

APPROVED

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: FORD COMMERCIAL AUTO REPAIR - 3456 NORTH RIDGE AVENUE - PC #24-004
LAND USE VARIATION TO ALLOW MOTOR VEHICLE REPAIR, MAJOR, IN THE
M-1 DISTRICT

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,
Illinois on the 10th day of July, 2024 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director of Planning & Community Development
DAN OSOBA, Planner I

APPROVED

2

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: It's 7:30, so we can do the call to order here and get started.

(Gavel pounded.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Let's recite the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, Dan or Michael, you want to do roll call, please?

MR. OSOBA: Sure.

Commissioner Dawson.

(No response.)

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Drost.

(No response.)

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Here.

Thank you. I think the first matter on the agenda is approval of minutes of 419 South Pine.

Can we do a voice vote on that?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make a motion for approval.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, for approval.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, motion carries.

All right, we have three public hearings on the agenda, starting with Ford Commercial Auto Repair.

Dan, have all the notices been given on this matter?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, they have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, well, if the presenters for Ford would like to step up? We'll do a quick swearing in here at the podium of anybody who's going to speak on behalf of Ford, it would be great.

If you could raise your hand?

APPROVED

3

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Excellent. If I could have you state your name for the record, that would be great.

MR. O'CONNOR: My name is John O'Connor. I'm a partner at Drost, Kivlahan, McMahon & O'Connor here in Arlington Heights representing the Petitioner.

MS. SMITH: I'm Cassie Smith; I'm one of the managers at Arlington Heights Ford on behalf of John Guido, Jr.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you. Petitioner, has the Petitioner read the Staff report? There are certain conditions laid out in the Staff report. Is the Petitioner in agreement with those conditions?

MR. O'CONNOR: We are in agreement with them.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, well, we'll get started with your presentation and then we'll move on to the Staff's. Sound good?

MR. O'CONNOR: Good. As I said, I'm here representing the Petitioner. So, Arlington Heights Ford is located up on Dundee Road, actually at the intersection of Dundee and Ridge. The subject site that we're looking for a land use variance is the building immediately behind the Ford Dealership on Ridge at 3456 North Ridge Avenue. We are looking for a land use variance for two of the units, the building has four units. In another slide, we'll show more about it or the location of the two units.

The building currently is zoned M-1 and it does not permit auto repair use which is the Petitioner's intended use. Petitioner was recently approved by Ford Motor Company, and Cassie will talk about that in a little bit, to become a Ford Pro dealer and plans to locate that in the building adjacent to the dealership.

The proposed use really will not alter any of the essential character of the locality. It's compatible with all the existing uses and zoning of nearby properties. As mentioned, the dealership is immediately adjoining it. Most of the surrounding properties or all of them are all of commercial use, manufacturing, warehousing, and other compatible commercial uses. There's no surrounding or nearby residential properties raising any issues.

Traffic has easy access to it in and out off of Dundee and Ridge. We have provided, I'm sorry, there is adequate parking. We've provided an adequate parking study to evidence the adequate parking. There's actually a, in addition, an adjoining lot that the dealership currently owns, a fenced-in lot where they plan to house any of the trucks, commercial trucks that will be serviced there while they're waiting. It has adequate, there's also an off-site storage a couple of blocks away that also is fenced in that could be used if needed, although it's not anticipated.

We're not asking for any parking modification, by the way. Our parking study shows that there's adequate parking for the use that we're proposing.

The only request, again, is for a land use variance for, you can see here, there's two -- let me go back.

The two shaded areas here which are two units, in the building there's four units in total. There's going to be two phases of the construction process, Phase I and Phase II. Eventually, the plan is to have 29 commercial bays there to service commercial vehicles. The repair operations would need to be for major repair as opposed to light repair. Namely, services would include heavy duty truck, including engines, transmissions, oil changes, et cetera. There would not be anything done with exhaust or mufflers.

APPROVED

4

MS. SMITH: So, our dealership opened in 1983, right around the early 90's to mid 90's. The Guidos actually planned on moving that to expand the lot. You guys here in the Village actually offered them the second lot on Ridge, not Ridge, I'm sorry, on University in order to stay within the Village, and we have flourished ever since.

With a lot of the bigger truck servicing centers closing, Ford is kind of opening their doors to certain dealerships to have the option to become a Ford Pro, and we were given one of those. We have tons of commercial accounts. I'm sure some of you guys have seen, we work with ABC Plumbing, Amazon, just to name a couple of those.

So, right now, we are so set back in service, so we've definitely got the work to fill this building. Not too long ago, I came before you guys to have our other lot zoned to be able to also place a couple, I believe like 50 commercial vehicles there in case we needed additional parking as well.

That's where we're at right now.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, thank you.

Dan, you want to take it for the Staff?

MR. OSOBA: Absolutely.

All right, good evening, Chair and Commissioners.

The property in question for this petition is located at 3456 North Ridge Avenue, which is in the M-1, next slide, sorry, M-1 Research, Development and Light Manufacturing District and designated for "Research & Development, Manufacturing and Warehousing" as a future land use in the Comprehensive Plan. The existing building includes four tenant spaces, two of which are occupied. The Petitioner, Arlington Heights Ford, is proposing to establish a commercial vehicle repair use within the two remaining units.

The proposed land use is classified as Motor Vehicle Repair, Major, due to the intended engine and transmission work which is a non-permitted land use outright in the M-1 District. Therefore, Petitioner is requesting a land use variation to allow the use of "Motor Vehicle Repair, Major" within the M-1 District, and one variation to Chapter 28 which I will discuss further on in this presentation.

This aerial shows the subject property in red, and the Arlington Heights Ford Dealership in blue immediately to the north along Dundee Road. General Electric is adjacent to the south, and multi-tenant office and industrial buildings are located to the east and to the west. Access is provided to the site from two access points on North Ridge Avenue. Additionally, there is an internal drive connection between the Arlington Heights Ford Dealership and the subject site. As both sites will operate independent of each other, Staff has no concerns with this interconnection. However, if the intensity of the usage of the subject property increases or each of the sites begin to rely on each other for code-required parking, a PUD would be required in the future.

The zoning of the subject site and the surrounding area south of the commercial properties on Dundee Road is all M-1. The existing land uses in the surrounding area are generally multi-tenant industrial/office buildings, and the development context surrounding North Ridge Avenue is industrial in nature.

The proposed site plan shows no exterior modifications to the parking, access or drive aisles. Phase I and II shown on the slide are the two vacant tenant spaces that the Petitioner wishes to establish the commercial auto repair use within. Staff worked with the Petitioner to ensure that the storage of any motor vehicle parts, such as batteries or tires,

APPROVED

5

would occur within the building or any screened enclosure or structure. The Petitioner has indicated that no outdoor storage of any motor vehicle parts would occur on site, and a condition of approval has been recommended by the Staff Development Committee (SDC) to that effect.

Staff reviewed the existing landscape conditions on North Ridge Avenue and found that the code-required landscaping for the parking lot screening was inadequate to properly screen the subject site. Code requires that all off-street parking areas shall be effectively screened from any adjoining public way, and the screenings shall be at least three feet high on the frontage of that public way. A condition of approval has been recommended by the SDC for the Petitioner to provide a landscape plan and then plant the landscaping to comply with code requirements.

These are the proposed interior floor plans for Phase I on the north and Phase II on the south. The two vacant spaces are approximately 55,000 square feet and show 31 vehicle service bays, offices, part storage, restrooms, and a photo studio and a wash bay. As referenced in the Staff report, the Petitioner originally submitted plans for exterior modification to this building to include painting on the brick to match the Ford Dealership to the north, corrugated metal finishes at the building entrances, and signage.

The scope of this modification would require Design Commission application. However, the Petitioner has elected to remove the exterior modifications from this petition and only pursue the land use variation at this time. The Petitioner is aware that the potential future exterior modifications would require a Design Commission application prior to any building permit issuance and is working with Staff on that future submittal. The SDC has recommended a condition of approval regarding this process as well.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you, Dan.

Is there a motion to include the Staff report in the public record?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Second?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: The motion passes, thank you.

Just a clarification, Mr. O'Connor. You indicated that you did review the five conditions in your approval and you're okay with those conditions, correct?

MR. O'CONNOR: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Why don't we start down if there are any questions from the Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'll wait until after public hearing.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right.

Mary Jo?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I have no questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Bruce?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Right here.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Oh, wait, Joe. Look at that, hiding behind the

APPROVED

6

shadow. What have you got?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, there was mention about the truck service closing. I'm just curious, are those in the Arlington Heights area or in Arlington Heights?

MS. SMITH: They were not in the Arlington Heights area. One of the closer ones was out by Melrose Park.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, that's all. All right, thank you.

MS. SMITH: So, we're trying to take on some of that business.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I do have a question.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Fire away.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Is there any painting or body working going on in this facility?

MS. SMITH: Absolutely not. We have our own body shop at the old Bill Stasek Chevrolet store in Wheeling and it's now a Tasca store.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, down at the other end, John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, it will be just mechanical service, not any body work; is that correct?

MS. SMITH: Hundred percent correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, and you agree, nothing would be stored outside, I mean, as far as parts, tires, anything of that nature?

MS. SMITH: Absolutely not. We have the proper storage that's up to code in the Arlington Heights Ford building.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay. All right, I have no other questions at this point.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks.

Terry?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I have a question, but it is I think better directed to Staff. In condition No. 4, and I've seen this verbiage in other automotive service conditions, we say no storage of inoperable vehicles. Can we define that better? Because how can a car service facility, car dealership have vehicles that aren't inoperable? I mean, you have an engine blow, that car is going to be there, a car, truck, whatever, is going to be there for a while until they can get an engine in. I don't know, maybe you get those in real quick but it's, to me it's an ill-defined condition. I wonder if we can clarify that.

MR. OSOBA: We could take a look at clarifying what the definition of inoperable is and build that into the condition, if that's something that Plan Commission would want us to do before we go to Village Board. I think in general, inoperable just means that we're not going to have vehicles standing in storage for a long period of time that aren't going to be able to be moved, but we can take a look at potentially modifying that.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes, because one person's definition of a, you know, I can understand we do not want a junkyard here, but on the other hand, this just says no storage of inoperable vehicles. From the dealership's standpoint, how do you feel about that wording? Would you like to see that better defined, like long-term storage, or --

MS. SMITH: I mean, what some of the conversation with Dan, I think it was fairly well defined with us. Exactly what you said, they don't want a bunch of vehicles that are not running, sitting in front of the building and taking up space because there's only so many excess

APPROVED

7

spaces, which is why we brought into effect that the other lot we have on University as well as our back lot which currently stores any vehicles that are waiting for parts.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right, which is an inoperable vehicle. Again, I would like to see something more clearly defined.

MR. O'CONNOR: Inoperable for a period of time.

MS. SMITH: Understood.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I think your counsel would agree with that.

MR. O'CONNOR: I would agree with that.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, that's the only thing I have.

MR. O'CONNOR: They may be there because they are inoperable, being brought and towed in.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you. Those are our initial comments. I guess we may have more, so we'll reserve the opportunity to comment. At this point, we'll open the public hearing for comment from the public.

Mr. O'Connor, you guys can sit down for a second.

Let's see if there's anybody on this side of the room who would like to comment on this matter. Anybody?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, we don't see any hands raised. We're going to move over to this side.

Anybody on this side of the room would like to comment on the matter before us here?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: None, okay. No request for public comment, so we will close the public hearing as far as public comments go and we'll come back to the Commissioners. I don't know if your opinion has changed in the last three minutes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I haven't. I really don't have anything further. I think it's a great project. I'm supportive of it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, anybody else? Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of a Land Use Variation to allow Motor Vehicle Repair, Major, within the M-1 District, and the following Variation:

- 1. A variation to Section 6.12-1.3, to waive the requirement for a traffic study by a qualified engineer.**

This recommendation is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The outdoor storage of tires, batteries, or other vehicle repair materials is prohibited on the subject site.**
- 2. Petitioner shall provide a landscape plan demonstrating compliance with the requirements of Section 6.15-1.2, *New Landscaping Requirements*, for parking lot screening along North Ridge Avenue before consideration by the Village Board.**

APPROVED

8

- Code-required landscaping shall be installed no later than September 30, 2024.**
- 3. Design Commission application shall be required for future modifications as depicted in Exhibit II.**
 - 4. Vehicles awaiting repair may only be parked in designated areas. No storage of inoperable vehicles. No vehicles shall be stored in front of the building. Should storage of motor vehicles on the subject property become problematic, at the discretion of the Village, the Petitioner shall be required to reduce or prohibit on-site storage or shall work with the Village to find additional viable off-site storage locations.**
 - 5. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations and policies.**

COMMISSIONER ENNES: With that, I would request that there is clarification to the no storage of inoperable vehicles.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, I think we would ask for a roll call vote here.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Dawson.

(No response.)

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Drost.

(No response.)

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

Congratulations, you have a unanimous positive approval from the Plan Commission. Stay in touch with Dan and he'll let you know about your next step in the process.

MR. O'CONNOR: Thank you.

MS. SMITH: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you.

(Whereupon, at 7:49 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)

APPROVED

9

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: TOTS LAND DAYCARE - 1007 WEST EUCLID AVENUE - PC #24-005
SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A DAYCARE CENTER IN THE B-1 DISTRICT

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,
Illinois on the 10th day of July, 2024 at the hour of 7:49 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director of Planning & Community Development
DAN OSOBA, Planner I

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, the second matter we have on the agenda is the Tots Land Daycare.

Dan, have all public notices been given on that matter?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, they have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks.

Do we have anybody representing the Petitioner here who is going to be speaking? If so, please come up and we'll do the old swearing in. If you could raise your right hand?

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Great. Could you please state your names both for the record?

MS. DWULIT: Anita Dwulit.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We may need spelling on that.

MS. DWULIT: D-w-u-l-i-t, Anita.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, thank you.

MR. DWULIT: And Damian Dwulit, D-w-u-l-i-t.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, thank you. Have you both read the conditions for your approval?

MS. DWULIT: Yes.

MR. DWULIT: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And do you agree with those?

MS. DWULIT: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, very good. What we'll do is have you start, just like we did last time, start your presentation, then we'll move to the Staff.

MS. DWULIT: Yes. So, first, a couple of words about our company. So, Tots Land is a family-owned company and we provide childcare services. The first location was opened in 2009 in Chicago. Then the next one, 2013, also in Chicago. The newest one, 2023, in Roselle. Through these years, we've been always looking for a new place in this area.

We are looking in Mount Prospect, so fairly close, and we know that here is a need for high-quality childcare services. So, once we found the building at 1007 Euclid Avenue, we think that this is a good place to be.

We have knowledge, we have resources and experience, so we believe that this project will be successful.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, anything to add?

MR. DWULIT: No.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, we'll move along to the Staff presentation.

Dan, please.

MR. OSOBA: Okay, the property in question for this Petition is located at 1007 West Euclid Avenue, which is within the B-1 Business District Limited Retail and designated for offices only as the future land use in the Comprehensive Plan. The existing site is the former BMO Harris Bank building that includes a surface parking lot on the north, an approximately 5,000 square-foot building with a bank drive-through, fencing and landscaping.

The Petitioner is proposing a daycare center at this location which requires a special use permit (SUP) within the B-1 District. Two variations are required which will be discussed later on in the presentation.

This aerial shows the subject property highlighted in red at the southwest corner of West Euclid Avenue and North Kennicott Avenue. The Arlington Heights Post Office is located across Kennicott to the east, the Fountain Apartments are located across Euclid to the north, and single-family detached homes are adjacent to the west and to the south.

Access is provided to the site with a full movement access on Kennicott and a restricted ingress only access from West Euclid Avenue. There is a third site access proposed at the southeastern corner of the site onto Kennicott; however, that access is only for loading areas and trash pickup.

The zoning of the site is B-1 Business District Limited Retail. The surrounding zoning and development context is a mix of commercial, low density and medium density residential. This portion of Euclid Avenue as it continues west is residentially zoned and has mostly single-family detached homes.

Given the proximity of residential properties surrounding the site, Staff requested that the Petitioner hold a neighborhood meeting to discuss the project and gather feedback. The Petitioner mailed notice and held a community meeting on May 21st, 2024 at this former BMO Harris Bank building. While the meeting was held, there were no attendees.

The proposed site plan is shown on the slide, and to provide some orientation here, the plan right is north, and it shows the 732 square-foot enclosure which is the former drive-through area in blue, and the five new parking spaces in red which closed off the existing drive-through. The playground equipment is proposed to the west of the building with new landscaping and fencing along the west and southern property lines. Additionally, landscaping is proposed along the building and parking lot frontages.

The interior renovations include new administrative offices, bathrooms, classrooms, playrooms and a commercial kitchen.

For landscaping, Staff reviewed the proposed plan and found that the landscaping along the rear and side of the property should be increased to provide a full year-round landscape screen. Additionally, the trees within the proposed parking lot island are magnolia trees and not suitable for that island. Staff has been working with the Petitioner to provide an updated landscape plan, and the SDC is recommending one condition of approval to that effect.

These are the proposed elevations which are mostly identical to the existing structure. As you can see on the north, west and south elevations, the newly enclosed drive-through area is shown with siding, windows, roof pitch and roof materials to match the existing structure. The Petitioner submitted a Design Commission application for the proposed modifications, and Staff reviewed these proposed changes and administratively approved these improvements as they're consistent with the design of the building and comply with the commercial building design guidelines.

The Petitioner has requested two variances for accessory structures within the side yard and for fencing within the front yard. Due to the location of the existing open space on the site and the need for outdoor play area for a daycare center, the Petitioner has requested a variation to Section 6.5-2 to permit playground equipment which is considered an accessory structure to be located within the side yard. The SDC is supportive of this variation request. The playground equipment is in an appropriate location, approximately 21 feet from the side property line, which is highlighted in blue. The Petitioner has provided measures to ensure that the number of children that are going to be outside at any given time is reduced to 20, and limiting the hours of operation of that outdoor playground area from 9:00 a.m. to noon, and again

from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. The SDC is recommending two conditions of approval to require those limitations with the SUP approval.

Additionally, the Petitioner is providing landscaping and screening between the residential properties and the playground. In furtherance of that screening, the Petitioner is providing a fence along that shared western property line to screen the playground and parking lot from the adjacent residential property. The front yard of the property is highlighted in red on this slide, and the fence that is located in that front yard of the subject site is highlighted in yellow and will not extend further in the face of the house that is to the west of this subject site.

The Petitioner has, therefore, requested a variation to Section 6.13-3.A to allow a six-foot high open and six-foot high solid fence in the front yard where a maximum of 36-inch open fence is required. The SDC also is supportive of this request to provide adequate screening for the residential property to the west, and the fence will not block any sight lines for pedestrian movements or vehicle movements and is set back 25 feet from West Euclid Avenue.

The parking table on the slide shows the parking requirements per code. Based on the employee count of 15, the total number of off-street parking spaces required is 23, and there are 37 spaces on site which includes those five new spaces that are proposed, yielding a surplus of 14 spaces. Additionally, the Petitioner has provided four bicycle parking spaces in compliance with code.

As stated previously, access to the site which is shown on all of the blue rectangles here, there is a full movement access on Kennicott and a restricted ingress only access from West Euclid Avenue, and the third at the southeastern corner is only for trash and loading areas.

The Petitioner has provided a traffic and parking study that evaluated the intersection of North Kennicott and West Euclid Avenues, the egress and ingress of the site, and pickup and drop-off operations of the daycare. The drop-off would occur between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m., and the pickup would occur between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. Vehicles would enter the site from either Euclid or Kennicott, and leave on Kennicott.

Based on the projected number of vehicles, children at the daycare, and projections from other Tots Land locations, the traffic study found that the site access and circulation flows efficiently as designed. The study did consider future improvements on widening the access on Euclid Avenue which would require a future study. The SDC is recommending a condition of approval to require an updated plan and analysis of this access if it is modified.

The Staff Development Committee is recommending approval of the application subject to these conditions outlined on the slide and on the motion sheet before the Plan Commission. That concludes my presentation.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Dan.

Is there a motion to include the Staff report in the public record?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Second?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We will have voice vote. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, the motion carries, thank you.

Why don't we start out with our Plan Commissioners here down,

John, at your end? Any questions for the Petitioner at this time?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, I think it's a good use of this former bank building and I don't really have any questions at this point in time.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Terry?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I have a couple of quick ones. Could we go back to the prior, to this drawing. So, how is traffic coming in? It comes in off of Euclid into the parking lot?

MR. DWULIT: So, you have two options. You can either access from Euclid or you can access from Kennicott Avenue, but the outbound traffic is only through Kennicott Avenue.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, to drop off children, do parents have to park, unload their kids and they come in?

MR. DWULIT: Yes. Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, there isn't a drop-off area like some of the grade schools have and that type of thing?

MR. DWULIT: No. So, they have to physically be in the building and drop off their child and sign the sign-in. We are doing this electronically. We don't do it on paper anymore, but they have to do that in the building.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, the east side of the building, is there, from the drawing, I can't tell real clearly, but is there any vehicle traffic that can go along there?

MR. DWULIT: From the east side of the building?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Along the east side, from the parking lot back to this rear access.

MR. DWULIT: No.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, so that rear access is for like probably garbage trucks, deliveries and that stuff?

MR. DWULIT: Yes, garbage trucks and maybe some loading carrier for some groceries, stuff like that.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, and then one last question. In regard to the fence around the play area, I don't know if I just missed the comments in the report, but that is going to have a six-foot fence all the way around?

MR. DWULIT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Connecting the three sides of the building? Or the two sides of the fence connected to the building in two places?

MR. DWULIT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, where do the kids go out from the building? Where is that?

MR. DWULIT: So, there will be a couple of options. So, they'll be able to select the classroom that have doors directly to the playground. They'll be able to use those doors. But some classroom will have to go and use the main entrance, and there is a little gate and they'll be accessing the playground this way.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, that's all I have. I think this is a great use of that long-abandoned building.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Lynn?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: No, I think it's a great project. I don't have any questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Mary Jo?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Joe?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: What is the total number of children expected to be in the building?

MR. DWULIT: At maximum, 91.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Pardon me?

MR. DWULIT: Maximum of 91.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Anything else, Joe? Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No, that's all. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Bruce?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No questions. I think it's great.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, at this point, we will move on to public comments.

If you two want to just take a quick seat?

Is there anybody on this side of the room, maybe starting in front here, that want to comment on this matter? Moving back, anybody? Back?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No, okay. This side of the room, do we have anybody that wants to speak on this matter?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No, okay. Well, I guess, again, we will close the public comments for the public hearing and we will have a final deliberation, if any, by the Plan Commissioners, or if there's a motion.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I'll make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of a Special Use Permit for a Day Care Center on the subject property within the B-1 Business District Limited Retail, and the following Variations:

1. Variation to section 6.5-2, to permit playground equipment, which is considered an accessory structure to be located within the side yard.
2. Variation to Section 6.13-3.A, to allow a six-foot high open and six-foot high solid fence in the front yard where a maximum 36-inch high open fence is permitted and where a solid fence is prohibited.

This recommendation is subject to the following conditions:

1. Petitioner shall limit the capacity of each outdoor playground area to 20 children at any given time.
2. Petitioner shall limit the hours of operation of the outdoor playgrounds to be 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
3. Petitioner shall provide an updated plan and analysis of the access into the site from West Euclid Avenue to the Village if the ingress only access on West Euclid Avenue is proposed to be modified to permit two-way traffic.
4. Petitioner shall provide an updated landscape plan demonstrating compliance with

the requirements of Section 6.15-1.2, *New Landscaping Requirements*, and shall install it before October 1, 2024.

- 5. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations and policies.**

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll second that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, Dan, why don't we do a roll call?

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Dawson.

(No response.)

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Drost.

(No response.)

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

Congratulations, once again we have a unanimous approval. This is a positive approval from the Plan Commission. We're not the final decision maker, but please keep in contact with Dan and he'll talk to you about your next steps in the process for Village Board. Thank you, congratulations.

(Whereupon, at 8:01 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: RECREATION PARK - 500 EAST MINER STREET - PC #24-007
PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, REZONING,
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,
Illinois on the 10th day of July, 2024 at the hour of 8:01 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director of Planning & Community Development
DAN OSOBA, Planner I

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, I think we have one more public hearing, Dan, and that is the Recreation Park matter.

If our friends want to come up from Recreation Park or Park District?

Dan, have all public notices been given on this one?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, they have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right.

So, gentlemen, if you could please raise your right hand?

(Witnesses sworn.)

MR. OSOBA: Thank you. Can you please say and spell your name for our court reporter?

MR. KRAMER: John Kramer, K-r-a-m-e-r, J-o-h-n.

MR. KONTERS: Steve Konters, K-o-n-t-e-r-s.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you very much. Have you gentlemen read the Staff report and do you agree to the conditions of approval Staff has laid out?

MR. KONTERS: Correct. We have and we do.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you. All right, so why don't you folks go ahead and get started with your presentation before we move on to Staff?

MR. KRAMER: Chairman, Commissioners, good evening. It was approximately two years ago that the District staff came before with plans of Recreation Park. As you know, Recreation Park has been in the plans for a phased improvement for many, many years. We are pleased to bring to you the first phase of that this evening.

Roughly, \$24 million has been awarded or budgeted for these improvements, of which over \$4 million is grant funding. The project largely is improvements to the existing site. I'm going to turn it over to Steve Konters who is going to walk through largely the Phase I improvements in the PowerPoint presentation.

MR. KONTERS: All right, thank you for having us here tonight to further explain this to you. We're going to go over just the quick existing conditions of the park that exists out there today and the context around the park. We're going to give you a little bit of background to some of the community input that we had during the grant application and the preliminary planning of the project. We'll go over the post-improvements specifically for our Phase I and just give you a broad overview of what the other phases include as well. Then we're going to focus in a little bit on some of the primary recreation elements that are in Phase I, to use some better imagery of what those components might look like. Then there's a few zoning variances that we are here to request as well, we'll go through those variances in detail, and then we'll open it back up for the process and the questions and the comments.

So, with that, before you here, you've got, north is to the top of the slide at this. So, you see Recreation Park there which is just to the north of Northwest Highway, with Belmont to the west, and Douglas to the east, separating two of the park parcels. As the existing park, as we kind of work our way from south to north, along Northwest Highway, there are currently some commercial buildings and pavement that have since been, those leases expired and those are going to be planned for demolition. We'll be talking about that in a little bit more detail as well.

Then as you continue to walk farther north, you've got the baseball field, and a lot of that open space between Northwest Highway and the field is utilized, as many know, for the festival, the annual festival. As we continue our way north, we have the parking lot north of the back ball field, the three tennis courts west of that, and then we've got the pool and

the bathhouse, and the other buildings just north of that parking lot. To the west of the pool is the existing playground. Then further north, you can just sort of see is more of the open space and the landscaping and the entrance to the current building at that particular location. Then east of Douglas is additional park property, but we are proposing many improvements as part of this master plan for that particular parcel.

So, as part of our grant process back in 2022, we did host a couple of community meetings to review preliminary plans, get community feedback at that point in time, and continued to finalize plans for both Park Board approval and submittal for the IDNR OSLAD grant application for Phase I, which the Park District was awarded that grant. So, that's why the project is moving forward here tonight.

This the phasing plan over on the right-hand side and a little description of each phase along the left. So, just sort of giving you a little bit of an overview of the exhibit, the red dashed outline represents primarily the Phase I project that we're talking about in a little more detail here tonight. Then as you work your way sort of to the east and north, the blue lot represents Phase II, and then the green line farthest north represents Phase III. Then within Phase I, there are a couple of areas outlined in black dashed lines that represent those building areas that are going to be demolished and converted back to open space.

As part of the Phase I improvements, we're going to go to another plan for that. For purposes of being able to zoom in a little bit more for legibility, we do change the orientation out here a little bit here. So, now north is going to the right, and Northwest Highway is along the left side of the slide. So, the red outline is what we've mentioned was Phase I, and working out way from left to right, along Northwest Highway, notice that there's a new concrete 10-foot walkway. So, that walkway was put in, in conversations with Village Staff, to help sort of envision the part of the bikeway plan that the Village has to do that kind of extension, a multi-use path along Northwest Highway, along with several new shade trees along the streetscape and the right-of-way as well as part of the conversation with Staff to add those additional trees.

Both at the upper corner and the lower corner will be new pedestrian park entries to collect people from the sidewalks, the neighborhoods and the train station from across Northwest Highway into the park. As we look at the lower left corner and that entrance into the park, you'll see sort of that pathway sort of winds up and around a new skate park, into that area right there that is labeled as I is the new skate park that we'll have an image for you that shows that, what that representation is. Then J, just a little bit sort of to the top of that, that open space, that's going to be a native landscaped area, part of the stormwater requirements that we need to meet. A lot of that area lawn, so that turf open space, while that smaller space is the native planting, there'll be more turf stormwater storage in that area. So, much of what was pavement and buildings is being converted to open space and usable park space and stormwater storage space.

We're trying to maintain as much open space to the south of the property as possible for, you know, not just open play and open park use but also for the continued use of the annual festival that occurs here. Many of their tent layouts and operations and access for the festival setup happen along the south side, so we made sure that we worked hand-in-hand with that committee to make sure this layout works for them and is not in the way of any of their tents or other structures that they'll have up there on an annual basis.

Then we continue, we'll replace the pathway and we're going to have a brand new pathway, so you'll see all along that light grey area that's labeled as G, that sort of

leads from the two corners along the outfield of the baseball field, works its way further north between the field and the new tennis courts and just making sure that we've got new pathways and accessibility to every single component in Phase I.

As we kind of work our way further north, we've mentioned the three tennis courts, so those are brand new renovated tennis courts. They are shifted a little farther south than the current location, and the shifting south allows for some of the new amenities, and especially that new parking lot. So, the small parking lot being added just off of Belmont Avenue there that you'll see labeled as C, there's about 19 spaces there. It not only provides better access to the park and those new amenities, but it provides additional handicap parking spaces, because the new playground north of that is intended to be a fully inclusive playground. So, not just having the inclusive play experience, but making sure we've got plenty of handicap parking spaces nearby to that playground to accommodate, you know, that special use of that kind of a playground. We'll have images for that playground for you further in the presentation.

Just sort of south of the playground which is in sort of a blue color, there's a smaller blue square you'll notice, and that's labeled as D, that's a small, there's outdoor fitness equipment. So, that's meant, so that, you know, older kids and parents can be there working out on outdoor fitness equipment, maybe while their children are over at the playground, or even if people are just using the pathway and stopping by that area, but outdoor fitness has been a big trend in parks and so we're seeing that, you know, more often.

Then one last thing to point out in that sort of central west area, just north and to the right of the tennis courts labeled as E are a few lawn games, specifically the bagger boards. So, while, you know, a horseshoe course used to be sort of the lawn game in the past, and so the new lawn games are the bagger boards, it was a residential kind of a yard game but it's really turned into more of a public game. So, these are meant to be illustration images of those as well. Then we've got some more rain gardens in those areas to make sure that we're continuing to add native plantings and pollinated plants as well as areas that can handle some of the stormwater in addition to runoff.

Then as we kind of work our way further north of A, the playground, we're really not touching much of the farthest northwest corner, because that's where most of the large and mature trees are. So, we're trying to make sure that we're working the playground in and amongst many of the existing trees and maintaining much of that open space with many mature trees in that northwest corner and connecting with some of the existing walkways there to not disturb that area too much. Along that walkway, Walkway B, the Park District does intend to partner with the Library to do like a storybook walk along that particular area as well.

Was there anything that I may have overlooked, John, that I should have captured?

MR. KRAMER: No, I think you've covered it.

MR. KONTERS: All right, so a few images, and then we'll get to the variances. So, these are a couple of renderings, preliminary renderings of the playground area. It is meant to be, like we said, fully inclusive. So, you kind of see up in the upper left, that will ramp up to a ramp structure, so again fully accessible to those ramps that lead to every single deck. Now, those lower areas are accessible as well. It's got the train theme, so you know, because of the station that is nearby, we worked with the District to come up with a special theme for this park and this playground. It's going to be a fully inclusive surface as well, not just the equipment but the surface.

Some of the other items we talked about, the bag-toss games, you

know, well, the public ones are precast concrete so they're durable and hold up to public use and weathering. The skate park is going to be a concrete skate park, and again something that's durable, holding up to that public use. In that southeast corner, the tennis courts, just like current tennis courts, are going to be asphalt pavement with color coding. We're going to talk in a little bit more detail about the fencing and the variances and the lighting, and then the outdoor fitness equipment as well having some accessible components since it's going to be next to the inclusive playground.

So, with that, I'm going to turn it back over to John to go through some of the variances.

MR. KRAMER: We are requesting to waive the requirement for the traffic and parking study. We're looking to request to increase the fence height from six to 10 feet. This is basically based on the fact that tennis standard is traditionally 10 feet. That's what the existing fence is indicated at, so we would add additional arborvitaes for screening on that site in order to provide some additional blockage from those residences that abut that. We request to permit the tennis courts in the required side yard. Proposed tennis is located 5.3 from the property line; the existing is 3.5 feet.

Then we request to allow 12 accessory structures, as Steve has outlined before. Basically, the playground shelter, the skate park shelter, well, the skate park itself, the tennis courts, restroom facility, basketball, or excuse me, baseball dugouts and baseball field storage shed. Then requesting to allow the sports lights from 40 feet to 50 feet, which based on photometrics we believe would be less of an impact based on that height increase.

MR. KONTERS: So, with that, we'll turn it back over to Commission and Staff.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Great, thank you very much for that.

Dan, can we go ahead with the Staff report please?

MR. OSOBA: Sure.

All right, the property in question for this petition is located at 500 East Miner Street, although there are several other addresses and PINs included in this petition. The subject property consists of Arlington Heights Park District-owned properties in the expanded area of Recreation Park, as highlighted by the Petitioner, which is approximately 18.3 acres. The Park District acquired three residential properties along North Belmont Street and four existing commercial properties on East Northwest Highway. These properties and the existing portions of the Recreation Park are intended to be consolidated into a single, cohesive park development.

The requested action that is listed here and in the Staff report include an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, rezoning, a planned unit development, and a special use permit, and each one of those will be discussed further in detail later in the presentation. Additionally, the Petitioner is requesting five variations to Chapter 28. These are regarding the requirement for a traffic and parking study, accessory structure requirements and limits, and light pole height. Again, these will be discussed later on in the presentation.

The subject property, highlighted in red on the slide, shows the consolidated properties including the Park District-owned property to the east across North Douglas Avenue. It should be noted that the American Legion Post 208 at the corner of Douglas and Miner Street and the residential property at 15 South Belmont are excluded from this application as they are not owned by the Park District.

The properties within the proposed redevelopment are designated parks, commercial, moderate density multifamily, and single-family detached by the

Comprehensive Plan. The existing designations are shown on the left on the slide. In an effort to consolidate the park development and make the future land use designation of the Comprehensive Plan consistent for the development, the Petitioner proposes an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to designate all properties within Recreation Park as parks. The proposed condition is shown on the right of the slide showing the full consolidation.

This proposal is consistent with the existing conditions of the park and the surrounding single-family detached or moderate density residential context. It will continue to provide amenities and open space for recreation. The future land use designation of parks for the entirety of Recreation Park is consistent with the spirit and intent of the Comprehensive Plan by providing an expansion of the park area which is a guiding principle of Chapter 5, Recreation, within the Comprehensive Plan.

The subject properties are currently zoned P-L Public Lands, R-6 Multiple Family Dwelling District, B-3 General Service, Wholesale and Motor Vehicle District, and M-2 Limited Heavy Manufacturing District. The existing zone is shown on the left on the slide and is part of the consolidation of these properties in Recreation Park as a redevelopment. The Petitioner proposes to rezone the properties that are not zoned P-L Public Land District to the P-L District for one consistent zoning for all of Recreation Park.

The facilities that are owned or operated by the Arlington Heights Park District are permitted in the P-L district with a special use permit, whereas other zone districts do not permit the use outright. The requested rezoning will remove nonconformities of newly acquired Park District property within Recreation Park and provide a Zoning District that permits the Park District owned and operated facilities that require a special use permit.

Since these properties are being rezoned to P-L, a special use permit for the following land use would be required: facilities owned and operated by the Village of Arlington Heights, Arlington Heights Memorial Library and branches thereof, and the Arlington Heights Park District on the subject property. The Staff Development Committee reviewed the proposed justification for special use permit approval that was submitted by the Petitioner and is in support of the proposed special use permit request.

The land use is necessary for the public convenience and enjoyment of the site as it has been a significant park, open space and recreation area in the Village for 85 years. If approved, the proposed special use permit will cover the Arlington Heights Park District facility, land use for Recreation Park, and that portion of property owned by the Park District on the southeast corner of East Miner Street and North Douglas Avenue. The proposed land use is an existing facility that is expanding to accommodate new and upgraded park land and provide public convenience at this location and will not be a detriment to the health, safety, morals or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity. The Staff Development Committee is, therefore, supportive of the proposed special use permit.

This planned unit development, or PUD, shows the phasing for the full redevelopment of Recreation Park. The subject of this application is Phase I, which is highlighted in red, and consists of the western and southern improvements as highlighted by the Petitioner. The demolition of the structures acquired by the Park District along Northwest Highway is included in Phase IA and highlighted in black. The infrastructure and public improvement requirements for the multi-use path which is eight feet, the closure of curb cuts, and landscaping along East Northwest Highway are included in this phase but contingent on Phase 1A which includes the on-site demolition of the commercial buildings and structures on East Northwest Highway.

The eight-foot multi-use path along Northwest Highway is highlighted in yellow on the slide, and the current sidewalk condition is a carriage walk and it has an inconsistent width. As part of this Phase I and the timing and demolition of Phase IA, the sidewalk will be set back behind the parkway with landscaping along the street frontage for a safer and more comfortable pedestrian experience. The condition of approval regarding curb cut, closure and public improvement timing have been recommended by the SDC.

It should be noted that the Petitioner is also requesting a variance to waive the requirement for the traffic and parking study as required by all PUDs. The SDC is supportive of the requested variation as the proposed application will not result in any increase in traffic and parking demand on the subject property.

There are three variance requests for accessory structures in particular. The first one is to Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3.B, a variance to increase the fence height from six to 10 feet around the tennis courts. The second is to Chapter 28, Section 6.5-2, a variance to permit the tennis courts which are considered an accessory structure to be located within the required side yard of the site, and Chapter 28, Section 6.5-2, a variation to allow 12 accessory structures on that subject zoning lot where four accessory structures are permitted on a lot that's 10,000 square feet or larger.

For the fence height, the Petitioner has requested a 10-foot fence to ensure that tennis balls remain on the tennis court as much as they possibly can. The fence location is shown in green on the slide if you can see that. This type of fencing is typical for tennis courts as described and is the existing condition. The Staff Development Committee is supportive of this request.

For the location of the tennis court, this is considered a sport court and an accessory. Accessory structures are only permitted in the rear of the property, and this is located 5.3 away from the side property line. The Staff Development Committee worked with the Petitioner to attempt to reorient the courts to allow for a larger setback; however, the Petitioner found that the tennis courts should be in a north-south orientation instead of an east-west orientation to reduce sun glare. The Petitioner has proposed an additional 28 emerald green arborvitae adjacent to the tennis courts to mitigate this variance request. Given the site constraints and the landscaping proposed, the SDC is also supportive of this request.

Lastly, the Petitioner is requesting a variation to permit 12 accessory structures on their zoning lot instead of the maximum of four. Given these structures provide for the expansion of a public park and provide amenities offered by the redevelopment, the SDC is supportive of this request. These structures are also highlighted in brown on the slide.

The last variance request, the Petitioner is requesting a variance to Section 10.2-12.3.C to permit a light pole at 50 feet instead of a maximum of 40 feet. The four light poles adjacent to the tennis courts are the ones that are circled in red on the slide. The Petitioner worked with Staff to provide photometric analysis shown on the slide that demonstrates the lighting levels would exceed code-required maximum foot candle levels on the adjacent residential properties if the light fixtures were proposed at 40 feet in height. The SDC reviewed these findings and determined that the light pole height at 50 feet was the minimum variance necessary as the added height of the poles is less of a nuisance than glare on adjacent residential properties; therefore, the SDC is also in support of this variance request.

The site is currently encumbered by a portion of a public right-of-way located on the subject site and highlighted in red. This is a remnant portion of the Haddow Street alley which is proposed to be vacated concurrently with this application. There are existing

overhead utilities in this right-of-way, and the Petitioner has been coordinating with ComEd on an easement to cover these facilities once the right-of-way is vacated. The completion of the easement dedication and subsequent future vacation are recommended conditions of the SDC.

The Staff Development Committee is recommending approval of this application subject to these conditions as outlined on this slide and the next one and on your motion sheets before Plan Commission. That does conclude my presentation.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks, Dan, nice job.

Do we have a motion to include the Staff report in the public record.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, second?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, we'll do a voice vote. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Motion carries, thank you.

Okay, we'll start out with the Plan Commissioners. Why don't we start out down by Lynn?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, I think I'd rather wait and hear public comment before asking questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, Mary Jo?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Same for me.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes, public comment first.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, Bruce?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Public comment.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Gentlemen?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I just want to clarify. That Park District area to the east of Douglas, nothing is happening there?

MR. OSOBA: No, correct. That is part of the PUD and the special use permit approval, but there's no improvements on that.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: And these pole lights that we're asking to go 50 feet, those are only along the tennis courts, just four of them?

MR. OSOBA: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: And not elsewhere on this park property?

MR. OSOBA: That is correct, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, that's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Terry?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I have a couple of questions before we go to public comment. First, I've got to say, Arlington Heights has fantastic park facilities and programs. Can we go to the, I think it was the Petitioner's existing conditions slide? I think it was the first one, I might be wrong.

MR. OSOBA: Is that the one you're looking for?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes, please. Is there going to be any change to the baseball field, the main baseball field's configuration and layout?

MR. KONTERS: Not, there won't be any improvements to the baseball field in Phase I. In a later phase, there will be improvements, but not a change to its orientation or

location. The improvements are primarily going to be improvements to some of the field drainage, providing some netting along the side lines to have better protection from foul balls, and improving the player and fan areas.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, so the existing parking for that field is going to stay the same?

MR. KONTERS: That parking lot is going to be renovated as well.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: The one at the north end?

MR. KONTERS: The one to the north of the ball field will be renovated and likely reoriented.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, most of my concern is in regard to the properties along Belmont and Arlington Heights. Are some of those real estate improvements on Northwest Highway still there? Are any of the commercial properties still there?

MR. KONTERS: The commercial buildings?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. KONTERS: Yes. Those buildings are still there.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: They're still there. Has the Park District applied for exemptions for that land yet? Exemptions from real estate tax?

MR. KRAMER: Correct, we have.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: You have. There's no renting of any of those properties anymore?

MR. KRAMER: The last rental ended approximately two months ago.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Two months ago.

MR. KRAMER: And both of, all the demolition of the three existing properties are what we're terming Phase IA in this. So, we've currently gone out to bid on the demo of those properties.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, you didn't get an exemption from the real estate taxes while you were still collecting rent, did you?

MR. KRAMER: The only exemption that I have in hand currently was the Shell property that had gone, that I had asked my finance director about. At present, I will have to check and get an answer to that question to be a 100 percent.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, I'd have a problem if you were still collecting rent and were exempt. Can you give me an idea of how much property tax, taking those properties around that corner in Belmont and Northwest Highway, can you give me an idea of how much property tax has been taken out of the bill to exempt that? I love the open space, it looks beautiful with your slide coming up with that open space, it looks great. I do have a problem pulling commercial property out of the real estate, we're losing a lot in town, it's hard to develop, we've got a lot of vacancies, and I know this was done a number of years ago.

But do you have any idea how much tax you're taking off the roll which affects all of our property tax always because they've got to make that up?

MR. KRAMER: I would have to come back to you with that information. I do not have that at this time.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Well, if you could provide that to the Board when you go to them, that would be adequate, because I'll use the information from them.

The notch-out property along Belmont, why wasn't that taken for the open space? What is that?

MR. KRAMER: Existing private residence.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: A single-family? A private residence?

MR. KRAMER: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Single-family. Who is that owned by, do you know? Well, maybe she'll comment on it later, okay. I don't want to see you taking somebody's home, I just wondered why there was a piece of property that didn't get taken when all the others were.

Let's see. That's all I have for the time being.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I just have one question. Just from a safety perspective with the open space along Northwest Highway, was there any consideration given to like a decorative fence or something like that to shield potential people or kids using that southerly area of the park beyond the baseball outfield and, you know, with that open space and we have Northwest Highway right there, is that a concern? Has that been looked at?

MR. KRAMER: It's been looked at. There is a retention area and a large majority of that which will not be conducive for open play, so largely there is not going to be a lot of free play that goes on there that would spill over into the multi-use path. The planting of the trees was a portion of that consideration as well as the orientation of the skate park as well, too.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, well, I think at this point, gentlemen, you can take a rest. Thank you.

We can open it up for public comments here at this point in time.

MR. KRAMER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes. We'll start on this side of the room. Anybody in the first couple of rows here that would like to speak? Okay, we'll move on to the lady who's raising her hand. Sure, you could come on up to the podium please. State your name and if you could just spell it for the record? If you want to give us your residence, you're welcome to do that.

MRS. OTTOLINO: Yes, I'm Barbara Ottolino. Barbara Ottolino, 15 South Belmont. My house is the little tooth in the park that you were talking about.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay.

MRS. OTTOLINO: The concern that myself and the residents across the street have is about lighting. We're meeting with the Park District. We have met with them in the past. Going back, my property in '74, well, there was no ball field. There were houses completely, residences completely from the tennis courts down to the gas station. Times change and I accept that. If you want to live next to a park, you have to be willing to tolerate as well as enjoy the benefits of park residence so to speak.

But there is a concern about lighting as it will affect the houses across the street from me as well as my own from the tennis courts. We're concerned, we've always been concerned about traffic. As a person whose best friend's 11-year-old daughter was killed by a car in a crosswalk, I know it can happen. We're concerned about the number of people who come off Northwest Highway and tear up Belmont at excessive speed. We'd like to see some of that traffic slowed down. We've talked about it for years with the Village off and on, and with the Park District, and it came up when the gas station was sold. There were discussions with the Village Board.

Some residents would like to see a stop sign at Wing just to slow traffic down there. We're going to have a parking lot where people are going to be coming in to the park. We're also concerned about the fact that once you pave more of the park, that's gone forever.

When the Park met with us and talked about accessory parking that they were planning, they said that all of those spaces would be for handicapped. I can't see 19 handicapped spaces. I'd like to see how many of those are still planned for handicapped. I know that the Park District was planning to share parking with the Library which is up on Miner. That was part of their agreement when the Library opened their facility. So, I can't imagine all of those would be handicapped.

Presently, north of the ball field, there are 57 I believe parking spaces that run along the north side of the ball field. Those are never used. We've had discussions with the Park District about the fact that those aren't used and that's a paved area. I know there will be changes there, but adding 19 more spaces, we're just seeing concrete starting to be introduced to the park more than grass.

I've been criticized for maintaining my residence there. That's my home. I didn't buy it to make a killing to sell it to the Park or to anyone else. I bought it because I wanted to live in that area. At the time that I purchased my home, it was a very different area. So, I plan to stay there a while longer, and eventually I'm sure the Park will have that land to add to their open land, but there is concern from the neighborhood about the amount of paving that's going on.

For the most part, I have no other comments except that the question that was raised about the fencing along Northwest Highway I think is one that should be taken into consideration. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you very much.

MS. OTTOLINO: Did you have any questions for me?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We'll take questions from the rest of the -- we'll have public statements and then we'll go back.

MS. OTTOLINO: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Anyone else on this side of the room?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you. We'll move over to this side of the room. Do we have any? Yes, sir, you're raising your hand. Why don't you come up if you could? State your name, spell it for our reporter and share your thoughts.

MR. FORREST: I'm Brian Forrest, F-o-r-r-e-s-t. So, I'm a resident of Belmont, I live there with my family. I'm generally supportive of the project but have some safety concerns that I'm hopeful that the Village can assist with.

So, as Barb mentioned, you know, this block of Belmont does have some traffic issues right now with a lot of cars that cut through to get to and from Northwest Highway. They're often speeding which is especially problematic given how close it is to the park and to people, especially kids needing to cross the street to get to the park. The Belmont and Wing intersection right across from the playground is currently uncontrolled, and to cross there you have to look left and right for speeding cars coming from Northwest Highway. You also have to look back to Wing Street, and then now with the introduction of the parking lot, it's going to be another place that you have to look to make sure that it's safe to cross.

So, as someone with kids, it can be dangerous and can be scary. It's, you know, I think about as, you know, my kid gets older, crossing there, it seems like it can be problematic. I've heard concerns from, you know, other neighbors as well. So, I would just ask that the Village adds a three-way stop sign at the Belmont and Wing intersection which would

make it safer across the street and reduce speeding. I think now would be the best time to improve the situation rather than waiting for an accident to happen.

Additionally, I just had a question about the justification for the variance to waive the traffic study. To me, you know, I heard that this proposal won't result in increased traffic in the area. That seems illogical to assume without the traffic study. You know, at the very least, I would think a traffic study should be done to support that assertion. I don't want to derail the project at this point but just could use help understanding why that requirement was skipped.

So, that's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you very much.

MR. FORREST: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Appreciate that.

Is there anyone else in the public that has not spoken that would like to speak?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, at this time, we will close the public comments section. I would ask Steve and John, if you would mind, please coming back up? I just have a few follow-up questions, and then maybe some of the other Commissioners do.

Just addressing some of the issues that were brought up by our residents. Could you speak a little bit to the lighting and maybe bring up the lighting plan? I think you did a photometric study, and maybe explain what that means with the combination of the height of poles and the lighting standards that you're meeting to make sure that the spillover is minimal?

MR. KONTERS: Well, first of all, with just replacement of the lights means that they'll be more energy efficient and already better glare control. But the fact that going to a taller pole allows you to angle it down further to get the spread that you need to have safe playing during the dusk hours, that's what we're trying to provide is to make sure that we have a certain amount of lighting across the court for safety and playing during the dusk hours. To get sort of that distribution of light, we'd have a certain angle. So, the higher we can get, the more those angles can be directed down and not outward, and so the higher pole allows that light spill to be within the court as opposed to going outside the court.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And as we look at the chart here and your numbers, because you just explained where we have, you know, when you measure it across the far side of Belmont, those are some very low numbers, what that means, compared to what's on the court?

MR. KONTERS: Yes, these are, our electrical engineer will speak into it in more detail, but I can give you a little bit of a high level overview. So, basically, those are foot candle readings of what you see on the court. So, what you're seeing across the court are things that are in the 30's and 40's, and what you're seeing outside and across are things that are even underneath, in decimals, underneath the one. Is this the existing or proposed? I want to make sure what we're showing.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: That's proposed.

MR. KONTERS: That's the proposed, okay.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And I guess the technology advancement in lighting and everything, is it correct to assume that, you know, lights and stuff that are, you know, 10-15 years old are pretty fairly obsolete compared to what you're putting into this to control the

spillage, is that accurate?

MR. KONTERS: Correct, yes. So, with just the improved technology will help with that as well, including the, you know, types of shields that they have to help direct the lighting where it needs to go.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: If you could also just talk briefly about, there was a question about handicap spaces within the parking lot adjacent to the tennis courts. It looks to me like maybe there's four spaces in there, or four or five? Is that --

MR. KONTERS: Right, if you can go back to that plan? Then we could show the quantity in there.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I think there was a statement that maybe all of them were going to be handicap at some point, although I'm not sure why that would be the case.

MR. KONTERS: Yes, I'm not sure where that statement came from, but that's not the statement we're making tonight.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, you do expect to have --

MR. KONTERS: So, yes, we're trying to put the handicap parking closest to the north and the northwest so it would be nearest to the playground spaces. Then the other part, so you can see along, you have about three handicap spaces that are all the north spaces, and then two that are kind of a shared space in that northeast corner of the parking lot.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay.

MR. KONTERS: And then the remaining stalls along the east side and along the west side are standard stalls. On the south is just a space to allow people to turn around and exit the parking lot.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, got you. Okay, and then my other thought, my other question would be, there was a question about the traffic study. Is it your opinion that, I mean, as far as the usage number, is the usage going to be generally the same? Is that why you're looking for a way around that?

MR. KONTERS: That would be our opinion. I mean, we're primarily replacing amenities that exist out there today for the most part.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, and my last, I'll shut up in a second here and turn it over to my colleagues, but there were some comments about Belmont Avenue traffic as it currently exists. I don't know that there's anything, you know, other than maybe this parking lot, but it sounds to me like there are issues currently that the citizens have concerns over which I would ask, you know, Dan, maybe that's something we need to look at with our folks. You know, I don't know if a stop sign can be put up there, a speed bump or whatever, but it doesn't sound like it's really being driven by the changes that the Park District is making as much as the current condition that we really need to I think do justice to the residents here to figure that out.

MR. OSOBA: Certainly, and our Public Works Department did make comment on that on one of the original reviews on potential adding of the stop sign and did not feel that it was necessary based on the proposal that we have before us tonight. Yes, that is something that we can take a look at and request to maybe further study on.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, I would say because they're looking at it in terms of changes, but they may not know all the current issues that our residents have just brought up. Okay, I'll be quiet, I promise.

Lynn?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Just to go to the parking issue, our first

resident indicated that it's her view that we have a lot of spaces that aren't being used right now. Normally, we do the traffic study to make sure we have adequate parking, but do we have any evidence or data that will shed some light on whether we have a bunch of unused parking that is now paving which could be turned into green space? Can we talk a little bit about that?

MR. KONTERS: Yes, so I don't know if we have any hard data, but I just know that from our conversations with the Park District as we're doing the planning, so understand that a lot of that parking lot is unutilized because of the issue where it's adjacent to the ball field. So, people are not willing or wanting to park their cars there because of some of those challenges that could happen, the safety concerns of foul balls. So, that's why in a future phase, we are looking at, as we renovate that parking lot because it is in old aging condition so it does need renovation, we're looking at the possibility of reorienting it so it's more north-south along Douglas which would bring back additional open space to the interior of the park, move that parking farther away from the baseball field. Then we're also, in that future phase, we're adding or propose to add netting, a taller netting along the sidelines to help minimize the amount of foul balls that might come out of the field.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, that's a different phase though, like Phase II or what is that?

MR. KONTERS: That's Phase II, correct.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And when would you, what's the timing that you expect to start and finish Phase II?

MR. KONTERS: So, Phase II is also a grant that the Park District applied for and was awarded. So, that design work is meant to start this summer. Then the scheduled for construction has not been determined yet, but they've got basically a two-year time period for the grant to complete that project.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, our residents' concern might be taken care of but it's going to take a couple of years to get there is what I hear you saying.

MR. KONTERS: As far as improving that parking lot and the parking situation?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, and deciding whether you really need that much pavement. It looks like you're going to give some back to green space in that Phase II is what I hear you saying.

MR. KONTERS: Possibly, yes. The reorientation of that parking lot that we're talking about in the northeast also has some connection to some of the improvements in Phase III. So, there is a lot of interconnectivity because that parking lot will also be serving some of the Phase III building, pool and components. So, as we look at that parking quantity, it's not just about the south part of the park, it's also about those facilities to the north.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, in this phase, I don't know if there's much to be done to address that. It sounds like you've got to deal with it in subsequent phases.

MR. KONTERS: Correct, correct.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And to follow up on what the Chair said, obviously some work by the Village itself ought to deal with the traffic and what we can do to improve the traffic flow and the speed limit on Belmont, which doesn't have anything to do with the, for the most part, with our Petitioner today. I don't really have anything else.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks.

Mary Jo?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes, I just want to say I worked on street

lighting for four years, very familiar with the new LED technology, so I can confirm that it will have less out and up-glare and more down-glare. So, it should improve things. So, I can confirm that you're, you know, speaking from knowledge at that point.

I do hear the residents about the traffic, and I'm all for fixing what can be fixed. I just want to point out though that this is a problem across pretty much the whole Village. I live on a street that connects Kirchhoff to downtown. I have the exact same problem of people speeding down my street. So, I hear you but it's not just Belmont, it's pretty much everywhere. That's all I have to say.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks, Mary Jo.

Joe?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes. So, the parking lot, you know, it makes sense, turning the parking lot makes sense. You know, it would be more convenient to have it near those immediate facilities.

But, Dan, what was the premise for not requiring a parking study? If people are not going to this parking lot, I don't think they could be racing up and down the street. They probably do it, but in general, why wasn't a parking, I mean, a traffic study required?

MR. OSOBA: So, Staff took a look at it from a perspective of we're increasing the park area and reducing the amount of commercial that is on the subject site. So, the commercial uses on Northwest Highway, the gas station included, are a high driver of traffic and parking needs, and because we're removing them from the whole petition, the whole project subject site, the traffic generated by the subject site would, therefore, be reduced. So, we felt that the Petitioner's justification for not requiring or requesting a traffic and parking study was justified.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks.

Bruce, thoughts?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I agree with what everybody has been saying here tonight. I just have a question about the lights. Do you turn it off? I mean, what time do they go off at night?

MR. KONTERS: That's an excellent question. Currently, the baseball field lights stay on the latest. They are 11:00 p.m. The tennis programming, programmatically we will look at it right now, it's estimated between 10:00 and 10:15. Traditionally, what that means is if we schedule the lights to go off at 10:00, then we would have 15 minutes to cool down or allow some way of safe egress out of the park and then officially shut off. So, it could go one of two ways.

The baseball field lights are electronically controlled based on a baseball schedule. Tennis lights are more user driven. If someone comes up, wants to play, they press a button, the lights come on and then stay illuminated for a period of time, and then ultimately go off. But they time out, as I indicated, at 10:00 o'clock with a max set point of 10:15.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Got you. So, no matter what, they go.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, if you're going to play in the dark, you play in the dark, but the lights go off.

MR. KONTERS: Correct. That's a good question.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: John, what do you think?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, I think it's an excellent project. I like what you're doing there to the park, the improvements you're making to the park. The issues on Belmont and the speeding, that's independent of what's happening here. I mean, we've got

people speeding down every street in Arlington Heights, so that's a whole different issue and it's got to be dealt with, whether they put speed bumps or whatever to help that, but I'm all in favor of this project so I really have no other questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Terry?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: A couple of questions. As the father of the son who played baseball on that field, I agree totally as to why people don't park in that lot. Foul tips go right in that lot. First couple of times, wow, look at all this parking, park there, you get hit once or twice, you quit parking there. So, great idea to do that fence up along the side, netting or whatever, and I think that will resolve a lot of the problem.

You know, I hear my fellow Commissioners' comments about the speeders in this town, yes, we have them, but this is a park, one of our biggest parks. What the neighbors have just gone through with the festival and everything, lots of traffic that's put on them and their neighborhood, I can't imagine that they ever try to plan an event during the festival because there's no parking for your friends to park there. If they're open to speed bumps or a stop sign, I would say they should consider it over there, just because of the number of kids walking in and out. I'm also open to the idea of a low three-foot fence or something at the south end of the park to prevent kids from possibly running out into Northwest Highway.

What else did I want to touch on with the traffic? No, that's it. I think we -- oh, could we go back to the foot candles for the tennis court? My biggest concern is the neighbors right across the street, and those were pretty low numbers.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, they were very low.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: All the way across the street, 0.04, 0.09, and that stuff, but when those people look out their front door and the lights are on, whether they're down or whatever, there is this huge lit-up field out their front windows from, you know, the 31's, the 40's and that. Isn't that still true? I mean, that park is going to be lit up.

MR. KRAMER: They will see illuminated park sight from their vantage point, correct. I'm currently working with Mr. Forrest on a similar issue relative to the baseball field lights and re-aiming them. Again, we would look to work on those specific instances as they come up. We've had similar, as Steve alluded, you know, you can put shades on, which is basically blinders for lack of a better term, on the fixture itself to directionalize the light down. Those have helped in what I'll call these cross scenarios where you're looking across the site and you may see more of a hue or a glow coming from the fixture that is focused down.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Could the courts be moved a little bit to the east to put in a row of arborvitae that get up, what do they go, 12-14 feet?

MR. KRAMER: Unfortunately, the orientation of the existing baseball field, the path, you know, has forced us to keep it in that orientation. As was alluded before, the north to south orientation is preferred from a playability standpoint of tennis. That's why, Dan did mention we looked at tilting it 90 degrees. That, unfortunately, was just not an option from a playability standpoint. So, unfortunately, we're almost locked into that location.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: If it's going to be there, yes.

MR. KRAMER: With the number of courts that were staying with, which was part of the public comment that had come out was staying consistent with three courts.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, and I do find, in regard to a parking study, it amazes me that we could spend \$8 million in improvements to the parking, we're not considering any additional use. There's got to be additional use for that kind of expenditure.

MR. KONTERS: Can you define what you mean by additional use?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Coming to the park to use it.

MR. KONTERS: Oh, you mean additional --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Traffic.

MR. KONTERS: Traffic.

MR. KRAMER: Future phases, we'll look at that during that time.

MR. KONTERS: Yes, we could look at that for future phases since future phases are bringing on additional improvements.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes, but that might be why a traffic study might be good now because if you need more parking, I don't know where you'd put it. I'd hate to see this nice, open green space black-topped any more.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Anything else?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: That's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, anybody else have any further comments?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I just have one last question. With the popularity of pickleball, have you looked into putting any pickleball courts in a future phase?

MR. KONTERS: Pickleball court was not discussed here. The proximity to the, excuse me, the proximity to the residents would be a concern. Pickleball has got noise concerns with proximate residents. So, whenever we're looking at pickleball locations, we try to find locations that are farther away from residents.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, that's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Good question.

Anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, so I think, Dan, a couple of follow-up things. Terry brought up the tax revenue issue to be addressed to the Board. Then obviously this traffic issue, and then potentially the fence issue are the things I noted.

Is there a motion from anybody?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of an Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to reclassify certain portions of the subject property from the Commercial Moderate Density Multi-Family and Single-Family Detached classifications to the Parks classification; Rezoning from the R-6 Multiple-Family Dwelling District, B-3 General Service, Wholesale and Motor Vehicle District, and the M-2 Limited Heavy Manufacturing District to the P-L Public Land District for certain portions of the subject property; Planned Unit Development for three phases of park and public improvements on the subject property; and Special Use Permit for facilities owned and operated by the Village of Arlington Heights, Arlington Heights Memorial Library and branches thereof, and the Arlington Heights Park District on the subject property.

This recommendation is subject to the following variations:

- 1. Variation to Section 6.12-1.3, to waive the requirement for a traffic and parking study;**
- 2. Variation to Section 6.13-3.B, to increase the fence height from six feet to 10 feet**

- around the tennis courts;
3. Variation to Section 6.5-2, to permit the tennis courts, which is considered an accessory structure, to be located within the required side yard of the site;
 4. Variation to Section 6.5-2, to allow 12 accessory structures on the subject zoning lot, where four accessory structures on a zoning lot that is 10,000 square feet or larger is permitted; and
 5. Variation to Section 10.2-12.3.C, to permit a light pole at 50 feet instead of the maximum 40 feet.

This recommendation is subject to the following conditions:

1. Petitioner shall design all light fixtures within the park to be on a timer and turned off and unable to be turned on when Recreation Park is closed except for security lighting.
2. At such a time that the utility easement is no longer needed by Commonwealth Edison Company within the existing Haddow Alley public right-of-way, the existing utilities shall be relocated, buried or removed, and the utility easement shall be vacated by the property owner.
3. Petitioner shall grant all easements required by the Village prior to the Petitioner being heard by the Village Board.
4. The Haddow Alley right-of-way shall be vacated prior to the petition being heard by the Village Board.
5. The closure of all curb cuts on East Northwest Highway shall be completed with all Phase I improvements.
6. The improvements to the sidewalk along East Northwest Highway, as shown on the Recreation Park-Phase I Plan prepared by Hitchcock Design Group with revision date 6/27/2024, shall be installed after the demolition per Phase IA or within one year of approved demolition permits for 500 and 506 East Northwest Highway, whichever is sooner.
7. The sidewalk improvements along East Northwest Highway shall be eight-foot wide and concrete.
8. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations and policies.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll second it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, we'll do a roll call vote, Dan.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Dawson.

(No response.)

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Drost.

(No response.)

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.
 MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Lorenzini.
 COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.
 MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Sigalos.
 COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.
 MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Warskow.
 COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.
 MR. OSOBA: Chair Cherwin.
 CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

Congratulations, Park District, you've got another unanimous approval tonight. A positive recommendation from the Plan Commission to move on to the next step, which is probably your visit with the Village Board. Please stay in touch with Dan for further details. Congrats and thank you.

MR. KRAMER: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Commissioners, very much.
 CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right.
 COMMISSIONER ENNES: It will be a beautiful park.
 CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: It will be.

All right, well, Dan, that wraps up our public hearings. Do we have any additional items to discuss?

MR. OSOBA: We do not.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I think we might want to, I think this is Mary Jo's big hour to continue her Vice Chairmanship. Do we have to do anything or do we just keep it because she's currently the Vice Chair?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Does she want to be?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes, I already responded to Sam that I would continue.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: She did respond positively. I checked with her beforehand. I didn't want to --

MR. OSOBA: We'll just work with you on any other paperwork we need and go from there, but --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right.

MR. OSOBA: -- congratulations.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, Mary Jo, congratulations. We know you're very excited about it.

All right, so we'll open up the floor for any general comments on anything for the Plan Commission.

Yes, any public comments at all?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Nothing, okay. All right, well, with that, perhaps we might have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Second. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, we are adjourned.

(Gavel pounded.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you.

(Whereupon, at 8:58 p.m., the public hearing on the
above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
 COUNTY OF KANE)

I, RON LeGRAND, SR., 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, SR.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO
 BEFORE ME THIS _____ DAY OF
 _____, A.D. 2024.

 NOTARY PUBLIC