

APPROVED

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: CHAPTER 28 - RED FLAG RESOLUTION - 106-110 WEST EASTMAN AVENUE -
PC #24-002

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 28th day of August, 2024 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

JAY CHERWIN, Chairperson
JOE LORENZINI
BRUCE GREEN
GEORGE DROST
JOHN SIGALOS

ALSO PRESENT:

MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Development
DANIEL OSOBA, Planner I
HAILEY NICHOLAS, Assistant Planner

APPROVED

(Gavel pounded.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, we're going to call the meeting to order.
Please stand and recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you.

Mike, do you want to take the roll call?

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes. Commissioner Dawson.

(No response.)

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Ennes.

(No response.)

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Jensen.

(No response.)

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Warskow.

(No response.)

MR. LYSICATOS: And Chair Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Here. All right.

MR. LYSICATOS: I think we're expecting Commissioner Dawson at some
point.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, thank you. All right, well, we have a
quorum, we can move forward.

I don't believe there is any approval of minutes on the agenda,
correct?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I think we have The Moorings and the
brewery.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Oh, thank you, I have the wrong sheet.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, so approval of minutes. We have
items A, The Moorings Independent Living Expansion, and B, Spent Grain Brewing.

Is there a motion to approve the minutes?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion to approve the minutes.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Motion made and seconded, and the motion is
to approve the minutes.

All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, motion passes, the minutes are
approved.

APPROVED

No. 4 on the list, on the agenda, is public hearings, and that is for Section A entitled Chapter 28, Red Flag Resolution for properties at Eastman Avenue, PC #24-002.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes. So, thank you, Chair. Thank you for introducing it, Chair, and what we'll do tonight is we'll go back through our Red Flag Resolution summary. We have provided all the public notices that's required for the public hearing tonight. What we're going to do is start with the resolution summary.

You may recall from our last public hearing that the Village Board passed Resolution 23-041 which directed the Plan Commission to obtain public comment concerning possible amendments to the regulations regarding properties within the vicinity of 116 and 120 Eastman, including the north side of Northwest Highway, between Vail Avenue and Walnut Avenue, and four properties along West St. James. There's also some properties near Campbell that were included in that as well. The Planning and Community Development Department specifically was directed to research the possible establishment of an overlay zoning district, rezoning of certain districts and properties, and revisions to the Comprehensive Plan and the Downtown Plan.

Tonight, we're going to specifically focus on elements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Downtown Master Plan, and the hearing is going to concern amendments to those two items. We will discuss some of the zoning, but that will not be addressed in any of the recommendations tonight.

I just want to review the steps in the process so far. As you may recall, we researched a number of the properties and the dynamics of the existing land uses and the Comprehensive Plan and zoning. We met with the property owners to discuss plans for potential redevelopment. There was a neighborhood meeting held in March within the vicinity of the Eastman property. We had our last initial public hearing on April 11th, 2024, and then we analyzed what we heard from the public, from the Plan Commission, and started crafting our recommendations. Tonight, the public hearing is specifically to address those recommended actions.

Just to remind you of the properties that are the focus of tonight's hearing, you'll see them in the aerial in front of you. There are six properties that were, or six areas I should say that are made of multiple properties, five of them are to the north in the map in the vicinity of the Eastman Project which the Board reviewed earlier this year, and then the last property is No. 6, to the west of the Arlington 425 Project along Campbell. Then you'll see the same properties with the zoning, overlaid onto the zoning just to give a sense of what the current regulations entail. Lastly, the Comprehensive Plan and the future Land Use Map, this is specifically pertinent to what we're talking about tonight as recommendations will be applied to these governing documents.

I'm just going to provide a brief summary of our initial public hearing from April 11th. We posted a number of items onto the public website. There was a specific website actually developed for this effort. Notices and updates were sent through an e-mail subscription service, and recommended highlights of each of the focus properties tonight will be run through individually. The recommendations take into account all the feedback that we heard from the public, the adjacent neighbors, the property owners in the meetings we had with them, and of course the Plan Commission, and the long-term land use goals and policies of the Village. Tonight, we'll also include a look at the Downtown Master Plan. We'll get into a couple of specific elements of that right now.

APPROVED

The Downtown Master Plan was adopted in 2007. It includes redevelopment guidelines for certain properties within the downtown area. It does not include specifically development guidelines for all the properties that were included in the Red Flag Resolution work, so tonight we're looking to remedy that and outline some specific recommendations for those properties. There are some general guidance when it comes to retail strategy, building heights, streetscape enhancements, and parking and traffic, but the specific redevelopment guidelines are going to be recommended tonight.

Tonight, what we're going to cover is three specific elements or pages that we would like to insert into Section 6 of the Downtown Master Plan, which is those redevelopment guidelines. It will highlight the focus properties: the Village Bank & Trust at 234 West Northwest Highway, the AT&T property at 106 West Eastman, and while this wasn't in the previous presentation, we did want to include 116-120 West Eastman which was the subject of the previous hearing entitlements to memorialize what was discussed at that meeting, whether that development moves forward or not.

So, with that, I'll hand it off to Dan who is going to highlight those properties I just discussed.

MR. OSOBA: All right, so the first property that we're going to be discussing is the Village Bank & Trust at Block 409 which is 234 West Northwest Highway. It's located right at the northeast corner of Chestnut and Northwest Highway. The property is zoned B-5 Downtown District and it's classified "mixed use" on the future Land Use Map in the Comprehensive Plan.

Back in December of 2018, the Village Board recommendation was to include this property for study, and the current recommendation for this property is to amend the Downtown Master Plan to include redevelopment standards for the Village Bank & Trust property at 234 West Northwest Highway. So, that's what we're going to be discussing at this portion of the hearing.

There are 11 recommendations for this property in particular. I'll go through each one of these and use the exhibit that's on the slide that kind of illustrates a lot of these recommendations from a top-down view. There is also another exhibit that shows a side section from St. James. I'll be using both of these to kind of illustrate what these recommendations would entail.

The first recommendation is relating to building setbacks which is marked as the dashed red line on the exhibit. The building setbacks, as recommended, would be 20 feet from West St. James, and the setback from Chestnut should be 10 feet, and the setbacks from Northwest Highway and Highland would be compliant with the underlying zone district of B-5 district standards.

The second recommendation is relating to the upper story setbacks, specifically to the fourth and fifth stories. The fourth story setback is recommended at 35 feet, which means any portion of the fourth story of the building that's located within that dark blue area on the exhibit must be set back at least 35 feet from the property line. The fifth story setback which would be recommended at 95 feet, which means that any portion of the fifth story of the building located within the brown area on the exhibit must be set back 95 feet from the property line. These upper story setbacks work in tandem to reduce the massing of the building along West St. James Street and push the building height further to the south.

The third recommendation is to encourage lower scale three-story rowhome or coach home development along the frontage of West St. James Street. Additionally,

APPROVED

access to parking is going to be in the rear of this type of development and should be provided at least 60 feet from the property line on West St. James, and this access and drive aisle is shown as a crosshatch on the exhibit.

Recommendation 4 limits the overall building height to 100 feet with height bonuses for areas outside of those upper story setback requirements, so the area marked in grey dots on the exhibit there. That 100-foot height is actually a recommendation that's in the Downtown Master Plan currently within Section 7, so that is just making it consistent with the recommendations that we're hearing tonight.

Then recommendation No. 5 would be to restrict site access from Chestnut and Highland Avenue only, and that would be to reduce the amount of traffic overflow onto West St. James Street.

Recommendation 6 is to consider architectural design of the building and utilizing more traditional forms to fit the context of the surrounding development.

To continue with more recommendations here for No. 7 would be to include focal points such as plazas or green space at the southwest and southeast corners of the building and shown on the exhibit. Those could include architectural elements of the building as well.

No. 8 would be to require sidewalks to meet downtown design standards which would be brick paver designs on Highland and Northwest Highway.

Recommendation 9 is to ensure that any redevelopment of the property is done as one unified development rather than doing it in separate pieces.

No. 10 would be regarding land use and include activating the first floor on Northwest Highway, Highland, and portions of Eastman. Residential, office or other mixed uses can be on those upper stories and within the mixed-use area. This recommendation would prohibit uses such as 24-hour operations, gas stations, funeral parlors, drive-through uses, and auto-oriented businesses.

The last recommendation for this site is to ensure that all parking for all uses is accommodated on the site with internalized parking for the actual building that's utilizing mixed use and then surface parking for any commercial uses.

So, then looking at the cross-section exhibit, there's kind of a lot going on here so I'll explain a little bit of what the colors mean. This exhibit is used to illustrate all of these recommendations from a section view, showing setbacks, upper story setbacks, and building height and massing. The exhibit shows the street section of West St. James Street with a typical 25-foot single-family home on the left which would be north of St. James. The 66-foot right-of-way for St. James Street, which all of this is drawn to scale, is right down the middle. That would include the sidewalk, parkway, and the landscaping.

Then, the building massings that are shown on the right, and I'll go through each one of those and they're color-coded here, so the yellow one on the bottom is the existing office building at 120 West Eastman. It's what's existing today. It's a three-story tall office that shows the extent of the current development that's on the site. Then the light orange massing is the proposed Eastman development, and you can see the upper story setback that was required with that entitlement and the maximum height of 77 feet.

Then, this is a little bit of a cleaner view showing what the Staff-recommended conceptual redevelopment that would fit within the limits of those recommendations could look like. So, the rowhome or coach home concept fits into recommendation No. 3, to encourage lower-scale development along St. James and is shown as

APPROVED

a 20-foot setback from the property line which gives enough space for landscaping in the front of the building. As the building gets up to the fourth story, the building has to be set back further to 35 feet from the property line to accommodate recommendation No. 2.

Then, as the building continues to increase in height to the fifth story, it would need to be set back 95 feet from the property line. This would allow for a typical alley loaded rowhome or coach home development, the required setbacks for the land use and access to be located at least 60 feet from the property line per recommendation No. 3. This access could be a drive aisle to act as garages for a townhome or rowhome, or a structured parking behind the units, depending on the type of redevelopment.

Lastly, after the fifth story setback, the building height could increase to 100 feet with those height bonuses per recommendation No. 4. This would be where the mixed-use building could start and continue south to Northwest Highway. Then just flipping back and forth between these two slides illustrates the massing difference between what's been approved as the Eastman development down to what could fit into the Staff recommendations showing that there is going to be a decrease in massing that's going to be immediately adjacent to West St. James and pushing the majority of the building height south on Northwest Highway.

So, that's the first property. The second property is 2A, and these are all numbered and are consistent with the recommendations throughout, so it will be consistent there. This is the AT&T property at 106 West Eastman. The original recommendation from December of last year was to again further study this as part of the Red Flag Resolution. The current recommendation is again to amend the Downtown Master Plan to include redevelopment standards for the property.

Those recommendations, there are seven of them here, these recommendations are going to mirror the Eastman approval. A lot of what's on this slide is also going to be the Staff recommendations for the actual Eastman property just to the west. The setbacks are going to be consistent at 10 feet from West St. James, and the remaining setbacks on Vail and Eastman would be compliant with B-5 standards. A larger setback would be required for upper stories, similar to Eastman where the second story would be set back 20 feet, and then the sixth story would be set back 50.

The building height would be limited to 77 feet or six stories per the Eastman approval, and then, again, consistent with the architectural design guidelines as the Village Bank property to be contextual with the design of the surrounding area. Then, recommendation No. 5 again to include focal points as is consistent with other properties that are in the Downtown Master Plan. Sidewalks on Vail Avenue and Eastman Street will have to meet the downtown design standards. Ideal redevelopment of the property would include uses that activate the street on Vail and Eastman, and those could be commercial or restaurant uses. Then, residential, office or mixed uses would be on the upper stories, and the prohibited uses again would be the 24-hour gas station, funeral parlor, drive-through uses and auto-oriented uses.

That was 2A. 2B is the actual Eastman property, Block 316 at 116-120 West Eastman Street. These recommendations are also based on what was approved on Eastman, so they mirror exactly what was on AT&T with the only change being recommendation No. 4, which is site specific to this one in particular to restrict site access to ingress only from West Eastman Street and egress to Highland Avenue to reduce traffic overflow onto St. James Street.

That wraps up 2B, and we'll move on to the next one.

APPROVED

MS. NICHOLAS: These next properties are the residential properties with frontage along Park Place, and these are images of the existing properties which include an apartment building, multiple single-family homes, and townhomes.

For these properties, they're all currently zoned R-7 with a Comprehensive Plan designation as "high density multi-family." The recommendation from December has not changed at this time, so our current recommendation is consistent with that which is to change the designation of these properties to "moderate density multi-family" on the Comprehensive Plan future Land Use Map whereas they are currently designated as "high density multi-family."

Additionally, Staff is also evaluating rezoning these properties to match the new Comprehensive Plan designation if that were to be recommended for approval tonight. However, that's not topic of tonight's hearing, so that's something that Staff will continue to research and evaluate moving forward, but these exhibits here show the existing and proposed Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps. As you can see, if the Comprehensive Plan were to be amended, it would be shaded in a lighter brown to indicate the "moderate density multi-family" classification, and then also we show the Zoning Map exhibit to portray what that would look like if that were to take place.

MR. LYSICATOS: Okay, thank you, Hailey.

Property No. 4 is in a similar vein, is on the rear half of that same block that is between Park Place and Northwest Highway. This focuses on the two auto-oriented businesses that are along Northwest Highway, 400-424 and 380 West Northwest Highway. So, you see on the left-hand side is the corner property that wraps around at 400-424, and the property on the right-hand side is 380 which is farther east along Northwest Highway.

The recommendation currently is to amend the Comprehensive Plan to change the designation of the northern portion of 400-424 West Northwest Highway from "commercial" to "moderate density multi-family residential" to match the properties Hailey just highlighted. There are no zoning changes being recommended at this time. Specifically, you'll see on the diagram on the top is the existing Comprehensive Plan which shows the commercial aspect that's being changed on the northern half of that property. Property No. 4 is I believe five parcels, so there's two or three parcels in that new light brown area which will be wholly within that residential district, and then the last parcel on the west side, on the left-hand side of the block is going to be cut in half, for the northern half to be residential to be consistent with the block of West Park Place.

As Hailey mentioned, at this point, we're not considering any zoning changes, specifically with these properties, as they are very specifically constructed to accommodate auto uses. We don't think it's appropriate at this time, especially along Northwest Highway, to address that zoning.

MS. NICHOLAS: The next properties are the Village-owned properties at Parking Lot S. So, the recommendation for this property is really just to amend the Comprehensive Plan so that it matches these properties' current zoning designation. Therefore, the recommendation from December is not changed, which is to amend the Comprehensive Plan to change the designation from "single-family attached" to "government."

These next properties are two parcels located on the southwest corner of Campbell Street and Chestnut Avenue. These properties are currently occupied by a parking lot and a single-family home. Similar as the previous properties, the recommendation is to amend the Comprehensive Plan so that it matches its current zone designation of R-6,

APPROVED

whereas it is currently designated as “high density multi-family” in the Comprehensive Plan Map. Therefore, the recommendation from December has not changed, which is to amend the Comprehensive Plan to change the designation from “high density multi-family” to “moderate density multi-family.”

MR. LYSICATOS: Okay, so what I'll do now is just kind of rehash and highlight the recommendations that we have at this point, and then we'll open it to board and to the public for comment.

The first set of recommendations here is for Properties 1, 2A and 2B, which are the three properties that Dan highlighted with amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, specifically portions of the Downtown Master Plan to include new pages in Section 6. The first one would be three new pages entitled Block 409, 234 West Northwest Highway, that is the Village Bank property and the illustrations that you saw in Slides 12, 13 and 14 and those 11 recommendations.

The second one would be to amend the same Downtown Master Plan and add one page for 106 West Eastman, which is the AT&T property, with the slide with the six recommendations that you saw.

Then, finally, the third new page for the 116-120 West Eastman property which was heard earlier in the year; again, it would be that Slide 19 with the recommendations that were put forward.

Following that, we would also recommend the remaining four properties to have amendments to the Comprehensive Land Use Map to reclassify those properties as was described. The first one will be the six subject properties on Park Place that Hailey discussed to be changed from “high density multi-family” to “moderate density multi-family” on page 22. So, 4A and B are those properties that I highlighted on West Northwest Highway, specifically it would be the parcels that are exclusively on Park Place. I believe those are a number of parcels that would change to the “moderate density multi-family” from the “high density,” and then reclassify the north portion or the back portion of the property fronting on Northwest Highway as multi-family as well.

The fifth recommendation would be the two properties that currently are within the Village parking lot, and those will be changed to 'governmental' from “single-family attached.”

Lastly, there were two properties along Campbell Street that will be amended from “high density multi-family” to “moderate density multi-family.”

So, at this point, we'll take any questions or comments that the Board has.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Michael.

Is there a motion to submit the report into the record?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll second it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, all in favor of the motion?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, motion passes. Staff report entered into the record.

MR. LYSICATOS: Thank you.

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Commissioners, do we have any questions?
We'll start down here with Mr. Joe.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Nothing for me at this point.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, Bruce, anything before public comment?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It's a very well done study. I can say there's a lot of information here, and I have no questions at this time.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Mr. John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I have no questions at this time.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: George?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, just a question for Staff maybe for the record. If some form of this Red Flag Resolution is approved, these are recommendations and they alter the Master Plan. Going forward, if there were individuals that wanted to present changes to this plan, what's the process?

MR. LYSICATOS: Present changes specific to these recommendations?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Specific to the resolution and to the recommendations. These are merely recommendations, they won't become --

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, these are recommended. So, at tonight's meeting, we're requesting that the board make a recommendation to the Village Board. That will be taken up in short order by the Village Board to memorialize these recommendations. The public hearing tonight is the opportunity to hear from the public their concerns or comments or support, and of course from the Plan Commissioners, on anything that might be adjusted. If there is something that comes out of this that we should consider, that could be entered into tonight, into the recommendations, and we would do that and prepare that for the Village Board for their consideration.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, my only concern is, going back to the Master Plan in 2007, there has been changes, and if there is not the inertia to get things done, there can be further changes to these recommendations.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes. Yes, there could, and even within the Downtown Master Plan, it could be further amended. These were sections that did not have specific redevelopment guidelines. The three properties that we're highlighting today, they had general building height guidelines which is in Section 7, but Section 6 which is very specific on each of the blocks on what type of development should manifest there for the most part has been relatively successful in guiding that development. I'll add that that is essentially the purpose of the Master Plan is to be a guidance document. These aren't codifying these recommendations into a zoning code. They're really to give us something to lean on when a specific development comes in to get more specific on those design elements, but it gives us a framework to work from where we didn't necessarily have that when we walked through the Eastman Project.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I'm just kind of making sure that if there's public comment, that --

MR. LYSICATOS: Of course.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And so, when a project, a specific project was to come before us, we would go through the same process and ask for, if they needed relief from this, we would go through the same process we always go through.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Good.

APPROVED

MR. LYSICATOS: Right.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And now we're looking at the Comprehensive Plan as one aspect of the overall development.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So, this is not the law just yet.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Not just yet. Not until Giorgio says so.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, well, I guess we'll move to the public hearing, open it up for public comments. If you'd like to address the Chair, if you have any comments on this, we can start on the first row on this side if we have anything. We have four individuals, nothing there. Second row looks like we've got some movement.

When you do step up, if you could please just recite your name, spell it for our transcript and just let us know where you live if you could, generally or specifically if you'd like.

PUBLIC COMMENTARY FOR PC #24-002

MR. GAYNOR: Sure. Hi, good evening. Tom Gaynor, 208 West Fremont. Gaynor is G-a-y-n-o-r. 42-year resident, currently serving as the HANA Board President. I'm speaking on my behalf tonight; I'm not representing the entire HANA neighborhood.

We've been on quite a journey together, and I really thought it's probably just good to make a note of we started with our down-zoning activity, we had a whole adventure with the Eastman Project, and now we have Red Flag ordinance. I think, you know, the level of trying to get this thing right is really commendable. I think the degree of collaboration between Staff, the Commission, the Board and the neighbors, I think it's something that I think we ought to just make note of and say that's a good model.

I think getting this design right in this very special, peculiar neighborhood with high density transitioning to single-family is something that's not trivial. I think getting everybody engaged in figuring this thing out has been really kind of key. So, a big hug from, at least from me, that I think what we've been doing is the right approach towards this. So, thank you for that.

We do have, through the Red Flag activity, I think we've made significant progress in terms of shoring up what has been a threatened neighborhood, as well as tightening up what the Village can do to further improve the downtown as well as the transition to our neighborhood. So, back to the collaborative thing, I think we're doing I think the right kinds of stuff. There is always opportunity for improvement. I do have a couple of comments, and I know I have some neighbors that are going to maybe get a little more specific.

One that's really not a HANA thing, but the AT&T building one still strikes me as awkward where you could have zero lot line between the Eastman Project and AT&T. I don't know if maybe that's handled in a, specific to a development proposal stage, but having two seven-story buildings touching each other I think is really a rather peculiar and unique situation for the Village that, you know, we've kind of not addressed.

Village Bank & Trust is probably our biggest concern because that's the biggest property. When I met with the President of Village Bank & Trust at the ribbon cutting, she says they have no intention of moving because they just remodeled and they're here to stay and they want to be good neighbors, all the right kinds of stuff, but who knows? Things can

APPROVED

change. A 100-foot building in that spot, even with the right kind of, as we're doing which is great, setbacks, step-down, all of those philosophies are exactly what we, you know, worked to achieve with the Eastman Project, but that's still going to be a lot. That's going to be a big building on a triangle that really doesn't have a grid, you know, that allows, you know, things to expand beyond it. So, that one property is probably the biggest concern.

From a historic preservation standpoint, 307-309 Park Place are 100-year-old homes that are just, they sparkle. I mean, they're right out looking at Memorial Park, and they've been single-family forever. They would just be, I think the right thing to do, to keep those as R-3. I know we're not talking zoning tonight, but those are single-family homes and they're keepers. They really do provide the kind of right environment for our Memorial Park setting there.

Then the last one is, John Lewis couldn't make it, a fellow board member, he's at 406 West Fremont. He says this is maybe a clerical issue, but the parking lot to the west of him on Fremont Street facing the apartments down there is, in the Master Plan is noted as high density, although the whole block is currently zoned residential. So, there is a discrepancy between the two, and maybe that happens a lot, I don't know, but the Master Plan and what it's currently zoned are out of sync, and I think it would be good to tighten that up as we go through and, you know, address the issues in this neighborhood.

So, that's what I wanted to share tonight. Again, thank you for all of your work, and this is a lot of work to go through all this, and the collaboration and the level of professionalism is really commendable. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, sir. Real quick, Michael, did you want to comment on that, on the discrepancy that Mr. Gaynor brought up? Is that something that's --

MR. LYSICATOS: I would have to look into it, but maybe we can get all the comments so if there's something that we can clarify at the --end.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, that's fine. I just wanted to put it on your radar.

Next in Mr. Gaynor's row, if you want to come up and join us? Please state your name, spell it for the record and let us know generally where you live.

MS. MENZIES: Hi, my name is Vivian Menzies, M-e-n-z-i-e-s, and I live at 212 West Fremont.

In general, I think the proposals for the Red Flag Resolution are very positive. I think we're heading in a really great direction, and I really want to thank the Village Staff in particular for all the work that you guys have done, and the Commissioners as well. You guys have done a lot of hard work and it's really paid off, but I think even the best plan can still be improved.

I guess I'd like to put it in a little bit of historical context. A lot of what we're asking for isn't as much a change as a restoration of what was. Each of the four blocks in our neighborhoods were 100 percent single-family R-3, and each one of those blocks has been broken up in some way by either a parking lot or an apartment building or something that has taken out a couple of the homes and put something else in there. So, a lot of what we're trying to do is make those blocks continuous and keep the neighborhood in tact.

Part of what has happened because of that, as we keep having these battles over developments, and hopefully these guidelines will help stop some of that, the guidelines will be more clear and it will save time for the developer, save time for Staff, and save time for us and maybe we can get our lives back a bit. One of the biggest positives out of all the

APPROVED

recommendations that I saw was the rowhomes that are recommended in the Village Bank property. I think that is absolutely wonderful. I think it's a really great fit for the neighborhood because it blends in well with the character of the single-family homes. It's a good step-down which is a philosophy that we really would like to see you stick to. It will blend in with the low-rise multi-family units that are there.

But in the same Village Bank property, the recommendation for the maximum height, a 100-foot building just doesn't seem to fit. It's totally out of character, and I think it's going to stick out like a sore thumb. Even being next to the Eastman Project that's 77 feet, it's just too tall. If the height of that could match what the Eastman Project has, then you've got a consistent height in all three of those properties. I think that would be much better aesthetically, and it would also, you know, would just align with what the height of the Eastman Project is and what the recommended height for the AT&T property is. I think those properties need to be considered as a whole; they kind of are a unit.

The other area that Tom already mentioned is that the homes at 307 and 309 Park Place, those homes should be R-3. This is another block that was all single-family homes until the Quad and the apartment building were built. It's just such a unique area because of its location directly across from Memorial Park, and those homes, having single-family homes on all sides of Memorial Park kind of anchors that park and gives it sort of a quiet dignity that I think you lose if it becomes all multi-family. I'd like to keep having that sense of quiet and calm there.

Finally, I know this is kind of a big ask and maybe doesn't make much sense, but there's the Village-owned property, the parking lot that we have the Farmer's Market at, and I realize that it is a parking lot right now but those lots used to be single-family homes as well. It's possible that in the future, that that parking lot won't be needed for commuters. We've seen big changes with Covid where nobody was commuting for a while, and that could happen again. It's important that blocks stay in tact, and this is an opportunity to potentially restore that block if that lot is not needed at sometime in the future. So, that's just what I would like to see.

But overall, I think the recommendations are great and I think the guidelines will be truly helpful. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you for your comment.

Anyone in the same row, comments? Okay, we're going to move to I think the back row. Yes, ma'am? Please come up and state your name, spell your last name.

MS. McKINNEY: Hi, can you hear me okay?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, very well.

MS. McKINNEY: Sarah McKinney, M-c-K-i-n-n-e-y --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

MS. McKINNEY: -- and I'm at 203 West Fremont. I just want to start out by saying thank you. I know this is a huge undertaking, and I'm grateful that we've all learned from the Eastman development and that the Village is working on improving this process going forward. I think having these guidelines are necessary to inspire development and get the kind of development that's desirable for our area.

I also think it helps to be efficient with everyone's time, residents, developers or Village Staff, all of you guys, our Board. Many of us were very engaged with the Eastman process. This resolution is really the result of us working through that process and being heard. I'm hopeful that our Plan Commissioners can add some value to what our Village Staff has proposed to ensure that this is a good balance for everyone in the area.

APPROVED

My concerns are mostly the AT&T site and Village Bank. One of the documents that the Village prepared mentioned looking at the whole block, so we don't have this piecemeal approach. I really appreciated that. That feels like the right way to do this. I think the guidelines for the appearances using traditional materials, green space, those are so helpful. I think that's great. The suggestion of rowhomes on the Village Bank site is a really nice transition to our smaller multi-family and single-family homes. I appreciate the variety of that housing type for this area.

The Eastman Project is 135 units, mostly studios and one-bedrooms. They're very small units and it's a very dense project. With that in mind, I'm concerned about the density for this whole block. A 100-foot structure on the suggested area of that Village Bank property, if it has the same kind of density as Eastman, that could have a huge impact on our area. If AT&T has a similar makeup, you know, mostly studios and one-bedrooms, these really small units, my question is could we potentially have 400 or 500 units on this block some day?

I know you guys have all these great equations that you run, and so I'm asking if you could run those equations for density and determine that and kind of give us a maximum number like what we're really looking at, right? Once the Eastman Project is completed and those 135 units are filled, we're likely to learn more lessons from that. It could be positive, it could be negative, we don't know. But I think we're going to learn how that project impacts the quality of life for our area residents and what it does to the sustainability of our historic neighborhood.

So, my final question is if we learn some really valuable lessons once that is built, are we going to be able to do anything with the lessons? Like will we be able to do anything with that experience? Will the Village Board be able to request changes to a proposed development for the AT&T site or the Village Bank site without the threat of legal consequences for the developer, or are we as residents just stuck? Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you for your comment.

Anyone else in the back row over here?

MS. COUGHLIN: Hi, Elena Coughlin, C-o-u-g-h-l-i-n, 121 West Fremont. I want to echo my neighbors saying thank you so much, the Eastman Project was a doozy. We put a lot of time and effort. We spent birthdays here, due dates here. I think you know I'm always dragging a kid or two here because we can't seem to find a way to make it happen, but thank you for everything, and thank you for protecting us as much as you could throughout that.

I just wanted to ask if we could try to take the most conservative approach possible. It doesn't sound like there's a ton of push-back from the current owners of this land. Could we possibly take a conservative approach, especially after everyone went through with the Eastman Project? Because I believe that developers can always come and ask for variances and ask if it makes sense for the Village to do certain things. So, if you're feeling like maybe this is too high, 100 feet is too high, that's too many people, could we act conservatively now and then possibly give more in the future instead of always kind of trying to backtrack to preserve the historic and our little neighborhood so it doesn't sink? Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you for your comment.

Do we have anyone else on that side of the room? I can't really see back there. Yes, ma'am? No problem, come on up. Be happy to hear you.

MS. MEYER: Hi, I'm Danette Meyer. I live at 29 South Mitchell Avenue. I'm here with my neighbors also from Mitchell Avenue, and we are just really glad to see the inclusion

APPROVED

of the 307 West Campbell Street, possible redesignation from "moderate density." You know, we were concerned previously and we've come and we've talked about like Sigwalt and all of that that was happening there. I just think it's great to change it from, you know, that high density to moderate density, and I think many of our neighbors really agree with that. It gives us a little bit more peace of mind knowing that it's not going to be like a large, you know, apartment building on that corner when our lots on that Mitchell are so short, like 107 feet.

So, we're really grateful for that. We just wanted to thank you and show our support.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Anyone else on this side of the room that we haven't gotten to? No? We'll move over here.

Sir, do you have any comment?

MR. ADREANI: Yes, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Sir, why don't you come on up?

MR. ADREANI: Good evening. My name is Bruce Adreani, A-d-r-e-a-n-i.

Thanks for the Staff in putting all this together and the board for listening to this, and thank you for all your comments. I'm a builder/developer, so I know exactly what you're talking about regarding toning down some of the property heights, the setbacks, things like that. I'm sure the time will come before us that I would be coming and talking to you about the properties that I own.

So, my thoughts tonight, and as mentioned to the Staff earlier, is regarding No. 6 up there. I own the properties at 307 Campbell and 217. One of my concerns is the other property that I have is 309 Campbell, and that sits directly across the street from the six-story apartment building. I'm just wondering why the 309 Campbell would not be included in there also. So, I just want to make this, put this on the record tonight that I think it should be included in there. Some day, maybe the house will be falling down and whatnot, I just don't know.

It's an older home and I think the property line, the west property line of 309 lines up with the west property line to the north of the six-story apartment building. So, for those reasons, I think that that should be included in here.

Coming from a high density multi-family to moderate density multi-family, I think that will be talked about for a while. I think that probably upon submission of some plans is when the most talked about time for a property will be discussed with Staff. Putting townhomes on this property, I think that that will be a lower type density, and I don't know whether or not any of these property owners that are affected by these changes would be compensated from the Village for down-zoning or down-Comprehensive Plan of their property. I just don't know, and maybe they should be compensated for the benefit that they provide the area.

So, those are my thoughts tonight. Hopefully, this will be put through. I'm just wondering, one of my thoughts before was the townhomes that are on Sigwalt, would they be allowable to go in over here on Campbell? It would be something that I would talk about. Whether or not they would be, maybe only Staff and the Commission can talk about it.

So, with that in mind, thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, sir.

Gentleman?

MR. WHISTLER: Good evening, Commissioners. Thank you for allowing me to speak. I'm Bob Whistler, address 2192 North Charter Point Drive. That's in Arlington Heights, Illinois.

I am the manager of the LLC which owns the properties at 400 West

APPROVED

Northwest Highway and 380 West Northwest Highway. We purchased the 400 West Northwest Highway property in November of 2016. We purchased the 380 property in March of 2019. The 400 property was built in 1948, it was a car dealer back in the day. The 380 property as far as I can find out was built in the 1980's.

In February of 2017, we started discussions and had meetings with the Planning Department of Arlington Heights to redevelop the 400 property. We did market studies, traffic studies, hired an architect, hired an attorney. We had neighborhood meetings, and we also had an early review. We requested R-7 Zoning which was consistent to the Arlington Gardens Apartments which is across the street from us and the adjacent property. In our minds, the Village Staff and neighborhood were all negative on the project. We listened and we moved on.

We've operated our property and also we purchased the adjacent property, 380, automotive property since then. Now, December 2023, the apartments are approved on the Eastman property where there are two old office buildings. After several meetings, public neighborhood comments, variation, the project was approved. Nice project in my mind, nice development, and also a good developer.

I then received notification from the Village of the Red Flag Resolution, and the Assistant Director, Michael, would like to meet, and we agreed. We had a nice meeting in March to discuss our property and the resolution. My question of Michael was, at the time, what problem are we trying to solve? In reading the minutes of the April 11th Plan Commission meeting, it is the same question that Commissioner Jensen asked, what problem are we trying to solve?

I have the same question today. I ended our meeting by telling Michael, whatever you do, just don't hurt our investment. Now, what I read from the information that I was provided, which was a little different than what I read tonight, but you want to amend the Comprehensive Plan to down-zone my back area from B-3 to R-6, and the information that I was provided said that you wanted to evaluate down-zoning my front from B-3 to B-2. These changes hurt us; they do not help. Less uses, less property value.

As I read the resolution, as it says, I don't need to go over paragraph one which talks about the properties, but in paragraph two, it says, whereas the President and Board of Trustees have determined it is in the best interest of the Village and its residents to direct the Village's Plan Commission to evaluate and recommend to the Board of Trustees whether and to what extent the Zoning Code, the Comprehensive Plan, the Downtown Plan, and other Village land use regulations should be amended with respect to the properties, properties that we're talking about. In my mind, it's not in the best interest of the Village and residents. It should say the best interest of the adjacent neighborhood.

This is and was an exercise to appease the neighbors. How many Red Flag Resolutions do we have in Arlington Heights or have we had? Where was the last one that we had? Are we reviewing other small areas in the Comprehensive Plan in Arlington Heights at this time? The zoning and rezoning should be on a case-by-case basis.

I oppose the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan as it relates to our properties, and at the time, if you so are evaluating the zoning, taking a down-zoning from B-3 to B-2, I also oppose that. Thank you very much for your time. I appreciate it. Have a good evening.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Mr. Whistler.
Sir, in the back?

APPROVED

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, anyone else that we missed? I don't think there is. Yes, ma'am? You may.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Good evening. My name is Ileana Rodriguez, R-o-d-r-i-g-u-e-z. I am a resident of 18 South Mitchell Avenue.

I showed up to show support for the recommendation No. 6 around the down-sizing of the high density to moderate density housing in a corner as, you know, my neighbor just shared, that is really adjacent to single-family homes and would be following this development very closely. Mr. Adreani's comments just, I just felt needed to be, you know, addressed. So, this is just, you know, compelling to the Staff and, you know, to the Planning Board to just really be thoughtful about how the buying power of developers cannot be what informs the evolution of our neighborhoods.

Not that long ago, I was in a meeting in the Design Commission meeting where Mr. Adreani was claiming he didn't have enough resources and needed to downgrade some of the elements of the development on Sigwalt Avenue, and we had to listen to that. Yet, we're able to keep buying properties and keep creeping into the neighborhood.

Please let's really keep in mind, and yes, a piece in the neighborhood, we are the residents of this Village. We are the voters and the taxpayers of this Village. I think it's absolutely critical that the quality of our lives be essential to the decision making process of the Planning Committee, not the business interests and the developer interests. Just because you keep creeping in and are able to buy homes, your interests do not get to follow you.

So, thank you for everything that you've done to really listen to the neighborhoods, listen to the community, bring things into perspective, because this community has been growing. Single-family homes are being nurtured. Streets are becoming really, you know, block party communities. We want to keep building that. So, I appreciate your attention to the community and all the efforts that have led to today. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Anyone else?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, I think we'll move to close the public hearing, back to the Plan Commissioners. Actually, before we get to the Plan Commissioners, Staff, we had some issues raised. One was the first one I talked about, about the discrepancy in the parking lot was to Mr. Lewis' house.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: That's something I don't know if you have an answer, you might not have an answer for it yet.

MR. LYSICATOS: We don't have an answer for it at this moment. Again, this is not a zoning discussion. I think that's more of a zoning discussion.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I think you're right, yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, I think right now we're focused on the Comp Plan amendments which are much more general for that block and I think a portion of that block which would provide consistency. We'd have to take a second look at the zoning. I think that also relates to the single-family discussion --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: -- 307-309.

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: The 100-foot height and all that, that's all real zoning in particular, right? I mean, that's not in the Comp Plan?

MR. LYSICATOS: The 100-foot height is I think a little bit more within our recommendations, but just specifically the zoning of some of the higher density or the single-family homes on that Park Place block I think will be a next step for us. It will probably be the issues that will be focused on that as a separate public hearing, a future public hearing.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, let's see. I'm just looking through my notes. I know there was an issue of, you know, can we reevaluate, are we stuck? I mean, I would say this is a good example of us reevaluating because we've learned from the prior development. There has been feedback and the Village has taken affirmative action to try to understand that. So, I would say if, down the road if there's more learnings, you know, then it would be another similar process potentially.

I'm looking at, I guess Mr. Whistler brought up the question, you know, one of the things that concerns me about this which is, I appreciate the work that the Staff has done, but I guess what I'm, the only thing that concerns me is this is sort of a one-off type of situation and I don't necessarily see this going on in other parts of the Village.

Do we plan to put, I know there was a controversial project a few weeks ago, and I'm sure the people affected by that decision would have appreciated a process like this and didn't get it. What, where are we going with it?

MR. LYSICATOS: So, I can speak to the history of what happened here with the Eastman Project. There was a significant response from the public when that proposal was put forward. There was a lot of dialogue and changes that were made with the developer. I think that request was really put forward in the Village Board so that, as a need, because I think the dynamics of this development within a relatively densely populated portion of our Village, the downtown being an integral part of several neighborhoods that are right there and sort of a lynchpin right there, and I think that's what really spurred the Red Flag Resolution.

Some of the other, we have not heard a response on other neighborhoods specifically, but we do like to look at the Comprehensive Plan every single year to determine if there are changes we need to consider. I think this was something that was just brought to the floor because of that process that we went through and the entitlements at the Eastman Project.

There was, I do want to respond briefly to Mr. Whistler's comments, and we did hear them. When we sat at the meeting, they told us that the redevelopment project that they wanted to move forward with a number of years ago was really what they had their hearts set on, what they felt was economically viable for the property, if not, they didn't want to hurt the prospects of the property as is and the tenants that they have. To that end, we did remove even the recommendation for the changing in the zoning to that exact point. Those buildings are really built for those auto-oriented businesses. Thank you for the history of that, I think he explained, you know, it goes back to the 40's, it was really built for cars. That's why we have even removed the discussion of changing the zoning. If at some point that redevelops, I think we'll have that discussion then to his point of rezoning.

We did look at the back half of the Comp Plan amendment, specifically to have continuity in the back of that block. We know if those properties at 400 and 380 get redeveloped, there'll be a very specific discussion of what we need to do there. I think it is trying to put forward the vision of having that Park Place block become wholly residential in the future at some point, but it wouldn't change, it wouldn't create nonconformities with zoning. It

APPROVED

would not create any issues at that point. We're not even discussing the zoning changes for a future hearing for that reason. We don't really want to change the viability of those buildings as is.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, if Mr. Whistler or Mr. Adreani were to come with a development and it's maybe out of the scope of what we're agreeing to here, we can evaluate that at the time and see if it fits --

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, correct.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: -- and there can be change.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, that would be considered on the merits at the redevelopment proposal, much like it was in 2017. That's why I think we're just looking at the Comp Plan for the rear sites of that property because of the juxtaposition of the uses as they are right now with those residential uses, it's more of a long-term land use plan. That's really what the Comp Plan is, which we're not looking to change, like I said, the zoning at this point.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Which, based on the last several weeks, I think in some of the decisions, that can be done relatively easily it sounds like. Okay, yes, I guess I'm talking a lot here, but --

COMMISSIONER DROST: That's good.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Oh, you like that, George? I appreciate that. I don't think anyone else agrees.

John, do you have any comments down there?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, I don't.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: George, anything?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, my comment is basically addressing, you know, some of the concerns that the Whistlers, that Bob Whistler made. Sort of the history, too, is that, and to kind of balance this with Ms. Rodriguez's point, I think as the Planning Department and Commission, we try to find the balance basically to try to make the community a community of good neighbors. I think both developers, Bruce Adreani and the Whistlers are examples of developers that are invested in they community. They've done a lot of developments, they come back, they understand that process. Bob's dad was on the task force that created the 2007 plan.

So, you know, there's a lot of history here, and I'm pretty sympathetic to those issues. I know it's hard to kind of look at values but most of, well, the two examples we have here, they come into the community and they understand the community and they make decisions based on, you know, current zoning. This is where maybe a greater balance or there is some form that the Village Board of Trustees can look at, all right, these people came in at a certain time, had an expectation, if we do this down-zoning, that there is a taking, you know, it comes into this loss of condemnation. So, I think that's got to be an issue that maybe the Trustees can look at.

But again, to the point, this is a plan, this is to move forward. We're, you know, learning through this history of the Eastman and other projects before it. But I'd like to, if I was going to make a public comment in the roll call, that they look at the developers, the developer's history and not injure them for, you know, what they've made an investment in. Again, it's hard to, you know, evaluate when the investor came in, where the developer lives and what those plans were, and then quantitating that into some sort of monetary compensation or leave it as is and reverse that process and say we need to down-zone because the current zoning is too generous. So, it's just a general comment.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: It's a good comment, George. I guess since you're okay with me speaking --

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, you go ahead.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: -- I have one more comment. You know, the other thing I'd add, too, is that I think it's been very clear, again I'm going to refer to the last few weeks, that the Village is very intent on, you know, promoting projects, making housing more affordable in the Village and finding projects where housing is more affordable. Sometimes, you know, other considerations get cast aside in favor of that apparently, but the real way to do that is density. You know, I mean, if we're going to say, if we're going to go around now and saying, well, affordable housing is very important and we need to do that, but then we say, well, but we don't want it to be very dense, so Mr. Whistler and Mr. Adreani can't create a development that makes economic sense, we're not going to get the density. So, it's either, you know, if you want affordable housing, you have to deal with density. If that's a real issue and the Village wants to promote it, then they have to get comfortable with density, and there are certain parts of the Village that are more conducive to density than other parts of the Village, and this area, the downtown area being one of them.

So, on one hand, we can't really say, oh, well, we want all this affordable housing, and on the other hand say but we don't want any density, because really the only way to make that happen is more density, because developers can't put in buildings and we can't get the type of redevelopment and units without, you know, density as a major consideration; otherwise, we're hamstringing the developers who are investing in the community.

So, that would be my thought.

Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I agree with that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, thanks, Bruce.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: That's very good.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I got Bruce and George.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Nice to have one on each side.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Joe, anything else?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: You know, I've got kind of a clarification question for Michael. So, what we're talking about here today is just revising the Comprehensive Plan, we're not changing the zoning.

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, basically, the Comprehensive Plan is kind of like a guideline, but the zoning is what we legally can do.

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct. The Land Use Map within the Comprehensive Plan, it's a master plan, it's a long-range plan. So, I think it talks about, and what we're talking about here is creating continuity within these blocks, guiding the types of development we'd like to steer towards different areas. But what it comes down to it, the zoning is what controls your entitlements. The zoning is, when a developer comes to ask for entitlements or variations, that's really the nuts and bolts of it is the zoning.

So, you know, for instance, the property here is an ideal one to look at where we may be looking at a long-range plan for the rear of the property which looks at more moderate density residential. That's a long-range plan. That's a long-range land use, not unlike what the developer came in in 2017 and wanted to potentially do, but to balance that, we heard from them don't hurt what we have now. They have tenants in their space, they're viable buildings. They have tenants who want to be there. We didn't want to change any of that underlying zoning to that effect. They would not become nonconformities. They would not

APPROVED

become issues if they're bringing in a new tenant or moving a tenant out.

So, that's where we try to balance that there. It doesn't stop it from coming in and having a long-range plan if these things modify over time. To your point about density, that's what we suggested also with the Eastman property, with the three first properties that we recommended. That is steering more density towards those larger developable blocks that you can master plan through PUDs, creating those setbacks, and we have those transition zones within that property at Village Bank.

I think we're trying to achieve what the Plan Commission is suggesting in creating those opportunities to provide all of those really policy points that have come up poignantly over the last few months. It feels it's déjà vu a little bit with some of our meetings, but I think that's what we're trying to do is organize it a little bit more from a general land use point.

There are some zoning recommendations here to be considered at a future meeting, but specifically with this property, we're saying we don't want to go there.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, one of the earlier cross sections showed a potential 100-story building.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, the 100-foot building? Yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes, the 100-foot. Is that based, the 100-foot based on the Comprehensive Plan or zoning?

MR. LYSICATOS: So, the 100-foot is based on the existing Downtown Master Plan recommendation. So, the existing Downtown Master Plan from 2007 recommended a 100-foot for the whole block in essence.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Is it zoned for that?

MR. LYSICATOS: The zoning there I believe is B-5. The zoning, actually, I believe is 140 feet, is the zoning there, because it's within the B-5. So, the B-5 can go to 140 feet.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: If somebody did come by and come up with a 100-foot tall story building, you know, they're not actually, they won't be a shoo in to get it done because they still have to pass the Board of Trustees?

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct. This would still be a planned unit development.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, so if we change the zoning or Comprehensive Plan on any of these, it's not a guarantee that what they have now is a guarantee to do whatever they want to do.

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct, and to clarify --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, everything is negotiable, okay.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, and to clarify for this specific recommendation, it's not a zoning recommendation.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Right.

MR. LYSICATOS: This is just within the Downtown Master Plan to guide the type of development we would look into. The minutia and the very specific elements that we would have to do, similar to what we have with Eastman which were quite a bit of work, and with the Board, with the Plan Commission and then the Village Board, to create that planned unit development which would be required here. So, this is to set the ground rules of how we would discuss setbacks, steering those elements that we heard from the public, from the Plan Commission, when they challenge us to find how do we create that transition within the zone on this specific property. I think that's what we try to achieve here.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: All right, so what we're doing tonight is really just passing guidelines.

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: That everybody can hopefully live with. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and I was just going to add this other point on the dynamic that goes on in the Village. Right now we've got, and this is just the papers, no insider information, but that there's a merger with Albertson and Kroeger and there's two locations that are pretty close together in my neighborhood. We've got a Jewel, and then in the Stone Gate area we've got a Mariano's. So, the question is, you know, will that be considered as one of the properties to be shed and how that is developed. So, that really becomes, you know, an issue and the flexibility that you have to build into these plans is to adopt to those changing conditions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, George.

Okay, so it's a Comp Plan change, no zoning. I guess one follow-up, Michael. Is there any imminent plan for a rezoning or anything at this point or are we just talking, I mean, I know we're just talking Comp Plan now, but have there been discussions? Has there been any framework for a rezoning?

MR. LYSICATOS: There were two I believe of the properties where we were making recommendations for the zoning that we could discuss a little bit tonight. But they would, to get into detail, we would schedule a public hearing. We would have to follow a different public process for that which is quite detailed, but I believe it was --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: It's just those two properties?

MR. LYSICATOS: This one? Yes, so we looked at this potentially, the R-7 to R-6, which is that whole back half of that No. 4. I think we're going to leave off the zoning though for the properties at 400, 424. We're not going to rezone this as R-6. So, this would be, you see where it says R-6 on the bottom right-hand panel?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: That would stop at pretty much the star.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Correct.

MR. LYSICATOS: I believe the start is the 4.

MS. NICHOLAS: The townhome.

MR. LYSICATOS: That's the townhomes, so it'd stop at the star. That's where the zoning recommendation that we would be talking about would stop. We wouldn't touch the properties west of that at this point. So, that is one zoning recommendation.

We talked to the residents on that block. There didn't seem to be major concerns, but again, that would come up in more detail at a public hearing. We could discuss what those specific impacts would be --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay.

MR. LYSICATOS: -- and we did hear some comments today we would take into consideration before that, we heard a few.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, I think it's appropriate to talk to the property owners, too.

MR. LYSICATOS: As you see here, we talked about, so this property, again, where it says B-3 on the top, those are not, we're not going to change the zoning there. So, that's not going to be included in that R-6.

APPROVED

No. 6, I believe we're not, oh, we're talking about this one at 5. Yes, 5, R-5, we would want to move forward with the zoning on that, correct?

MR. OSOBA: No, it's already zoned P-L.

MR. LYSICATOS: It's already zoned P-L. That one is zoned P-L, so we don't have to worry about that. No. 6, we would leave that as a B-6, or R-6, I'm sorry. That would be left as R-6. We're not looking to change that. It would just match the Comp Plan to not be high density, so that would be more in line with what we're talking about the future land use should reflect more of what the zoning is there. I think that's about it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, there's not that many elements of zoning that we would come back for. We will take comments that we receive tonight from the Plan Commission, from the public, to refine those recommendations that would be the subject of a future hearing.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, thank you for that summary on the potential future zoning.

MR. LYSICATOS: Absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: For this meeting, we're not getting into the zoning. We're talking about the Comp Plan. Do we have, is there a motion from anybody? Would anybody like to pass a motion, or I should say suggest a motion?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I'll make the motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #24-002, to amend the Comprehensive Plan, specifically portions of the Downtown Master Plan of the Village of Arlington Heights to include the following:

- 1. Section 6 - New page 32A, 32B, and 32C entitled Block 409 (234 West Northwest Highway);**
- 2.A. Section 6 - New page 32D entitled Block 316 (106 West Eastman Street); and**
- 2.B. Section 6 - New page 32E entitled Block 316 (116-120 West Eastman Street);**

and to:

- 3. Amend the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map to reclassify the six subject properties located at 301-303 West Park Place, 307 West Park Place, 309 West Park Place, 315 West Park Place, and 402-404 North Chestnut Avenue from "high density multi-family" to "moderate density multi-family";**
- 4.A. Amend the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map to reclassify portions of the subject property located at 400-424 West Northwest Highway located on the south side of West Park Place and North Fremont Street from "high density multi-family" to "moderate density multi-family";**
- 4.B. Amend the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map to reclassify a portion of the subject property at 400-424 West Northwest Highway from "commercial" to "moderate density multi-family." The portion of the property to be reclassified is located on the northern portion of the property at the southwest corner of North Walnut Avenue and West Fremont Street with the southern limits of the reclassification defined by the rear lot lines of the adjacent resident properties to the east along West Park Place.**

APPROVED

6. **Amend the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map to reclassify the properties located at 110 West St. James Street and 112 West St. James Street from “single-family attached” classification to “government”; and**
7. **Amend the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map to reclassify the properties located at 307 West Campbell Street and 217 West Campbell Street from “high density multi-family” to “moderate density multi-family.”**

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll second it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, we have a motion on the table for approval with a second.

Michael, do you want to take a roll call of votes?

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye with comment.

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: Chair Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: And Commissioner Drost, you had a comment?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, the comment is basically good job, Staff, community. The concern that I've got is that the economic issues of recognizing developers and the developers that have been consistent partners with the Village, that we consider some of the impact on what they might do as far as developing their property, and that there may be ways to compensate them if there is a position that they have that is compensatable.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, sir.

Okay, well, that closes the public hearing on that agenda item. Next up is other business.

I don't believe we have any, Michael?

MR. LYSICATOS: No, sir.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And then the next agenda item would be public comment.

Yes, sir?

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTARY

MR. MOENS: Thank you, Chair Cherwin, I appreciate that. I'd like to flashback just for a moment to the Full Circle ordeal we had a couple of weeks ago. There is a statistic that was frequently cited and we heard during that approval process, and that statistic was according to the Illinois Housing Development Authority which they call IHDA, 10 percent of year-round units are required to be affordable in a community. Also according to IHDA, Arlington Heights has 19.8 percent of year-round units that are affordable today.

So, why do we need any more affordable housing? We are

APPROVED

exceeding the requirement by almost 10 percent. The problem is, with that 19.8 percent number, is that it is way overstated, especially the IHDA calculation of the owner-occupied affordable units for all communities. So, all communities are overstated in that calculation in the IHDA formula.

The Affordable Housing Planning Appeal Act determines if a community is exempt or non-exempt to the act based upon this IHDA calculation. They listed the communities in relative order, not absolute to that number, that 19.8, they list it in relative. So, the absolute number is overstated, but it's the relative order that is important to this.

So, I would encourage you to please visit the IHDA website and review how this exemption is calculated by IHDA. I think you would see how it overstates, especially the owner-occupied affordable units part of that 19.8 percent. So, I think next time we hear this statistic being quoted as a reason for normal affordable units in Arlington Heights, I think what we have to do is what I've been told, take that with a large grain of salt. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Any other public comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, we will close that portion of it.

Do we have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Second?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right.

(Gavel pounded.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Meeting closed.

(Whereupon, at 8:49 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)

APPROVED

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