

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION

A MEETING HELD ON:

April 24, 2024

Project Title: The Berkshire Senior Living Residence

Address: 8 - 12 S. Beverly Lane

Petitioner: Sig Strautmanis
General Capital Group

Address: 6938 N. Santa Monica Blvd.
Fox Point, WI 53217

Requested Action:

1. Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval to allow a 44-unit multi-family development for seniors.

Variations Required:

1. Density Variation: Section 5.1-7.3b, to allow a 26,000 square foot lot size where a minimum lot size of 30,000 square feet is required. The extent of this variation may increase upon any dedication of Right-of-Way along Campbell Street.
2. Setback Variations: Section 5.1-7.6, to allow a 5' side yard setback along the east and western sides of the site where code requires a minimum 13' side yard setback along each side, and to allow a 5' rear yard setback (north), where code requires a minimum 30' rear yard setback.
3. Setback Variation: Chapter 28, 5.1-20.1d, to allow a public street frontage setback (south) of 5' where a setback between 8'-10' is required.
4. Parking Variation: Section 10.4-1, to allow 52 parking stalls where 66 are required.
5. Loading Zone Variation: 10.7a, to waive the requirement for one loading berth.

Attendees: Sig Strautmanis, General Capital Group
Lynn Jensen, Plan Commissioner
John Sigalos, Plan Commissioner
Bruce Green, Plan Commissioner
Sam Hubbard, Planning Department

Project Summary:

The subject property is approximately 26,000 square feet (0.6 acres) and is bounded by Campbell Street to the south and Beverly Lane to the east, which is a private street owned by the Arlington Market HOA. The land is currently used as a parking lot for the Beverly Lanes bowling alley; however, the General Capital Group has a Letter of Intent to purchase the land and develop the parking lot with a 44-unit age-restricted senior living residence to be rented at affordable levels. The development would be funded through Housing Tax Credits issued by the Illinois Housing Development Authority (IHDA). The project would include the following unit mix and affordability levels:

UNIT MIX		
Unit Type	Total Units	% of Total
1BR	32	73%
2BR	12	27%
	44	100%
INCOME RESTRICTIONS		
AMI	Total Units	% of Total
30%	13	30%
40%	0	0%
50%	0	0%
60%	12	27%
80%	19	43%
	44	100.0%

The building would be “L” shaped and consist of 3-stories with one level of below grade parking, along with a small surface lot, totaling 52 parking stalls. Access to the site would come from Campbell Street to the south, which is a public street that was recently constructed in the spring of 2023.

The subject property is within the Hickory / Kensington Overlay District and is part of the Hickory / Kensington Area Plan, both of which were established in 2013. The property is also located within the Hickory / Kensington TIF District, which was adopted by the Village Board in 2014. It is unclear what would happen to the Beverly Lanes bowling alley upon the sale and development of the subject property by the petitioner. The Hickory / Kensington redevelopment area is continuing to see momentum with the recent completion of the 4 N Hickory mixed-use redevelopment to the west of the subject property, along with the recent completion of the final phase of the Arlington Market development to the north and east.

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Strautmanis – started by sharing that General Capital Group is a family-owned business that has been around since the 90s. He has been with a company for 25 plus years. This is not our first time in Arlington Heights, we actually developed the Mariano's that is close to this site. Everything that we develop, we hold long term, and I think that you'll find that working with us, we're good partners.

With our housing effort we promote community, and our tagline is “alive with activity”. For the residents we have clubs, activities, and trips, etc. As a result of that we have really super low turnover, in fact we are at over 97% occupancy across our 13 Berkshires, you have about 35 properties in the portfolio. This is really important because it's very stabilizing effect when we come to an area, we can be pioneers at certain times as well.

For many of our residents, a Berkshire might be their first time moving out of a single-family house, and sometimes they're moving through closer to adult children. Seeing this migration toward places like Arlington Heights. This location is perfect in our opinion, because it actually straddles what is more of a high intensity corridor on Kensington and the residential neighborhood to the north.

We are proposing a 44-unit project is tucked into the neighborhood on the 8 N. Beverly lot that we are currently under contract. It is a small lot, .6 acres. This site is in the Hickory – Kensington planning area. The L shape building purpose is to keep parking off of Campbell, and the single-family neighborhood. From a kind of a new urbanist or traditional labor development standpoint, it put a main entrance at the focal point, which is a corner of Beverly and Campbell. We pulled the building a little closer to the street purposely again to improve more of a sense of place against the pedestrian environment. We understand that staff from the Village may want to see us pull that back off for reasons of setbacks of residential to the north.

We are proposing a three-story building a flat roof which we did response to some extent what's showing the master plan is actually a couple of different types of buildings that are shown in the master plan as it transitioned from the residential that's on the north, which had more pitched roofs down to would be more intense development at Kensington, which is flat roof. Feedback from staff, which we actually liked the idea of taking this building but breaking it down to something that maybe looks more like townhomes rather than one larger building. We're happy to work with you on that, we actually like that idea a lot. A couple other small details about the project which I think that you would like to hear is we're going to certify to the National Green Building Standard with Net Zero, which is a very specific green certification that will basically use high efficiency lighting, plumbing in a mechanical package, and recycled materials. Also achieve Energy Star, we're going after 45 L tax credits. We will be using green infrastructure to mitigate stormwater, including some biospheres, other elements in the parking area and under the parking area. In terms of unit sizes, one bedroom are about 660 square feet, two bedrooms about 980 square feet.

We applied for housing tax credits, and the current round of applications to IDA will also be seeking some additional money to finance this, which we believe will be about a \$19.5M project. A significant project for us, but staff also brought up the affordability aspect, and from a planning perspective, our project is consistent with the main goals of the Hickory - Kensington area plan. There's one couple of very specific ones in there that. Affordable, senior living with its proximity to downtown AH, Metra Station, Pace, etc.

Though a market study, there are 4,100 income and age profit households in our target market area. Of those 1,900 are considered rent burden, which means they spend more than 30% of their income on housing. This would help these residents in demand of such housing. We have also taken in staff comments and believe we can address most of the technical concerns and design. In terms of density, we think that senior housing from our experience is less intense, typically from an impact for vehicles and neighborhood. We have a small increase in density we're requesting as part of the community, which we think is also appropriate for this site.

Our project would eliminate parking for the bowling alley. Our understanding is that in the past several developers took a look at the site and because the site was bisected by the right away, they couldn't do a larger the mixed-use development. Now the owners are actually selling these as two individual parcels and we would developing the parking lot. They are choosing to market these separately and understand the implications of doing that. From our perspective, we believe the bowling alley will ultimately be redeveloped, we will not have anything to do with that.

The last piece I want to touch on is the comments that there is a piece meal nature of redevelopment in this area and that this may be that the Village wanted to see larger scale redevelopment. The plan calls for this type of high density in in this area, and actually identifies this particular site as the as the last residential site to the north and then coming into higher density sites on Kensington. Basically, it calls for a transitional property and we feel that is what we are complying with. Plus, looking at the long-term redevelopment entire area, we believe that that half block development concept actually sets up for nice long-term redevelopment those blocks and the blocks next to it. We feel like developing our site is not taking away from that future potential of this area and is consistent with what that that kind of approach where you do a piece meal and the market will take care of itself.

Mr. Hubbard – gave a brief overview, stating the property is part of the Hickory-Kensington overlay district, which is subject to the Hickory-Kensington area plan, approved in 2013 to foster this semi mixed use, for a higher intensity multifamily area as an extension of the downtown. Staff Development Committee is not supportive of this project as proposed. We're certainly supportive of a redevelopment that would be a little bit more sensitive to the surrounding properties, which it's abutting, and more consistent with the Hickory- Kensington area plan and an overlay district regulations.

Staff are certainly not opposed to a senior development in the Hickory- Kensington area. The plan does specifically call out from a use standpoint that fits. Staff is supportive of affordable housing developments in the right locations, but our concerns here relate to the piece meal approach to development. If the parking lot of the bowling alley is redeveloped with the senior living facility, then that will leave the building of the bowling alley standing without any on-site parking, which is a code requirement and a parking variation would be required. The parking demand would be shifted entirely to the surrounding

street network, which again is not the intent of the regulations or the zoning code. Staff Development Committee does have some concerns with this piece meal approach to redevelopment here, I understand from the petitioner that the bowling alley is marketing the site separately, but you know that's really going to create a piece meal approach towards development that may make sense for a developer just on this singular parking lot site, but to what cost is that going to be to the overall community good of redevelopment in this area? These are staff's concerns.

Staff is also concerned with the density. A density variation would be required with the proposed 44 units, and about 39 units would be allowed based on the zoning regulations. From a density standpoint, this proposal of 44 is a little bit over what we're envisioning for this area and how the overlay regulations are established. Also, there are concerns that the setbacks don't really take into consideration the surrounding land uses and configuration of the abutting properties. The bulk and mass of the structure is a little bit much in comparison to the specific location of this property, and then the height is compliant with the R-7 and overlay regulations, as well as, the Hickory-Kensington plan. But again, in combination with the setbacks that are really minimal, especially on the east, north and south sides, it really does not take into consideration the context of this property, which is directly abutting single family homes to the north and east, and so in combination with those setbacks and the height proposed, staff did not think that this development was compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

We were not supportive of this project. We believe the use could be successful here in the in the Hickory-Kensington area, the individual characteristics of this development that give us concern, and we cannot support the project as proposed.

Commissioner Jensen – inquired if the petitioner owned the property. What about the bowling alley?

Mr. Strautmanis – it is under contract, and if the Village does not approve, we are not obligated. We do not own the bowling alley.

Commissioner Jensen – asked if it is financially feasible for you to reduce the density from 44 units to 39 units?

Mr. Strautmanis – ultimately it is not, and to be able to manage these effectively 44 units is just on the edge of being able to maintain and provide services that we would like to. This project would be the smallest we have done, we are comfortable with it, and if we go below that the cost of the land and everything that is associated with it.

Commissioner Jensen – asked staff if there is any idea with businesses on the west side of property.

Mr. Hubbard – to the West, staff have had conversations in the past. It has been a while since we've reached out to that property owner, so I don't know exactly what their plans are directly to the west. Properties to the south, people have approached and were in contact with a lot of those property owners.

Commissioner Jensen – we are concerned about the piece meal point, leaving the bowling alley without parking is a problem. With the suggested setbacks and other suggestions, do you believe adjustments can be made to meet the requirements?

Mr. Strautmanis – yes, most of those were technical, and we are comfortable making those changes.

Commissioner Jensen – has anyone done a parking count at the bowling alley, does it get used, is it full? Before you come before the Plan Commission it would be nice to know the use.

Mr. Hubbard – no, but that could be requested as part of the development proposal.

Commissioner Sigalos – shared that he is fully supportive of housing for seniors and so forth. I'm concerned about the issue with the bowling alley, if you purchase their parking lot what happens to the bowling patron parking?

Mr. Strautmanis – there is an answer, but it's not that we're going to have a solution per say. They are marketing it and we believe it's going to be a redevelopment site. They are marketing the parking lot separate from it, so they understand that they're marketing their parking separately

Commissioner Sigalos – shared his concern, and is in favor of all the variations the petitioner is requesting as far as setbacks and so forth, but requested affirmation that they could meet the setbacks and the proposed variations.

Mr. Strautmanis – confirmed yes, however we have a little difficulty with the idea that there is a 30-foot rear yard setback. There are two fronts to this, Hickory off of Campbell and bring the building closer to Campbell. We will probably still have some variations with the density, the parking, and one of the setbacks, but otherwise we're trying to keep this as compliant as possible.

Commissioner Sigalos – the variations are a main concern, if you are able to address these setbacks and not have such a wide variety of variations that you require there, I'd be in favor. But right now, the way it is today, I am not in favor.

Commissioner Green – agreed with Commissioners Jensen and Sigalos, you need to find a bigger piece of property. We are not going to argue senior living, I'm going to argue the zoning with you. This is a new piece of property and as far as I'm concerned to come in and ask for all these variations on this piece of property for a new development, is a stretch. I don't think we should be doing that. You have a density problem and if you cannot have 39 units, then you need to find a bigger piece of property. Because if you didn't have these variations and these problems with our zoning codes you probably wouldn't have any problem at all with your project.

Mr. Strautmanis - from our perspective, the reason that looked at this with that knowledge is because of the PUD process. Everything in the Hickory-Kensington plan requires PUD and this is the opportunity to look at special situations like the senior housing, if that is more appropriate to add some density. We are not coming in here trying to bend the rules, we just know there is a vehicle with the PUD process to be able to do it.

Commissioner Green – we have considerations with the residential units, and of recent have a lot to say about development across the street from them. This has been a big issue for us and we're listening to it.

Public Comment

Mr. George Motto - Senior Citizens Commission Representative, does not understand about the Berkshire objections, however, and I do not quite understand the Villages objections. There is a great need for senior citizen housing. So if there is a Village plan that was made years ago, and Berkshire is not comparable with that he believes that changes need to be made. The senior population is increasing, seniors are less and less moving away. aging in place, and need affordable housing. Not only affordable housing, but affordable housing that is close to amenities for walkability or ease. He believes that our need for affordable senior housing supersedes the problem of projected parking for a building that is empty now if it is going to be a bowling alley. He heard someone say that this would be a good project if it had more land. The question is, where are they going to get more land? You speak about variances and we talked about setbacks and then where the seniors going to go. He believes this is in line with what was said last time about maybe getting together and really discussing this because to have a development that is forcing this. Another very important point, most affordable housing, depending on the funding, cannot be designated for seniors. You cannot discriminate. This development can be for seniors. He asked the Villages to review their objections and figure out what they are really talking about, but I have to balance that in my own mind against what I hear every day, where are seniors going to live and age well in our community? He would ask that the Village to come up with an answer. We are asking this for the future, and if this project is denied, where is the next one going to come from? He would also like to go on record to understand the Village's stand on affordable senior housing.

Commissioner Jensen – since we last met there was talk of a number of commissions that have stated this, and there was some talk about the chairs of the of those commissions coming together to talk a little bit about this issue.

Mr. George Motto – one of the Senior Citizens Commission action plans is senior housing affordable housing. 25% of the population is going to be seeing you eventually. What we would like to do is get the interested together to talk about these things. But when I hear parking for an empty building that was a bowling alley.

Commissioner Green – asked Mr. Motto to make a statement and not lecture. Your statement is on the record and the Village will take appropriate measures to get your concerns answered. We have a zoning requirement; this is not an argument against senior living. It is an argument against zoning. If it does not fit the zoning requirement, which is the law of Arlington Heights, zoning ordinances are laws.

Mr. George Motto – wants to see zoning modified to push for a variance.

Unidentified Male – would like to see staff to work with this petitioner to iron out your differences and try and get this application to the Planning Commission, as soon as soon as we can. He believes this can be done.

Commissioner Jensen – encouraged the owners of the bowling ally to come to a meeting and explain what their plans are.

Ms. Cathy Model – based on the conversation with the Berkshire people sounds like a good company, do you have any information on any of their other properties.

Mr. Hubbard – if the project were to move forward, we would certainly look into their other developments, and make sure that they're upstanding to developers.

RECOMMENDATION

The Conceptual Plan Review Committee encouraged the petitioner review their submission, make suggested changes before coming Plan Commission.

Bruce Green, Chair
CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Kendra Maher, Recorder

**REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION**

A MEETING HELD ON:

April 24, 2024

Project Title: The Moorings Independent Living Expansion

Address: 800 E. Central Rd.

Petitioner: Drew Roskos
Perkins Eastman

Address: 209 S. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60604

Requested Action:

1. Amendment to PUD Ordinances #85-154, #88-057, #89-043, #91-108, #92-051, #93-051, #02-077, #06-069, and #15-046 to allow construction of a five-story, 70-unit independent living building.

Variations Required:

1. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-8.5, Maximum Height, to allow an approximately 65' tall five-story building where maximum building heights are restricted to 45' and four stories.
2. Additional variations may be required based upon the submittal of detailed plans.

Attendees: Drew Roskos, Perkins Eastman
Jerry Walleck, Perkins Eastman
Nadim Abi-Antoun, Presbyterian Homes
Joe Hassel, President & CEO of Presbyterian Homes
Lisa Vandermark, Executive Director Presbyterian Homes
Scott Freres, Lakota Group
Lynn Jensen, Plan Commissioner
John Sigalos, Plan Commissioner
Bruce Green, Plan Commissioner
Sam Hubbard, Planning Department

Project Summary:

The subject property is approximately 41.5 acres and occupied by The Moorings, a continuing care senior living facility that provides a full range of services enabling residents to age in place. The property exists as a Planned Unit Development (PUD), which was originally approved in 1985 and has been amended several times since. The Moorings has proposed construction of a new five-story independent living building within the campus, to include 70 units and 73 parking stalls below grade within the basement of the building. In order to accommodate for the proposed building, the site would be modified by shifting several drive aisles, relocating and expanding several parking areas, and constructing additional onsite stormwater detention.

The new independent living building would consist of 65 two-bedroom units (93%), with the remaining five units being one-bedroom (7%). The subject property is also home to the Wheeler-Magnus Round Barn, which is one of three structures in Arlington Heights that is on the National Register of Historic Places. There is no modification or relocation of the Wheeler-Magnus barn proposed as part of this project and the building will be preserved. Access to the campus comes from two curb cuts along Central Road at the north and one from Douglas Avenue at the west. No change to the site access is proposed as part of this project.

THE MOORINGS INDEPENDENT LIVING EXPANSION – TEMP FILE 1837

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. Abi-Antoun – we are non-profit organization and have been in the Chicago market for 120 years. In 2001, we were associated with The Moorings of Arlington Heights, a continuing care retirement community that has been in the Arlington Heights market since 1988. We own two other communities, one in Evanston and one in Lake Forest. We serve about 1,500 residents across our continuum, and we are here today to discuss the expansion of the proposed 70 units in Arlington Heights.

Ms. Vandermark – has been executive director of The Moorings since 2016, and was a part the assisted living expansion around that time, which expanded our assisted living product by 73 units. Then a year later, our assisted living memory support expansion was completed in 2018/2019. In 2005, shortly after we acquired The Moorings, we built 22 Villa homes. We have over the years invested an average of \$14-\$17 million dollars in capital over the past 10 years, with the with the goal of continuing to meet the needs of our current residents and future residents.

Mr. Hassel – thanked everyone for responding to their submittal and appreciate the feedback. He introduced their team, Drew Roskos & Jerry Walleck, architects with Perkins Eastman, Scott Freres from Lakota Group, Chris Fish & Steven Corcoran with Eriksson Engineering, and Harold Francke from MPS Law.

Mr. Freres – was involved with the 2015 PUD amendment for the assisted living facility, and now we are back with the request to add on and reinvest in property with an independent living expansion. A few important things to keep in mind about this project:

1. As the project design has proceeded, it has been important for the development team to collaborate with Village staff. Staff has given some really detailed preliminary feedback from all the different departments, which outlines key items that they are keeping in mind as they finalize the development proposal.
2. The Moorings understands that it is important to consider the concerns of our neighbors, and I want to let you know that we are sending out invitations to all of our neighbors on all four surrounding sides, including Mount Prospect on the east, to make sure that they're heard, they're concerns are answered and they understand what our proposal is. The neighborhood meeting will be complete prior to submission of our formal application.
3. We are asking for a variation. There are requirements and standards that need to be met and we intend to prove up compliance with those as we present our case in the formal application.

Mr. Roskos – is an architect and gerontologist, and is proposing a 70-unit independent living expansion on the Moorings campus. The unit sizes are between 1,050 and 1,700 square feet, which are sizable units. The building is five stories tall, which will require a variation, and we are also looking for a variation on the height. We believe we have created a complementary expansion of the existing campus that has responded to the site characteristics and to the architecture of the existing campus. The existing curb cuts into the campus will be maintained. We have done a traffic study at key intersections and we are bringing in people through the site in a similar circulation pattern that will wrap them around the expansion. The main entry to the proposed building will be through the existing entry to the primary Moorings building to the west. There will be a secondary access point into the independent living extension as well. We will provide 70 structured parking spaces underneath the footprint of our building and we're excited about the project.

Mr. Walleck – explained that one of the reasons they were proposing a five-story building was to preserve green space in the campus. They did not want a building that was overly spread out so they wanted to keep the density a little more direct. Additionally, travel distance is important for seniors, so being able to keep the footprint a little tighter so the residents are not having to walk far when they come down the elevators and get to the different amenities. The smaller building footprint also allows them to preserve some of the surrounding parking areas. So while

THE MOORINGS INDEPENDENT LIVING EXPANSION – TEMP FILE 1837

the building does go up, it has a smaller footprint, and they have tried to keep it more towards the center of the campus and away from the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Hubbard – The Moorings is part of a PUD, and the proposal for a new 70-unit independent living facility requires an amendment to that PUD. Staff has only identified one variation based on a review of the preliminary and conceptual plans. It is a height variation and it would be to allow an approximately 65-foot tall five-story building where maximum building heights are restricted to 45 feet and four stories. The Moorings campus has previously been granted a height variation in 2015 to allow four-story assisted living addition at just under 49 feet in height. Also, in 1985 to allow construction of five-story buildings with average heights just under 50 feet. This would be the tallest building on the campus, however, it would be centrally located within the campus. It would be about at 187 feet away from the nearest property line to the east, which about single-family homes. The petitioner will need to provide justification for the variation based on the four approval criteria.

The Village is recommending a neighborhood meeting and the development team is in the process of setting that up, so that will occur well in advance of the Planning Commission hearing on this project. We will ask for a summary of the meeting from the petitioner outlining, generally, how many people attended, what the issues were that they raised, and any response that was given to those issues.

We are recommending that the petitioner provide generous landscape screening, especially on the eastern property line, which is the closest area to the proposed building addition. There are modifications proposed to the parking lot and drive aisles in that area and we want to make sure that there is a dense screen to the east abutting the single-family neighborhood there in Mount Prospect. We also are asking the development team to analyze the placement of the new parking areas and whether they can be shifted closer to the interior of the site and away from the perimeter. This would place them closer to some buildings/uses to which they serve. We are asking for data on parking usage in the parking lots that will be removed to accommodate for the building so that we can evaluate the impact of having to shift that parking demand to other areas of the site.

Recommending the petitioner set up a meeting with the Building and Life Safety Department and Fire Department to discuss fire and life safety code requirements. The petitioner should provide a Fire and Life Safety Exhibit to facilitate any discussion on compliance with code requirements. A Traffic and Parking Study will be required and we are asking for data on the overall uses within the campus. Historically, the site has operated at a parking deficit, and variations have been granted. During the last PUD amendment in 2015, a parking variation was granted, however, it appears a parking variation may no longer be required based on preliminary data provided for this development. Comparing the current data on uses and number of units within the campus to the data provided in 2015, it shows significant changes have occurred and we want to understand where these changes have occurred and if we have the most accurate and up-to-date information to allow us to assess parking from a code standpoint. We are supportive of this project.

Commissioner Sigalos – is in favor of the project concept, liked the condensed footprint so there is more green space. Asked if the number of proposed units was driven by demand or economics?

Mr. Abi-Antoun – it is a combination of both. The market study showed a demand for a higher number of units, but we felt this was the right expansion number for us.

Commissioner Sigalos – was not too concerned with the height, large property and should not have a substantial impact on the surrounding residential properties. Very much in favor of the project concept.

THE MOORINGS INDEPENDENT LIVING EXPANSION – TEMP FILE 1837

Mr. Abi-Antoun – the building height is also a product of consumer preferences for larger ceiling heights.

Commissioner Jensen – considers the Moorings a tremendous asset to the Village. Not too concerned with the height, based on the building location at the interior of the property. During the 2015 PUD amendment many of the neighbors expressed concern over the proposed building additions, but since they have been constructed, he believes they have been well received. Does not anticipate the neighborhood meeting to be very controversial. Believes the code required parking is likely excessive and that parking variation may be warranted. Data on parking usage would be helpful for when this application comes before the Plan Commission. In favor of the project concept.

Commissioner Green – is also in favor of the project, and agrees the property is large enough so that the height will not be an issue. Was pleased that the Round Barn would be preserved. Anticipated the surrounding residents would not have a problem but the neighborhood meeting would be important.

RECOMMENDATION

The Conceptual Plan Review Committee encouraged the petitioner to proceed forward with their application.

Bruce Green, Chair
CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE
Kendra Maher, Recorder