it will be. If we build a fifth level and don't put spots under Chestnut, we'll be around 1.2.

So, we haven't decided which to do because if you do condos, there's a stronger likelihood that someone who's plopping down \$500,000-\$600,000 on a condo would want an underground heated parking place for which they're willing to pay. Doing all apartments, we already know what we would do and that is we'll build a fifth level deck. A five-level deck will have 535 parking spaces for 319 units.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Which will put you at one point what? If you went more with apartments?

MR. FIRSEL: You know what, I can give you that answer momentarily. So, we're going to have 535, this is without the --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Is it 535 or 435?

MR. FIRSEL: Oh, 435, 435, I'm sorry. Yes, we're not doing 535, sorry, Sam. That will be 1.36. So, we'll be over. The only scenario that we're not over and close to what they want is if we build, first of all, if we provide 56 commercial spaces where code requires 19, to be honest with you that's what's skewing all of this, okay, and that's the problem here. If you were to put no commercial on this site like many of your downtown commercial businesses have, they don't account for their parking. They park on the street, their customers' parking garages, if we were treated like everybody else, we'd be providing 1.36. If we build the five-level deck and if you divide the 389 by 340, it's 1.145.

It is cheaper, by the way, to build a 90-parking space fifth level than it is, it's not cheaper, it's almost the same price within a few hundred thousand dollars, to build 90 spots on a deck than 44 spots underneath the Chestnut building.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Oh, I agree with that. For sure.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes.

MR. FIRSEL: And that's what our tendency is to do right now, but we want the flexibility to do either one. Keep in mind that we would be providing 389 where 344 are required, so it's 45 additional spots. Whose problem is that for? Our residents. Ours. It's our problem because we'll have to say we won't rent to people with two cars, we'll put in Zipcars. But I think the part that we probably are having the most difficult time with is the requirement that we not only park all of our commercial, but we park three times the amount of commercial than the code requires.

If the code needs changing, okay. But as an attorney, the first thing I do when I get a zoning case is I read the code. As anybody would. We have a right to go by what's in your code, and a right to rely on it. That's what we were, someone said we're going way, above and beyond. Trust me when I tell you, that's exactly what we're trying to do to get this project to move forward.

I appreciate all the comments, but if I sound a tiny bit frustrated tonight, you now understand why.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Well, and you can understand as a Village, one of the difficult things that we face, and that you as a developer faces, is that the economic life on a building like this is 40 to 60 years. When somebody does an appraisal, that's what they'll put on this, 40 to 60 years. We're at a spot in time, and we're saying we think the parking is 1.1, 1.3; 30 years from now all these cars might be gone, what are we going to do with all these parking garages? It's a hard thing to sit here at this point in time and know what the long-term need is.

But it sure looks like now that we're in a situation where we might be a little bit low. But if you fill the fifth floor of the garage in the future with 1A and 2, that Sam, at that point, we might be in pretty good shape, right? We'll still be short.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I mean, the developer and Staff see eye to eye on Phase 1. I don't think there's a disagreement there. You know, they want the 345 stalls in Phase 1 and we think that's fine. It's just, and we don't want stalls to be built and not used, but we just want the authority to, if and when they're ready to build the Chestnut building, to prove up that, hey, maybe we were wrong, maybe we thought 1.3 parking spaces per unit was reasonable, but they can show data that shows all they needed was 1.1 or 1.15. We don't want those parking spaces to sit, you know, any different.

So, we just want the authority to, when they're ready to move forward with that Chestnut building, show that their actual demand was less than the 1.3 per unit. If they

can, then here's an administrative process for you, you know, provide that information to Staff, allow review, and we'll bring it to the Village Board and see what they think. At that point, you know, they can construct less. They're still going to be above code requirements but, you know, it's just giving the Village that extra assurance that there couldn't be a parking problem, because if this is as successful as people think and maybe it doesn't move as quickly as people think, at least we have the ability to reevaluate that in the future.

MR. FIRSEL: So, let me distill this for you, if I may, Mr. Chairman. Here is where the difference is. Aside from the Highland drive issue access point which we've beaten to death, and the Commission will do what the Commission is going to do, Phase 1 we agree on. I believe Phase 1A where we would propose 435 spots and the Village says we need 450, the Village would be flexible enough to allow us to do Phase 1A without coming back.

The issue is our Phase 2. We propose 389 spots, 345 in a four-level deck and 44 underneath Chestnut. That's 389 spots. Code requires 340, or 345, I'm sorry. So, we're 44 spots over which is 1.14. That's where Staff --

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: At code?

MR. FIRSEL: It's over code by 14 percent or 44 spots. We believe that's more than enough, and that includes the 19 spots, okay. So, we just simply don't believe that we should be handcuffed if we provide those spots.

So, the only issue that I'm aware of, unless Sam can correct me where we have that difference, is if we build Phase 1 and Phase 2 and not Phase 1 and Phase 1A. Is that accurate, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, no, I mean, I think even at Phase 1A construction, you're still having a possible deficit. So, we would still want that authority to, if you move forward with that and then you want to build the Chestnut building, you know, we'll want to make sure that your parking still meets demand. Even at 1.3, they're still projecting that there'd possibly be a short.

MR. FIRSEL: Okay, and that's why we wouldn't build this project under those circumstances, I'm telling you straight out. It's absurd.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: It seems to me that the burden falls on the developer and not the Village. If they haven't provided enough parking and people become frustrated and they talk to other residents and the residents say love this place, but the big problem is there's not enough parking, it's going to correct itself.

Terry, you made a key point. If you look at the long-term trend, the socio-demographics and other things don't suggest we're going to need ever-increasing amounts of parking. It suggests we're probably going to be going the other direction, given family size and given the modes of transportation and so forth. I think we're being overly nitpicky with the developer.

I agree with what Sue said and what Mary Jo said. I think they have taken this all into consideration. I think they've bent over backwards, and I think we ought to give them the latitude to proceed as they have proposed. I'd hate to see this project fail on such a silly idea.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Well, I hate to say that go ahead and start building but then, you know, at some point in time we're going to require you to put out another \$2 million some and that's not accounted for in the revenue that they can generate. They've done their numbers now. They know what they can and can't do and what they're presenting to

us, and that's what our code supports.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But I have a problem with, they're following or going above and beyond our code, so we want people to meet code, it's always for them best to exceed code, but where are we pulling the support? I get that we're showing in data, but it hasn't gone to the code. If we felt that there is a problem with the way our code is calculating parking, then we as a Village have an obligation to amend the code, not to just make a number and put the burden on the developer who based the project off of the code as presented.

MR. FIRSEL: You just said it better.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: If the developer has miscalculated, it would adjust itself because people will not become renters or they won't buy the condos or whatever. If parking becomes a big issue, it will be the developer's problem more than the Village's.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: But I would just like to throw out there that the developer is leaving the big 'if' here. If they build this 1A and if they build this and this, and if, if, if. So, it's not definite what they want to do. They're leaving it open-ended.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Everything they want to do is above code.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: What do you mean, Bruce? They're doing Phase 1 and then what's open-ended is whether or not they do Phase 1A and/or Phase 2. So, what are you --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Right, so it's how they are going to do it. So, you know --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Well, they have a proposal in both situations. That is, make sure I'm correct, in both situations, whether or not they do Phase 1A, this is driving me crazy because you can't have an A without a B, but okay, so from Phase 1A to Phase 2. But in both situations, we are above code in the number of parking that is built into it -- no, that's not correct?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, no, I think you are correct on that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: And I think that we're never going to move forward, and the question is do we go with what code says or do we not? That's the question. So, I think the consensus seems to be, I'm just guessing and we could take a roll on this, that if you make code it should be good. I think that's what I'm hearing from --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, and --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Let's not go crazy because they've agreed to provide above code and I like that. Let's not take that away but let's not push for more than what has already been presented.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: If we had any idea that the trends were going to go in the other direction and we were going to need a greatly increased parking down the road five years from now for whatever, you know, then you might then say, you know, Staff made a good point and we really ought to have exacted more than code, but they're going over code. I think we've got to, you know, we've got to give them a chance to develop this thing as they've done the numbers. I agree with Mary Jo, they've been very diligent in everything they've done. I would certainly hate to see this project fail because of this issue around parking.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I agree with that, and I don't know, what does everybody else think? Maybe we need to --

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: John, we haven't heard from you.

COMMISSIONER DROST: We're getting close to the three-hour period, that's what I'm thinking.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We're at the three-hour period.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, because I think maybe, I think there's a consensus here.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Right, yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I see the direction and I didn't pipe in because I'm basically agreeing with most of the comments of the Commissioners and some of our fine residents in the Village of Arlington Heights.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Well, is there a motion out there?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Well, I think we're going to leave the entrance on Highland, the garbage thing, is that --

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: A non-issue? Is that what you're saying?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes. I mean, is that --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Three people. Just as a point of order, do we need to do a motion to extend the meeting after three hours? Is that the rule?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: This is Jay, I move to extend.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Jay moved to extend. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'll second that, Jay. I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Sue Dawson had seconded that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Extend for one hour? How long are we extending? One hour?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Extend for 30 minutes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Thirty minutes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thirty minutes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Mr. Chairman, would you like to have a motion on this particular project?

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: I would like to have a motion, but we have to address the motion to extend the meeting which we have a first and a second for. We'll ask Sam to do a roll call.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes.

So, we have another 30 minutes.

So, Commissioner Jensen?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Can I just point out that Sam has --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I'd like to ask Staff a question.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: -- tonight by doing things out of order all the time? But way to go, Sam, you're keeping us awake.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sam, a question. If we don't want to go with Staff's recommendations on those two items, do we just drop the last sentence in your proposed language for the motion?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, in condition number 12, that's pretty much all wrapped up in one. I mean, let's see, let me bring it up. Hold on.

MR. FIRSEL: I think it's item 11 that we would strike.

MR. HUBBARD: Right.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes, the proposed storage/refuse area along the eastern side.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Right, that would be gone.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Does that handle the parking issue, too?

MR. FIRSEL: No.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: If we want to make a motion that basically allows things to stand in the way that the developer is proposing, what change do we need to make to your motion, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, what's your consensus? Is your consensus that --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, let's say you find out, you have a proposal and somebody seconds it and then you take a vote. If you don't have it, then you do it again.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Well, I think if you're proposing that we remove this obligation, and I think Mr. Firsell would be able to more specifically point us to what you're looking for, but this obligation that they could only go to Phase 2 if they meet certain criteria on the parking, that is Section 12C.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I don't know if we need that for 12B though, for the Phase 1A. I'm getting a little, is that, do we need that for, for Phase A, that's okay, right, that language? It's just --

MR. HUBBARD: So, I guess, I mean, I will clarify with Mr. Firsell. You're proposing 345 spaces in Phase 1, and then you're proposing Phase 1A which is construction of a fifth level to the Highland Garage for a total of 435 spaces?

MR. FIRSEL: That is correct.

MR. HUBBARD: You want the ability, once you build that Phase 1A addition to the garage, you want to have the ability to go Phase 2 at 85 units without having to come back before the Plan Commission?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, because your own number, Sam, says 450 is what would be needed. We're providing 435. So, the answer is yes. It is the Phase 2 that we need to

correct. Phase 1A is that if we build 435 spots for the 319 units and the proposed restaurant and retail, we would not have to come back.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, really it's under 12C, Phase 2, where it says this phase shall only proceed if the following has been met. That would say instead this phase shall only proceed if Phase 1A has been completed?

MR. FIRSEL: No, Phase 2 would be if Phase 1A is not implemented.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay.

MR. FIRSEL: And we only implement Phase 2, that 345 spaces in the parking garage and 44 spaces under Chestnut will be satisfactory.

MR. HUBBARD: Okay, now you're saying something different. Now, you want the 389 spaces to be suitable for the entire --

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: 389?

MR. FIRSEL: My proposal, Sam, our proposal, Sam, is presented to which the Staff did not agree before we even introduced this Phase 1A, is that Phase 2 would have 345 spots in the garage and 44 spots under Chestnut. That was in our very first submittal to Staff for this project, of 389 spots for 319 units and the square footage of the parking of the restaurants and retail in the Campbell building. That's what we would like to see.

MR. HUBBARD: Well, you propose a different alternative to your alternative.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, so the Phase 1 is 345 parking stalls.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Where does this 44 stalls that are going underneath come into play?

MR. FIRSEL: Okay, in our original submission, we submitted a proposed plan for the entire project of 319 units, 234 in the Campbell building, 89 in the Chestnut building. We would build a four-level parking deck containing 345 spaces and 44 parking spaces underneath the Chestnut building, for a total of 389 parking spaces for 319 units, to which the Staff has continued to object. That is what we had originally proposed. We've never varied from that proposal.

Phase 1A is an option that, quite candidly, we may very well adopt unless the trend leaves us that we must build condos. We don't know what the future brings. So, we want to either build, let's call Phase 2 the Phase 1B. 1A is you build the fifth level deck to accommodate 319 units. The other option is we build 389 spaces to accommodate the same number of units except 44 of the spots would be under the Chestnut building with 345 on the four-level parking deck and would not build the fifth level. That's the proposal.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, really to proceed to Phase 2, you either have to do Phase 1A which is the fifth level, or you have to include 44 underground spots under Chestnut when you're proceeding, that's what you're saying?

MR. FIRSEL: That is exactly what we have proposed, yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, can you tell me where our ratios are at? Right, so at the 345 spaces, we're at 1.3?

MR. FIRSEL: No, no.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, that's what I need to know.

MR. FIRSEL: Okay, for which, for the whole project?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, Phase 1, we're getting 345 spaces of which 56 are commercial. So, we've got 289 spaces for the 234 units, correct?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, except I look at it, we have looked at it, we compare what we're providing to what code requires, okay.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I understand that, but I'm just asking based on what you've presented, what's my ratio at that point?

MR. FIRSEL: The whole ratio is we're building, it's 1.36.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay.

MR. FIRSEL: And Staff and we have concurred that, maybe we get to the conclusion a little differently, but we have concurred that that is adequate for Phase 1, a four-level deck, period, end of story.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: If we add in 85 units on top of that, but also increased the residential parking by 44, where does that leave us in our ratio?

MR. FIRSEL: 1.14.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, I'm comfortable with that.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: And that's if they're apartments.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Well, that's saying they can't go to Phase 2 unless they either put a fifth floor up or they include 44 parking spaces in Campbell. Right?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: The 44 parking spaces underground is more likely for condos. The fifth floor of the parking deck is more likely if Chestnut is apartments.

MR. FIRSEL: That is absolutely right; we're all on the same page now.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'm comfortable with that.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, Mr. Firsell, what are the changes that maybe we make to this motion that takes care of where you want to place the refuse pickup and the parking? What do we need to do this to get to the point where, because I believe you probably have the general agreement of the Plan Commission. What modifications do we need to make in the motion?

MR. FIRSEL: Okay, I think that although it says 56, let's go through 12.a(i), 56 to be dedicated and reserved for commercial uses, okay. Now, we're okay with that, but if we find we need more, what I'd like to see that say is we'll be initially reserved and dedicated, the 289 will be initially reserved and dedicated to residential subject to variance based on usage. We'll come back and if we need to vary that and add a few more commercial and less residential or a few more residential and less commercial, we'll come back and talk about it. We're okay with a(i), a(ii), b(i), we're fine with, so long as we have the flexibility to work with the Village, mutually agree on adjusting those allocations. We're fine with that. C is that the minimum number of parking spaces will be if we build a fifth level, we'll be 435, and if we don't build a fifth level, we must build 44 spaces underneath the Chestnut building.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, we've got to take these as two separate issues because you're raising a different issue than what we were talking about. So, you're saying that under A, you want us to add a romanette (iii) that says that if you feel that a different ratio of residential to commercial is more appropriate, you will come to the Village and we'll work with you?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, all I would say is (i) and (ii) are subject to a reallocation

upon, you know, request of the Petitioner and review by the Village. I mean, it's that, the ordinance would say, as Sam pointed out before, if we can prove up that we don't need this many commercial, but we need more residential, that's fine. We are not at all suggesting we will build less parking spaces. Once the garage is up, it's up. We're not taking any away.

MR. HUBBARD: I would argue that that's already in there, Mike, under F. It's just basically saying you provide us with the data and we, if it's still in substantial conformance, then we'll adjust the ratio essentially.

MR. FIRSEL: Great. Then forget everything I said and let's move on to C. If Sam says it's already in there, then he's right, it is in there. I'm great with it. That's fine.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: So, I'm scratching my head here. If we're going to have apartments, we're going to have a fifth floor the parking garage which adds 90 spots, but if we are going to have condos, which there's going to be fewer of because they'll be bigger, right?

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, but we didn't specify, there's a chance we could build the apartments and still want to put parking underneath.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: No, I understand that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, he's just giving us an example of when it might happen. I don't think he's --

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: What I'm saying is --

MR. FIRSEL: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: So, if it's condos, what I'm hearing you say is that in addition to the four floors, 345 spaces, we're just going to add 44 spaces underground, which the condo people are going to want more parking.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: So, if we're going to go from 90 spots with the fifth floor extra to just 44 spots, how is that working out?

MR. FIRSEL: Well, yes, I think I touched on it earlier, Mr. Chairman, that if we do condos, we'll probably do around 50. Based on a 1.7 to one ratio for condos, it's the same response as it is if we're building 85 apartments. It's the same number.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, okay, because they're bigger.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes. Yes, you demand more parking. We agree with Staff on that issue.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Would the adding of the 44, this is a question for Sam. Would the adding of the 44 spots underground require an amendment to the plan that has to come back before us? That is a change.

MR. HUBBARD: No, they've provided the plan showing the 44-space garage for the alternatives they're proposing.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Great. So, we can approve that as an alternative and not make them come back to us for that permission, great.

MR. FIRSEL: Correct.

MR. HUBBARD: If you're comfortable with that parking ratio, then yes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Then I think in the setup here, Mike, is it right that, I think C(ii) and C(iii) would be struck, correct?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, I would say the best way to do it would be strike c(ii) and c(iii), and then c(i) would say this development shall only proceed if Phase 1A is constructed

or if 44 spaces are constructed underneath, you know, the Chestnut building for the maximum of 85 units.

MR. FIRSEL: That's all you need to say, I think so.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I think we've got to move that B, I mean, not to be overly complicated, but it reads really odd. I think you've just to get rid of B and just make Phase 2 be B, and then it says this phase shall only proceed if the following has been met. Move the language of B to romanette (i) under that, and then add the 44 spaces as (ii), because otherwise it doesn't make any sense. What is this Phase 1A thing that's hanging out there? I mean, that's just what I think.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, just make it Phase 2.

MR. HUBBARD: That's fine. That's fine.

MR. FIRSEL: Just make that Phase 2. I agree with Sam. I agree with the Commissioner. Sam, that's probably the right way to do it.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, that's fine with me.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Then if we don't want to move the refuse area, we eliminate 11?

MR. FIRSEL: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Get rid of 11, yes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: So, our attorneys agree with these changes, c(ii) and c(iii)?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I don't know that I can speak for everyone whether or not they'll vote for it. It's just a matter of the language of the motion. I'm comfortable with it.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Right.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, okay.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'm not going to speak for George and Jay.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: George, you're still out there, right?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I am, and I'm listening just like Sue has taught me to do.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And through the different iterations of it, you know, basically you're creating the flexibility that you need as the development goes forward. I think that's what we're trying to state in that motion. So, and 11 is easy, just delete that.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Jay?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes. No, I think we're on the same page. I didn't necessarily get that because I was taking notes. Then that's probably where we eliminate B. So, I don't know if Susan wants to kind of read it off. I think conceptually we're on the same page, but how that reads under the new format, you know, however you guys decide that works is fine with me. We're on the same page conceptually.

MR. FIRSEL: Yes, so I agree that B should be Phase 2, we should get rid of C, and B would say either we build a parking deck with an additional 90 spots for 435 or we put 44 additional spaces under Chestnut to accommodate the 85 Chestnut units. It's that simple.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And you can't move to Phase 2 unless you do one of those two.

MR. FIRSEL: That is correct. We are in complete agreement with that.

COMMISSIONER DROST: All right.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, do we have a motion?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I think Commissioner Jensen was --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I couldn't begin to make a motion based on that. But Sue can.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I don't think you have to read any of that. You just say with the changes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Go right ahead.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I have to find the motion sheet.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I can do it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: You have it? Thanks, Jay.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll pull up the motion.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thanks, Jay, okay.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I had it up, I don't know where it went of course. Where did this thing go? Here you go.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Very good.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here we go, all right, hold on. All right, Commissioner Cherwin, I make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of Application No. PC #21-002, an amendment to Planned Unit Development Ordinance 19-019 to allow modifications to the previously approved development plan and a special use permit to allow a "private garage, customer/employee" on the subject property.

This recommendation is subject to the modified conditions of approval as outlined below in Exhibit 1, with the following modifications:

- **Eliminate Condition #11.**
- **Condition #12 shall be modified to eliminate paragraph c and to modify paragraph a and b to be as shown: “#12. The Highland parking garage shall be operated as presented within the Arlington 425 “Managing from the Inside Out” document (dated March 2021), the Parking Allocation Diagram (dated 3/12/21) and Highland Alt. Garage w/5th Fl. plan (dated 3/22/21), and as within the written Departmental comment responses provided by the petitioner. Parking within the PUD shall be subject to the following additional conditions:**
 - a) **Phase One – Development of Campbell Building with 234 residential rental units, 7,962 square feet of commercial space, and 345 parking stalls within the four-story Highland garage:**
 - i. **56 spaces shall initially be dedicated and reserved on the first floor of the garage for the commercial uses within the Campbell building. Residential guests or residential tenants shall not be permitted to park in these spaces.**
 - ii. **289 spaces shall be initially dedicated and reserved for the residential uses. Of these spaces, 12 shall be open to**

residential tenants and their guests, and 277 shall be open to residential tenants only.

b) Phase Two – Construction of 85 units within the Chestnut Building. Phase Two shall only occur if:

- i. A fifth level to the Highland garage is constructed, providing a total of 435 parking spaces within the garage. This may be completed as a separate phase or may be combined with Phase One , or;**
- ii. 44 parking stalls are constructed in the basement of the Chestnut building.**
- iii. A minimum of 56 commercial parking spaces and 289 resident parking spaces shall continue to be maintained.**

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, seeing none, can we take a roll?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: So, you have all of us? So, you have a 100 percent approval. I know it's been a long process, but all the best of luck.

MR. FIRSEL: We can't thank you enough. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also want to say having sat in your chair for a period of eight years, and I do want to say that this Plan Commission works extremely hard. I appreciate all that you do. The volume of materials on just this project have been overwhelming. So, it does not get lost on me, Mr. Adriani or any of us how hard you work. Every time I appear before you, it is a pleasure because you are knowledgeable, you're thorough, you consider the public, the Staff, as well as the Petitioner, and treat everybody with the respect they're entitled to. For that, I sincerely thank you all.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Well, thank you and good luck.

MR. FIRSEL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Sam, do you have a date when they're going to go to Village Board?

MR. HUBBARD: I don't, but we'll work with them on the dates. I think it still has yet to be determined with the scheduling.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay.

MR. FIRSEL: Thank you all so much.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Best of luck.

MR. FIRSEL: Have a good evening and a good morning.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: So, is there any other business?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, I want Sam to start going in order again because he's confusing us.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: What? Oh, you mean up and down the row? We're not on our seats. Well, based on where your picture is here.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Just kidding.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, is there a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Second?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, and Sam, could you take the roll?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes.

Thank you all. Have a good evening.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 10:57 p.m.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
COUNTY OF KANE)

I, RON LeGRAND, depose and say that I am a digital court reporter doing business in the State of Illinois; that I reported verbatim the foregoing proceedings and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript to the best of my knowledge and ability.

RON LeGRAND

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO

BEFORE ME THIS _____ DAY OF
_____, A.D. 2021.

NOTARY PUBLIC



Plan Commission 4/28/2021

Item: Greenbrier Detention Pond - NE Corner Cambridge St & Yale Ave - PC#21-004

Department: Planning & Community Development

Background

On March 1, 2021, the Village Board approved Ordinance #21-007 which authorized Preliminary Plat of Subdivision approval to consolidate the subject property into one lot. The petitioner has completed the Final Plat documents and obtained all of the necessary signatures to proceed with final approval. All conditions of approval as outlined in Ordinance #21-007 and #21-008 shall continue to apply.

Recommendation

— Staff recommends that the Plan Commission recommend **approval** of the Final Plat of Subdivision.

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Staff Memo
PC Minutes 2/24/21
Final Plat of Subdivision

Type

Memorandum
Minutes
Exhibits



Memorandum

To: Chairperson Dawson and Members of the Plan Commission
CC: Randy Recklaus, Village Manager
All Department Heads
From: Jake Schmidt, Assistant Planner
Date: 4/23/2021
Re: Final Plat Approval - April 28, 2021 - PC #21-004: Greenbrier Detention Pond

On March 1, 2021, the Village Board approved Ordinance #21-007 which authorized Preliminary Plat of Subdivision approval to consolidate the subject property into one lot. The petitioner has completed the Final Plat documents and obtained all of the necessary signatures to proceed with final approval. All conditions of approval as outlined in Ordinance #21-007 and #21-008 shall continue to apply.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Plan Commission recommend [approval](#) of the Final Plat of Subdivision.

If you should require any additional information, please let me know.

APPROVED

PLAN

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF A PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION

COMMISSION

RE: GREENBRIER DETENTION POND - NE CORNER CAMBRIDGE STREET AND
YALE AVENUE - PC #21-004
PUD, PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PLAT OF SUBDIVISION, REZONING FROM
R-3 TO P-L, COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT TO CLASSIFY AS OPEN
SPACE, VARIATIONS

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting held virtually in response to the COVID-19
pandemic, which permits the public to fully participate via their computers or using their phones,
on the 24th day of February, 2021 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

TERRY ENNES, Chairperson
BRUCE GREEN
MARY JO WARSKOW
JAY CHERWIN
LYNN JENSEN
JOE LORENZINI
JOHN SIGALOS
SUSAN DAWSON
GEORGE DROST

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner
JAKE SCHMIDT, Assistant Planner
SCOTT SHIRLEY, Director of Public Works

LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES
Chicago & Roselle, Illinois - Miami & Orlando, Florida
(630) 894-9389 - (800) 219-1212

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: So, Jake, any time you want to, there he is.
Good evening, Jake. Is your Petitioner here?

MR. SCHMIDT: We are the Petitioner.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Well, then you're here.

MR. SCHMIDT: Let me pull up my presentation here. I'll begin with the Staff report if everyone's ready?

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: We're ready.

MR. SCHMIDT: So, the project tonight here is the Greenbrier detention pond expansion. The location of the property is at the northeast corner Cambridge Street and Yale Avenue. The current zoning of the property is R-3 One-Family Dwelling District and P-L Public Land District. The Comprehensive Plan designates the site as single-family detached.

The requested action tonight is in four parts: the first being a preliminary plat of subdivision approval, to consolidate four lots and Village right-of-way into one lot; the second being a rezoning from the R-3 District to the P-L District; a third being a planned unit development approval, all developments within the P-L District are required to obtain PUD approval per Village Code; lastly, a Comprehensive Plan amendment to classify the site as open space. As the proposed use of the site would be an open detention basin, open space is a more compatible designation for the site.

One variation is required for this petition, that being a variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.12-1, to waive the requirement to provide a traffic and parking study.

The subject site is south of an existing detention basin in the Greenbrier area, situated just north of Cambridge Street. To provide some additional context for the project, it is part of a larger stormwater infrastructure improvement program. As seen in this aerial, the subject site is shown in the yellow box. New storm sewers are proposed in yellow north of the site, and existing storm sewers do tie into this site as shown with the black lines in the neighborhood.

As mentioned, a plat of subdivision approval is required as part of the petition, tonight is just preliminary plat of subdivision approval. Here, you can see the four existing lots and the Village right-of-way. The Village right-of-way will be vacated, and the four lots combined to form one single parcel for the purpose of expanding the pond.

Rezoning is also required. All public facilities are required to be zoned P-L. Currently, as shown here, you can see the two lots that are zoned R-3 as well as the Village right-of-way. As part of this project, rezoning to P-L is proposed which would look as shown.

As part of PUD approval, engineering plans are required, which the Village has prepared. As seen here to the left side of the map, south in orientation, is the expanded basin. Water would flow into this basin during large stormwater events when the pond would exceed its capacity, and then it would drain back into the basin as water flows out from the pond.

Landscaping plans are also required as part of PUD approval. The Village has prepared one as well for the subject site. It should be noted that there will be some slight changes when this project goes to Village Board for the landscaping plan. Trees will still be provided; however, there will be a 30-foot gap which is necessary for service trucks to enter the pond, as well as some changes to the location of the trees in order to account for existing parkway trees as well as existing utility lines.

APPROVED

With respect to traffic and parking, no vehicular or bicycle parking is required for this use; however, a traffic and parking study is required. The Village has sought relief from this requirement, and Staff supports the variation as this use generates no traffic. It will maintain the fabric of the neighborhood and preserve the quiet residential character. Since there is no traffic generated, a traffic and parking study would be an undue cost for the taxpayer. As traffic and parking studies are required to assess impact, since there will be no impact on traffic, this is within the harmony and intent of code.

In conclusion, the Staff Development Committee recommends approval of the application subject to two conditions: the first being that final plat of subdivision approval will be required, and that we will comply with all applicable regulations and policies.

This concludes my presentation. If there's any questions, I'm happy to answer.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, can we have a motion to approve the Staff report?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, and a second. A question though, Jake, do you have to recuse yourself from this?

MR. SCHMIDT: I'm sorry? Oh, I don't think so.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, well, the Staff approves it, right, but you're the Petitioner. Anyways, so will you take the roll call vote to approve the Staff report? We have a motion and a second.

MR. SCHMIDT: Certainly. Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes.

So, you have a unanimous approval on your report.

Are there any questions of Jake, Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: No?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'd like to hear public comments.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I agree.

MR. SCHMIDT: Before we do that, the Director of Public Works has his hand raised, so I'm going to allow him to speak in case there's anything he wants to add.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay.

MR. SCHMIDT: Scott, you're able to speak if you'd like to add anything.

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes. I just wanted to let you know that we're here, Jake. Chris and I are out here and we can't tell whether or not you know we're here. So, that's why I raised my hand. We are here for questions, either of the Commissioners or of the public. So, we're out here. We just don't, we don't see the same thing you guys are seeing, so that's all I have.

MR. SCHMIDT: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Mr. Shirley, you're here because your department is going to be handling the preparation of the pond?

MR. SHIRLEY: Absolutely, yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, are there any questions?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes, for Mr. Shirley. So, you are in agreement with this plan?

MR. SHIRLEY: Am I in agreement with this plan?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay. All right, Jake, there were a couple of e-mails that the residents sent. They're worried about floodings. That kind of makes sense, but did you get back to them? Did you get back to them in any way?

MR. SCHMIDT: I did. My responses were included in that packet, at least they should be.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, I just wondered if there's anything else, okay, all right.

MR. SHIRLEY: Pursuant to that, Commissioner Lorenzini, the pond, this is just an overflow for the existing pond. The pond will be cleaned, de-watered, a safety shelf will be put in, the volunteer growth will be cleared out and it will be more landscaped in appearance, both the existing wet pond and the overflow area that will remain dry.

So, the homes right around the pond don't have flooding issues under moderate conditions. However, farther up in the neighborhood to the north is where we have some problem spots along several streets, namely, Roanoke and a couple of others there. So, this will allow more water to be intercepted and get to the pond before it's discharged at a controlled rate. So, the people around the pond I know have expressed concern, they will not be impacted at all. There will be an overflow from the pond and the dry section that will route the water, if it overflows, to the street.

So, there will be no impact on flooding except to improve it for people within the neighborhood.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Mr. Shirley, would both ends of the pond be fenced? The wet part and the dry part?

MR. SHIRLEY: We have just planned to fence the wet part because the Park District would still like some, possibly like passive or smaller like kids soccer and such. They don't program is formally, Commissioner Ennes, but people do go there and use the lot

APPROVED

that's there now. So, that will be down a little slope but there's a relatively flat area and they still want to encourage people to use that because it will not have water in it but maybe, I'm going to guess once every couple of years and maybe for 24 hours max. So, it's going to be normally dry and we plan to maintain turf on the dry part.

Like I said, we want to improve the wet part because right now we can't even get in there to maintain the wet part. I don't know if you've been out there, but it's a pretty ugly pond.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Right.

MR. SHIRLEY: So, it will also give us access to it so we can maintain it better for the residents around there. So, there have been issues with some snows and such in the pond, and so cleaning it out, taking out the sediment, putting in some controlled landscaping that's engineered will help everybody there around it.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Somebody had mentioned something about a fountain in there to circulate the water?

MR. SHIRLEY: No, we did not have current plans for an aeration device. But if we get to a point where odors are an issue again, we will install one, but we think that cleaning the pond of the sediment. It's not been touched in at least 25 years, that that will take care of the odor issues that we've experienced periodically.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: So, on an ongoing basis when we have a rain and it goes into the dry pond, will it just settle into the ground or will it flow into the wet pond?

MR. SHIRLEY: It will, some will probably settle or infiltrate into the dry area, but the majority will flow back into the wet pond as the water will go down into the system.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, so the two ponds will have some kind of a pipe connecting them?

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No questions.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll wait for public comment.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes, Jay?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: No, I just said I'll wait for public comment. I don't have a question.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, Jake, are you going to read those letters? Do you have to read the e-mails since we all got them in our packet and read them, or do you have to read those into the record?

MR. SCHMIDT: No, it's not something we've done before.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, I'm fine with that. I've read them all. I think the biggest concern was that the neighborhood was losing kind of a shared play area, and they were concerned about flooding. Obviously, it's a Village issue that this will help resolve. You know, they've had the benefit of a piece of land in their neighborhood for gatherings and whatnot, and it sounds like they'll still have that. So, that kind of answers the questions I saw in there.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Jake, don't you have three people who want to come in and make comments?

MR. SCHMIDT: We do. So, we can open it up for public comment.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay.

APPROVED

MR. SCHMIDT: But I'd like to make one note on the e-mails we did receive. As far as part of the record, it will be provided to the Village Board in their agenda, so it will be recorded down in our record via the Village Board meeting.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes, okay. So, if you could bring in any audience members that would like to comment?

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes. I see three hands raised. John and Mary, you should now be able to speak.

QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE

MR. ERNST: Hi, my name is John Ernst. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes, we can, John.

MR. ERNST: Okay, good. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thank you for coming in so late this evening.

MR. ERNST: Thank you, Chairman Ennes and members of the Plan Commission. My question pretty much had been answered. The first question I had concerned the fencing, so I see that is going to happen. That's good.

The other is the safety, during the construction phase, the safety for pedestrians walking on Cambridge and Verde Drive going past Happiness Park, the children on their way to Greenbrier School. That all I presume is going to be taken care of by the contractor, is that correct?

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Mr. Shirley?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: They're going to, the Village is going to do the work.

MR. ERNST: Oh, the Village is, okay.

MR. SHIRLEY: No, sorry, Trustee Green. Actually, we've contracted it out. We've awarded a contract for the pond and all the utility work in the subdivision to the Mail Brothers Construction. Residents in the area should have gotten a notice, either my e-mail blast or a letter that should be in mail boxes in the next couple of days. There is a neighborhood meeting, virtual meeting next Wednesday, March 3rd, that everyone in the neighborhood is invited to attend where the contractor and our consulting engineer will be present to answer questions along with those of us from the Village.

As far as the safety plan that the gentleman is asking about, the Happiness Park side will have some utility work obviously in the street. So, they will have to either detour people around the sidewalk and such. The park itself may be closed for a period of time for everyone's safety. On the Cambridge side, they'll have to detour people around that sidewalk if they make it, you know, impassable which it probably will be when they fence off the site, although that may come and go a little bit depending on the activities that they're working on.

So, yes, safety is part of their requirement. We will have a consulting engineer overseeing the contractor, and then Village Staff will be assisting him. So, we've already contacted Greenbrier School through the school district, and they are aware of what's going on. I mean, we're going to try to do our best to gap the work that directly impacts like bus traffic and kids and such to other areas around the neighborhood that will be a little bit less impacted on Greenbrier. We can't avoid it totally because we're going to start hopefully,

APPROVED

probably by I guess like second week in March and we're coming up pretty quick. We'd like to get going because we've awarded.

So, I hope that answers your question.

MR. ERNST: Yes, pretty much I think it does. The fencing that currently surrounds the basin will be removed. I presume that there will be a fence surrounding the entire Happiness Park so that children cannot get in there and go to that attractive nuisance called a pond?

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: It will look a lot nice when it's done.

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes, actually we'll have, probably we'll have like either a black or green fence.

MR. ERNST: The fence itself, yes, no, the question isn't about the fence surrounding the basin.

MR. SHIRLEY: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. ERNST: Once that fence comes out, the existing chainlink fence that's in there I know is going to be removed and replaced.

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes, sir.

MR. ERNST: But until that happens, if the current fence is removed and before a new fence is installed, the concern I have is for the children who see the park to play. That part should be closed off completely until a new fence has been installed around the pond.

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes, sir. Now I understand completely, and it is the Mail Brothers contractor's responsibility to put up a temporary fence for whatever that gap --

MR. ERNST: Yes.

MR. SHIRLEY: So, and it won't be just an orange snow fence.

MR. ERNST: No, I would hope not.

MR. SHIRLEY: It will be something, right, no, it will be something that will be basically probably a chainlink fence but it will probably have no post in the ground.

MR. ERNST: Sure.

MR. SHIRLEY: It will probably have those little platforms with some sandbags on them and such. So, no, it will be substantial enough to deter people from going through it or over it.

MR. ERNST: And the project is anticipated to be completed by what date?

MR. SHIRLEY: I think that we have a due date before school starts in the fall. So, I think we're somewhere around middle of August to beginning of September latest. But our contractor wants to get in and get out. There is quite a bit of utility work in the subdivision because while we're going to be putting in these larger storm sewer pipes, we want to do the water main on those streets and then obviously repave all those streets afterwards. So, there's several phases to the project, and one is water main replacement in those areas that are affected, one is storm sewer placement as outlined in the exhibits that Jake was showing, and then we're resurfacing all those streets that we excavate through because they're really going to be trashed, for lack of a better term, during construction.

Yes, it's going to be an impact on the neighborhood. I don't want anyone to get the feeling it's not going to be, but we think in the end the overall project both from the utility replacement standpoint and the pond itself will be an improvement.

MR. ERNST: My wife and I live on Plymouth Court, the cul de sac street

APPROVED

immediately to the north of Happiness Park.

MR. SHIRLEY: Okay.

MR. ERNST: For the last couple of weeks, we have seen surveyors come into the neighborhood and they've got posts that they've banged into the ground and through the snow. They've got little flags on them. So, yes, we are well aware of the impact and the construction areas.

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes.

MR. ERNST: And we thank the Village for taking such an aggressive and positive action in helping to reduce the flooding in Greenbrier. We moved here Memorial Day 1975. Our children went to Greenbrier School, and we just love living here, the Village of good neighbors. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thank you. Jake, the next up?

MR. SCHMIDT: Andrew, you should be able to speak now.

MR. SCOTT WALLACE: Hi, this is actually Scott Wallace, but I'm here with my father-in-law Andrew who actually lives right behind us. So, thank you for having me and for giving me the opportunity. I had actually e-mailed Jake earlier, and most of my questions were answered.

But I still have some concerns about the pond because I can tell you that pond has, over the last few years, backed up into our backyard. We're on the southeast corner right by Happiness Park. We've had that pond back up into our yard several times and it's gone a little bit farther each time. It brings whatever, you know, you guys were joking around about the condition of the pond, it brings whatever it brings with it onto the plants and my grass and everything.

So, I'm just, I'm still concerned about that and the odor. When we had discussed this with several other of the associates who were on this project before, they had mentioned that they had talked about a fountain. So, I guess my take on it would be I think there needs to be some considerations for that in terms of water circulation and in terms of beautification. I don't want to see, the pond has been an eyesore for a long time and I think you guys were talking about doing cleaning things, but I think that a fountain would, it's been probably over 50 years since anything has been done.

I believe the fountain would add a lot to that process and also, you know, obviously add some aesthetic appeal as well. But I think it would just be something that should be considered and would help overall with, you know, the integrity of the water quality. The odor is bad, it's bad and it's been, and for people that have allergies who are close it, it is definitely something that everybody needs to take into consideration when we discuss it.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Mr. Wallace, do you plan to attend the neighbor meeting next week?

MR. SCOTT WALLACE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Mr. Shirley, did you say where the meeting was going to be held?

MR. SHIRLEY: Well, Commissioner Ennes, it's a public virtual meeting.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Oh, okay.

MR. SHIRLEY: So, may I respond? The e-mail blast has the link information and the call information if people want to do it over a phone. But to address Andrew's other questions, any of that spillover into backyards will be eliminated because now it

APPROVED

will go in to the dry basin area which right now it cannot do. So, even though we are brining in more water, we've engineered in the quantities for what's coming in now and having to sometimes spillover, and the additional water that will arrive there due to the improvements.

As far as the aerator, like I said, we do not have it included in the contract. What we propose, and we'll be open for discussion at the neighborhood meeting and going forward as we have a firm that comes in and tests the ponds for, you know, whatever stagnancy, and I don't know the exact terms of all the stuff they test for. So, if it becomes a problem --

MR. SCOTT WALLACE: It is a problem.

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes, we will address it the same way we have, like we have an aerator over at Hasbrook if you're familiar with that location, just north of Thomas and several others. So, we have a consultant over contract that maintains them for us. So, if that's necessary, we will take action.

MR. ANDREW WALLACE: Yes, I've been talking to them sometimes, nothing has been done before. I've been living here for over 50 years and nothing has been done. I've been complaining to Jeff Wozinski, to Dennis who used to be superintendent. They told me they're going to do something, but they've never done anything.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Well, now it's going to --

MR. ANDREW WALLACE: And we have a problem, we have a health issue over here. We have a very bad smell, we have the odors. You know, we have to do something, or if not, we'll have to just talk to somebody in the state. I don't know who we'd have to talk about it but we have to take care of it. There is a health issue.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Andrew, that's --

MR. ANDREW WALLACE: Since 50 years, I've been living here and nothing's been done, nothing in this pond.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: But Andrew --

MR. ANDREW WALLACE: So, I hope you guys are going to do something.

MR. SHIRLEY: I believe Trustee Ennes --

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: I'm a Commissioner.

MR. SHIRLEY: Commissioner, I'm sorry. I don't dispute what -- I don't really have any information contrary to that.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Guys, I'm hearing a lot of feedback, it's very difficult to hear. I don't know if anybody else is having that problem.

(Chorus of yeses.)

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes, with many people talking.

MR. SHIRLEY: I'll wait. Should I go ahead?

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes, you were going to comment on that?

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes, I was saying that I'm not going to dispute what Andrew is saying about the lack of maintenance going way back. I know that in the 22 years I have been here nothing has been done, and I don't dispute what he's saying at all. But I do believe that this improvement will address all his concerns.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Good, good to hear. Andrew and/or Scott, do either of you have any other, or were you done?

MR. ANDREW WALLACE: I would like to ask, because I've been told that they're going to put some kind of, you know, water pond and this is to circulate the water so that

APPROVED

we don't have that issue.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: But it has not been approved.

MR. ANDREW WALLACE: Well, I've been told they're going to do it but if you guys, you know, did not approve yet, I don't know who's going to approve, but I just am saying that, you know, there was supposed to be, what is it, my daughter is saying something, sediment, yes. The maintenance, this thing, they're supposed to remove the sediment because we have it very shallow on our side of the backyard, it's very shallow, that the water, whenever we have rain, the water comes to my backyard.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Right.

MR. ANDREW WALLACE: All those dirt and everything comes right into my backyard. I have to clean all those things.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay.

MR. ANDREW WALLACE: So, something has to be done there. Somebody has to come over.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: It is being done.

MR. ANDREW WALLACE: They can look at it.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thank you, Andrew. Jake, anyone else?

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes. Tim Copeland, you should be able to speak.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Mr. Copeland?

MR. COPELAND: Yes, thank you for having me on.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: And thank you for staying so late with us.

MR. COPELAND: I appreciate it. Yes, I think most, Mr. Shirley has answered most of my questions. I am glad to hear that the south side will be, you know, dry for the most part and used as an overflow. I think that was my biggest concern.

I've, you know, conversed with Jake a little bit about the safety issues that are over there, so I'm glad to hear that the fencing will be replaced also. So, I guess not really any questions but just comments at this point. So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thank you, Mr. Copeland.

Any other hands?

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes. J. Costello, you should now be able to speak.

MR. COSTELLO: Okay, I have one comment and a couple of questions. The comment, I agree with what's been said. I have been here for 37 years. I don't think that pond has ever been touched, and the odor is constant. So, something, if we're going to spend the time and money to do something, the pond needs to be addressed and not forgotten.

One of the questions that I had is that dry retention area, how deep from the sidewalk, from the street level is it going to go down? I'm just concerned about the children when they go down there to play.

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes, it's about , can you hear me, Commissioner Ennes?

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes, go ahead.

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes, it's about a four-foot drop on the side slopes, but it's in a gradual slope so it shouldn't be a hazard for people to trip or anything like that.

MR. COSTELLO: Okay, and then just to confirm, there will be a fence around the pond itself to separate the pond from the dry retention area, the overflow part?

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes.

MR. COSTELLO: Okay, and then the last question I had, I thought this was

APPROVED

a public hearing tonight and the Plan Commission was going to vote about the redistricting from R-3 to P-L District. But again, I'm hearing that the contract with Mail Brothers has already been executed. So, my question for my own clarification is how can you execute a contract when this hasn't been approved yet?

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: It can be made contingent; a contract could be made contingent on being approved.

MR. COSTELLO: But hasn't work been done already? I already heard that the survey has been going on.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: If a contractor is going to give us a bid, they're going to have to do some surveying review to know what it's going to cost them to dig this out and fix up the pond. So, if a company wants to bid on it, they've got to come out there and take a look at it.

MR. COSTELLO: I thought that somebody said that the contract was already awarded. Is this a foregone conclusion that this is being done?

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: No, what I just said when you asked about that is that a contract could be given subject to the project being approved.

MR. COSTELLO: Okay.

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes. So, I will just add, sir, that, you know, we had to negotiate the transfer of three of the lots from the Park District. So, that took longer than expected, and so that's why we're coming to the Plan Commission a little later than we might otherwise like to. But because we want to get a jump on the construction, we are trying to push this through because it's an improvement for the neighborhood. It will not be a detractor, in fact, it will solve a lot of the issues that the public has brought forward as far as maintenance and such. Now we'll be able to get in there and actually maintain it.

So, we expect it to be approved, but anything can happen. So, Commissioner Ennes is correct, if it doesn't happen, we either push it off or we'd have to cancel the contract.

MR. COSTELLO: All right, one last question. Are there going to be sewers in this retention area to catch the water and put it back into the pond?

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes.

MR. COSTELLO: Okay, and those will be covered to keep, because right now that field is used, everything with the kids, from soccer to baseball and everything, so the last thing we want to do is see a child get caught in some type of sewer. So, that will be covered and the safety protocols will be followed, correct?

MR. SHIRLEY: Absolutely.

MR. COSTELLO: Okay, all right. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Mr. Costello, while you're here, do you see any reason why this project shouldn't be approved?

MR. COSTELLO: Well, I don't know what it's going to do for the property values. I would think that it would be a benefit regarding the flooding.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Right.

MR. COSTELLO: But again, hopefully, but it's just, we'll have to wait and see. It depends. As I mentioned before, nothing, nobody has touched that pond in the 37 years I have been here. You know, I just don't want to see something put in place, you know, have everything fixed up and then everybody walk away from it, and then the neighborhood has to

APPROVED

deal with it like we're dealing with the pond right now.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Well, my understanding, it will be in the budget to maintain going forward, and this is part of the flood control.

MR. COSTELLO: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thank you, Mr. Costello.

Jake, any --

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes. Zoom Meeting 2020, you should now be able to speak, and if you wouldn't mind giving your name and spelling it for the record?

MS. PFEIFER: Hi, my name is Pat Pfeifer, P-a-t P-f-e-i-f-e-r.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Could you say that again?

MS. PFEIFER: Sure. Pat Pfeifer, P-a-t P-f-e-i-f-e-r.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thank you, Pat. What is your comment?

MS. PFEIFER: So, my home faces the Illinois Avenue and I just have a couple of comments. One, I just wanted to ask, I was under the impression that the utility lines would be buried. Is that correct or only in certain areas?

MR. SHIRLEY: The utility lines that are crossing kind of the point between the wet pond and the lot we're talking about this evening, those will be raised by ComEd so that we can get equipment in for the construction and also for maintenance in the future. So, they are not going to be undergrounded.

MS. PFEIFER: Okay, directly behind our home, we have quite a few utility lines. How will they be affected at all?

MR. SHIRLEY: No, they should not be, ma'am.

MS. PFEIFER: Okay, the other thing I wanted to reiterate like some of the earlier folks is we, too, smell the pond as it is now. It has a very pungent smell. I feel like they do, if we're going to go to this expense, I don't know why an aeration system wouldn't be part of it already knowing what we've been living with here. So, I strongly urge that that be considered, just as a resident living very close to the pond.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Ms. Pfeifer, are you planning on going to the neighborhood Zoom meeting next week?

MS. PFEIFER: Yes, I am now. Thank you for letting me know about that.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, because that will be a good time to bring that up because all those comments will go to the Village Board if this project is approved by us tonight.

MS. PFEIFER: Okay, wonderful. Then you had mentioned, too, that it would be in the budget, in the future budgets to maintain that pond, keep an eye on it and make sure that all the work that we do does stay in good shape.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Mr. Shirley, can you comment? Is that the plan is to get that in the budget?

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes. We already have enough funds in the budget for it.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: And maintenance going forward?

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes.

MS. PFEIFER: Great. Then we've never really had a problem, we've had some of the water come up, and like the earlier gentleman said, it does bring with it whatever sediment and unpleasant things come. So, with the new layout, that should eliminate that from creeping up on people's lawns?

APPROVED

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes. The properties that border upon, that water will go into the dry basin overflow before it gets in your backyards.

MS. PFEIFER: Okay, and then just about the fence, we touched on that a little bit. Can someone just give me an idea of what the fence might be like? Is it a black fence, decorative fence? I'm not sure.

MR. SHIRLEY: We would propose either a green vinyl-coated or black vinyl-coated chainlink fence.

MS. PFEIFER: Okay, and would the fence line stay similar to where it is now around the property or are you going to move that?

MR. SHIRLEY: We would propose keeping it right where it is.

MS. PFEIFER: They're taking the dead trees out. That's correct, right? All these overgrowth trees and invasive plants?

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes, ma'am. We kind of consider those volunteer growth which means seeds that fell there many moons ago and things just sprouted up. We don't believe there was ever any kind of landscape plan for the perimeter of the existing pond. So, the plan is to clear all that invasive growth out of there, plant in some things that are engineered for this kind of application. There'll be trees along the dry basin, you know, parkway trees and stuff where possible, leaving some gaps for maintenance access. But no, the landscaping will be cleared that's out there now, and then a more engineered landscaping will be put in.

MS. PFEIFER: Okay, and then just one other thing I'm thinking of, there is wildlife back there. We've had a lot of problems with skunks, and I know coyotes go. So, I'm not sure what the plan is to handle the wildlife.

MR. SHIRLEY: Well, we don't really have a plan. You know, I think that if we remove all the volunteer growth and such, that those two specific wildlife that you mentioned, it will be less attractive to them. It won't be an easier place to hide. So, you know, we don't have a plan to address or relocate any wildlife, I can tell you that. They're just going to have to kind of go on and find somewhere else.

MS. PFEIFER: I'm okay with that. I just want you guys to know that you're going to run into some wildlife back there and some skunk issues.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Usually they move into backyards.

MS. PFEIFER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: I'm trying to be honest.

MS. PFEIFER: Oh, I know. We've had, I had five in my backyard one time. Yes, that's all I have. Thank you so much for addressing this. Sorry I didn't type my name, and I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thanks, Mrs. Pfeifer, appreciate your call. Mr. Shirley, will any of the existing trees on the wet pond be left?

MR. SHIRLEY: That's not our plan.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, because there's a couple of decent-sized trees over there, right?

MR. SHIRLEY: I'm not aware of anything that's desirable.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, so the neighbors should really look forward to this it sounds like.

MR. SHIRLEY: I think so. I think there'll be a little rough sliding during construction and everyone will have to kind of hold their nose, too, no pun intended. But you

APPROVED

know, I think otherwise it's going to be a great improvement, you know, compared to what they're dealing with now with the pond.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, Jake, any other audience up?

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes. Don Peterson, you should now be able to speak.

MR. PETERSON: Yes, hi. Thanks for the opportunity to talk with you folks.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Hi, Mr. Peterson.

MR. PETERSON: We've been a resident, we actually were one of the original owners of the house that was around Lot 77 which backs up to the middle of the proposed area where you're going to consolidate those four lots. So, we've been watching all the activity going on with ComEd, AT&T, Comcast has been out there pretty much around, but the focus had been parking and utilities underground, you know, in the last couple of days.

So, we're looking forward very much to having this area -- help with summer activities -- a couple of questions though.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Mr. Peterson, are you on a speaker phone?

MR. PETERSON: No, I'm actually on a computer talking through a microphone.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, I'm just getting a lot of echoing.

MR. PETERSON: Really? Okay, sorry.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: No, that's okay.

MR. PETERSON: My question has to do with the landscape plan. The landscape plan that was published, that was posted on the web only shows the trees that are going to show up along Cambridge and it shows 20 something trees in the works. Yet the text of the discussion of the plan talked about none of the 40 plus old trees and plants that are around the detention pond. So, I'm assuming there's going to be 26 along Cambridge and -- or so, you know, around the detention pond. I'm curious whether there is a plan where you can actually see what is proposed for the landscaping --

MR. SCHMIDT: There is, and I'll jump in. So, to be clear, the subject site is just that southern portion which is currently the empty field. The adjacent site, the existing pond is under a separate plan. I do have it for reference to show now. It should be on the screen. This would be, in reference or as a note, this would be the landscaping for the existing pond.

MR. PETERSON: Okay, that's helpful. Would it be possible for you to be able to post it up on the website where the other documents go?

MR. SCHMIDT: Sure, that can be posted as part of the Village Board agenda.

MR. PETERSON: Okay, yes, thanks. The other question I had is regarding the meeting on March 3rd. We submitted our e-mail address twice to the Village now to be notified about things like this. I've gotten some things in the mail but never any information about a meeting on March 3rd.

MR. SHIRLEY: Yes, we sent out an e-mail blast. If you did not get it, Mr. Peterson, then we must not have you on the Greenbrier distribution list. So, if you want to call the office tomorrow here at Public Works at (847) 368-5800, give us your e-mail address, we'll put you on the e-mail blast list. You should be getting something in the mail, a manual mailer probably tomorrow, because it was put in the mailbox over the post office on Tuesday.

MR. PETERSON: Okay, yes, I appreciate that. Like I said, I submitted my e-mail address and sent it to the Village. Okay, gents, that's all I really have. Appreciate you

APPROVED

taking the time for this. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thanks, Mr. Peterson. That's gents and gentesses.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Not gentesses, no. Ladies would be nice.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, so anyone else?

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes, just as an item, since it's past 11:00 o'clock, we do need a motion to extend the meeting.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'll make the motion to extend. How much do we want to extend?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Two in the morning.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Two minutes?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Two in the morning.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Just in case, just in case.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll second. This is Jay, I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, shall we take a voice vote on this?

MR. SCHMIDT: Everything has to be roll call. Just to be clear, the motion is for an extension of an hour?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Sure.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes.

Okay, so we have an extension, and there is another speaker?

MR. SCHMIDT: I'm seeing no other hands raised.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, I will, therefore, close the public portion of the meeting.

Are there any questions from the Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: This is Jay. I don't really have any questions about it. I think it seems like the park is going to be in tact, that's a big part of this, you know, attraction for families. The fact that it's going to be a grass-bottom dry, I think that allays a lot of the concerns in some of the e-mails as well.

APPROVED

I would just say, you know, going forward from a public works perspective, it would be helpful to have the neighborhood meeting before our meeting, because then we can have a better kind of collection of thoughts, but you know, it is going to be --

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Right.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: It seems to me, you know, there are just a few small things, you know. We talked about this, an agitator in Hasbrook Park, and that's what people are looking for. I don't see why we wouldn't put it here. You know, as far as having the neighborhood meeting and understanding what the landscaping is, what the fence looks like, making sure everybody has some input, there's probably some variation on what they can do. So, I would just say listen to the neighbors going forward. You know, they're the ones that will be most affected by it, so to the extent we can accommodate them on landscaping, fencing and all that, I say we do it. That's all.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thanks, Commissioner.

Anyone else?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of Greenbrier Detention Pond, PC# 21-004, a Planned Unit Development, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision to consolidate four lots and Village right-of-way into one lot, Rezoning from the R-3 District to the P-L District, a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to classify the site as Open Space, and the following Variation:

1. **A variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.12-1, to waive the requirement to provide a traffic and parking study prepared by a certified traffic engineer.**

This recommendation is subject to the following conditions:

1. **Final Plat of Subdivision approval is required.**
2. **The Petitioner shall comply with all Federal, State, and Village Codes, Regulations, and Policies.**

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I second.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Thank you, Jay.

Can we have the roll call vote?

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Jensen.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes.

So, Jake, you have unanimous approval. I think a great project for the neighborhood. That is an unsightly pond and the project should drastically improve it. I am also glad that the overflow pond will be a dry pond so that the neighbors will continue to use it. Super.

Mr. Shirley, thank you very much for being with us to provide all the insight that you did.

MR. SHIRLEY: You're welcome and I thank all of you, Commissioner Ennes, I really do. Thanks to everybody. I know several of you, I haven't seen you in quite sometime, so it's good to see some familiar faces. I don't think I've been in front of Plan Commission since 2003.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: It's been a while --

MR. SHIRLEY: That's when it came through for that. So, it's been a while. But thank you to everyone, I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, seeing no other business --

MR. SCHMIDT: I do have a few announcements.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay.

MR. SCHMIDT: Just so you guys are aware, there won't be a meeting on March 10th. There's no items on the agenda. Then for the second meeting in March, it's been moved to March 31st on account of spring break. There's one final announcement, if you haven't already, please respond to Sam's e-mail regarding in-person meetings. He needs to have an answer by Friday.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: All right.

Yes, George?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, can you send that around again? I must have missed that. Then one other question, what's going up kitty corner to the Village Hall?

MR. SCHMIDT: Nothing right now. They just removed the building. There's no final proposal for the site as of yet.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Aren't they consolidating the number of parcels?

MR. SCHMIDT: There's been some proposals for the site, but nothing official yet that I've seen.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, so what do you think, the Bears on Arlington Park?

MR. SCHMIDT: I couldn't opine on that.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: It was in the news on Channel 7 tonight and they said won't that be a great industrial park? Anyways, thank you all for being here tonight. Long meeting but we got a lot covered. Really appreciate all your comments.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: We need a motion to adjourn.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: That sounds great.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make the motion.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: George was the first, who was the second?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll be ecumenical about it whoever wants to take it, but we want to get Jake out of the building here.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Do we need a roll call vote?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, you do.

MR. SCHMIDT: Who make the motion, who made the second?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I think I seconded, but I'm not sure.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Okay, George and Bruce.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I made the motion.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. SCHMIDT: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRPERSON ENNES: Yes, with comment. I'll see you all in March. I will have my second shot. Okay, thanks a lot.

(Whereupon, at 11:10 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)

LEGEND

•	5/8" REBAR & CAP SET
•	IRON PIPE FOUND (IPF)
00.00	MEASURED
(00.00)	RECORD
---	PROPERTY LINE
---	R.O.W. LINE
---	BUILDING SETBACK LINE
---	EASEMENT LINE

SEND TAX BILL TO:
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005

COUNTY CLERK'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF ILLINOIS }
COUNTY OF COOK } SS

I, _____, COUNTY CLERK OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I FIND NO DELINQUENT GENERAL TAXES, NO UNPAID CURRENT GENERAL TAXES, NO UNPAID SPECIAL TAXES, NO UNPAID FORFEITED TAXES, AND NO REDEEMABLE TAX SALES AGAINST ANY OF THE LAND INCLUDED IN THE PLAT OF RESUBDIVISION. I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I HAVE RECEIVED ALL STATUTORY FEES IN CONNECTION WITH THE RESUBDIVISION.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL OF THE COUNTY CLERK, DATED
THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 20 ____ A.D.

COUNTY CLERK

OWNER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF ILLINOIS }
COUNTY OF COOK } SS

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT I, THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS IS/ARE THE OWNER(S) OF THE PROPERTY SHOWN AND DESCRIBED ON PLAT OF RESUBDIVISION AND THAT THEY HAVE CAUSED THE SAME TO BE PLATTED AS INDICATED HEREON FOR THE USES AND PURPOSES HEREIN SET FORTH, AND DO HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE AND ADOPT THE SAME UNDER THE STYLE AND TITLE HEREON INDICATED.

THIS IS TO ALSO CERTIFY THAT THE UNDERSIGNED, AS OWNER OF THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED ON THE PLAT OF RESUBDIVISION HAVE DETERMINED TO THE TO THE BEST OF THE OWNER'S KNOWLEDGE, THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN WHICH EACH TRACT, PARCEL, LOT OF BLOCK OF THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION LIES IS/ARE:

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT 25
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS TOWNSHIP HIGHSCHOOL 214
HARPER COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT 512

OWNERS NAME & ADDRESS
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
33 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD
ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, IL 60005

THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 20 ____ A.D.

BY: _____

TITLE: _____

ATTEST: _____

TITLE: _____

OWNER'S NOTARY

STATE OF ILLINOIS }
COUNTY OF COOK } SS

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT I, _____, A NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR SAID COUNTY, IN THE STATE AFORESAID, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT _____ PERSONALLY KNOWN TO ME TO BE THE SAME PERSONS WHOSE NAMES ARE SUBSCRIBED TO THE FOREGOING INSTRUMENT AS SUCH OWNERS, APPEARED BEFORE ME THIS DAY IN PERSON AND ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THEY SIGNED AND DELIVERED SAID INSTRUMENT AS THEIR OWN FREE AND VOLUNTARY ACT FOR THE USES AND PURPOSES THEREIN SET FORTH. GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND NOTARIAL SEAL

THIS _____ DAY OF _____, 20 ____ A.D.

NOTARY PUBLIC

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: _____

GENERAL NOTES:

- ALL DIMENSIONS ARE GIVEN IN FEET AND DECIMAL PARTS THEREOF.
- ONLY THOSE BUILDING LINE SETBACKS AND EASEMENTS WHICH ARE SHOWN ON THE RECORDED PLAT OF SUBDIVISIONS ARE SHOWN HEREON. REFER TO THE DEED, TITLE INSURANCE POLICY AND LOCAL ORDINANCES FOR OTHER RESTRICTIONS.
- COMPARE DEED DESCRIPTION AND SITE CONDITIONS WITH THE DATA GIVEN ON THIS PLAT AND REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO THE SURVEYOR AT ONCE.
- NO DIMENSIONS SHALL BE DERIVED FROM SCALE MEASUREMENT.
- CONTRACTOR/DEVELOPER SHALL NOTIFY J.U.L.I.E. AT 1-800-892-0123 AT LEAST 48 HOURS PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF ANY WORK.

SURVEYOR NOTES:

- BUILDING DIMENSIONS AND TIES SHOWN HEREON ARE MEASURED FROM OUTSIDE FACE OF BUILDING.
- BEARINGS AND DISTANCES SHOWN HEREON ARE ON THE ILLINOIS STATE PLANE COORDINATE SYSTEM, EAST ZONE, NORTH AMERICAN DATUM OF 1983 (2011 ADJUSTMENT) "GRID".
- THIS SURVEY IS SUBJECT TO MATTERS OF TITLE WHICH MAY BE REVEALED BY A CURRENT TITLE REPORT.
- PROPERTY IS SUBJECT TO: RIGHTS OF THE PUBLIC, THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, AND THE MUNICIPALITY IN AND TO THAT PART OF THE LAND, IF ANY, TAKEN OR USED FOR ROAD PURPOSES.
- THIS SURVEY IS BASED ON FIELD WORK PERFORMED ON 01-22-2021.

HAPPINESS PARK RESUBDIVISION

LOTS 72 THRU 75 INCLUSIVE IN ARLINGTON MEADOWS SUBDIVISION, BEING A SUBDIVISION IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 18, TOWNSHIP 42 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED FEBRUARY 14, 1978 AS DOCUMENT NO. 24324934 AND THAT PART OF VACATED NORTH YALE AVENUE ADJOINING SAID LOTS 72 THRU 75 IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY

STATE OF ILLINOIS }
COUNTY OF COOK } SS

RIGHT-OF-WAY / EASEMENT VACATION AS SHOWN HEREON. APPROVED & ACCEPTED THIS 02 DAY OF MARCH, A.D., 20 21.

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY

BY: Russell Dillon

TITLE: REAL ESTATE REP.

NICOR GAS

STATE OF ILLINOIS }
COUNTY OF COOL } SS

RIGHT-OF-WAY / EASEMENT VACATION AS SHOWN HEREON. APPROVED & ACCEPTED THIS 10 DAY OF MARCH, A.D., 20 21.

NICOR GAS

BY: Paul L. Wenzel

TITLE: LAND AGENT

ILLINOIS BELL TELEPHONE DBA AT&T, IL

STATE OF ILLINOIS }
COUNTY OF COOK } SS

RIGHT-OF-WAY / EASEMENT VACATION AS SHOWN HEREON. APPROVED & ACCEPTED THIS 16 DAY OF MARCH, A.D., 20 21.

AT&T CORPORATION

BY: Susan E. Manshum

TITLE: Manager - AT&T ROW

COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

STATE OF ILLINOIS }
COUNTY OF COOK } SS

RIGHT-OF-WAY / EASEMENT VACATION AS SHOWN HEREON. APPROVED & ACCEPTED THIS 23 DAY OF February, A.D., 20 21.

COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

BY: Jed Ullman

TITLE: RIGHT-OF-WAY ENGINEER

VILLAGE CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

UNDER THE AUTHORITY PROVIDED BY 65 ILCS 5/11-12 AS AMENDED BY THE STATE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS AND ORDINANCE ADOPTED BY THE VILLAGE BOARD OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS, THIS PLAT WAS GIVEN APPROVAL BY THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS AND MUST BE RECORDED WITHIN SIX MONTHS OF THE DATE OF APPROVAL BY THE VILLAGE BOARD, OTHERWISE IT IS NULL AND VOID.

APPROVED BY THE PLAN COMMISSION AT A MEETING HELD _____

CHAIRMAN _____

SECRETARY _____

APPROVED BY THE VILLAGE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AT A MEETING HELD _____

PRESIDENT _____

VILLAGE CLERK _____

APPROVED BY THE VILLAGE COLLECTOR _____

APPROVED BY THE VILLAGE ENGINEER _____

HAPPINESS PARK RESUBDIVISION

IN
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS
PREPARED FOR
VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS

CALC.	KJR	PROJECT NO.
DWN.	AJK	210040
CHKD.	JRM	SHEET 1 OF 1
SCALE:	1"=20'	DRAWING NO.
DATE:	02-19-2021	RESUB210040A

CAMBRIDGE STREET

66' RIGHT-OF-WAY

PLAT AUTHORIZATION CERTIFICATE

STATE OF ILLINOIS }
COUNTY OF COOK } SS

WE, CHRISTOPHER B. BURKE ENGINEERING, LTD., AN ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM, NUMBER 184-00175, HEREBY DESIGNATE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS TO RECORD THIS PLAT OF RESUBDIVISION WITH THE COOK COUNTY RECORDER OF DEEDS OR REGISTRAR OF TITLE. THIS DESIGNATION IS GRANTED UNDER THE RIGHT TO DESIGNATE SUCH RECORDING UNDER SECTION 2 OF THE ILLINOIS PLAT ACT, 765 ILLINOIS COMPILLED STATUTES 205/2.

GIVEN UNDER OUR HAND AND SEAL AT ROSEMONT, ILLINOIS.

THIS 19 DAY OF February, 20 21 A.D.

Christopher B. Burke

KENNETH J. RASMUSSEN, P.L.S.
ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR NO. 35-3240
MY LICENSE EXPIRES 11/30/2022

"THIS PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONFORMS TO THE CURRENT ILLINOIS MINIMUM TECHNICAL STANDARDS FOR A BOUNDARY SURVEY."

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF ILLINOIS }
COUNTY OF COOK } SS

WE, CHRISTOPHER B. BURKE ENGINEERING, LTD., AN ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL DESIGN FIRM, NUMBER 184-00172, DO HEREBY STATE THAT WE HAVE SURVEYED AND RESUBDIVIDED THE PROPERTY AS FOLLOWS:

LOTS 72 THRU 75 INCLUSIVE IN ARLINGTON MEADOWS SUBDIVISION, BEING A SUBDIVISION IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 18, TOWNSHIP 42 NORTH, RANGE 11 EAST OF THE THIRD PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED FEBRUARY 14, 1978 AS DOCUMENT NO. 24324934 AND THAT PART OF VACATED NORTH YALE AVENUE ADJOINING SAID LOTS 72 THRU 75 IN COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS.

WE FURTHER DECLARE THAT ALL THE LAND INCLUDED IN THE ANNEXED PLAT IS WITHIN THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ILLINOIS, WHICH HAS ADOPTED A CITY PLAN AND IS EXERCISING THE SPECIAL POWERS AUTHORIZED BY DIVISION 12 ARTICLE 11 OF THE ILLINOIS MUNICIPAL CODE.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH CHAPTER 765 ILCS SECTION 205/1 - 5/8" X 24" REBAR & CAP ARE SET AT ALL LOT CORNERS AND POINTS OF GEOMETRIC CHANGE, UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE.

THIS IS TO FURTHER CERTIFY THAT THE PROPERTY DESCRIBED IS LOCATED WITHIN ZONE X AREAS DETERMINED TO BE OUTSIDE THE 0.2% ANNUAL CHANCE FLOODPLAIN AS SHOWN IN THE FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP COMMUNITY PANEL NUMBER 17031C0201J, DATED AUGUST 19, 2008 AS PUBLISHED BY THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY FIRM.

THIS 19 DAY OF February, 20 21 A.D.

Christopher B. Burke

KENNETH J. RASMUSSEN, P.L.S.
ILLINOIS PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR NO. 35-3240
MY LICENSE EXPIRES 11/30/2022

"THIS PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CONFORMS TO THE CURRENT ILLINOIS MINIMUM TECHNICAL STANDARDS FOR A BOUNDARY SURVEY."



CHRISTOPHER B. BURKE ENGINEERING, LTD.
9575 West Higgins Road, Suite 600
Rosemont, Illinois 60018
(847) 823-0500