

## APPROVED

PLAN

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

COMMISSION

RE: CHEREPOVICH TATTOO - 417 SOUTH ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD - PC #24-011  
LAND USE VARIATION TO ALLOW A TATTOO PARLOR IN THE B-2 DISTRICT

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of  
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village  
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,  
Illinois on the 18th day of December, 2024 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

### MEMBERS PRESENT:

JAY CHERWIN, Chairperson  
LYNN JENSEN  
GEORGE DROST  
TERRY ENNES  
JOHN SIGALOS

### ALSO PRESENT:

MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director of Planning & Community Development  
DANIEL OSOBA, Planner I  
RACHEL HITZEMANN, Development Planner  
DARKO BOJIN, Assistant Planner

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Let's go ahead. We're going to call the

LeGRAND REPORTING & TRANSCRIBING SERVICES  
(630) 894-9389 - (800) 219-1212

## **APPROVED**

meeting to order please.

If we could have a roll call of the members?

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Dawson.

(No response.)

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Green.

(No response.)

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Lorenzini.

(No response.)

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Here.

All right, we do have a quorum for this meeting, so we will proceed on the agenda. We have an approval of minutes for --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: We've got to do the Flag.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Oh, yes, what the heck am I thinking? Yes, sorry about that, the most important part, sorry. Pledge allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you for the reminder, Lynn. I should have known better. Usually George reminds me.

All right, so we'll do a voice vote approval of minutes for: (a) Doctor's Subdivision, and (b) Chapter 28 Text Amendments.

Do we have a motion?

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

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

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

The next item on the agenda is the public hearing for Cherepovich Tattoo at 417 South Arlington Heights Road.

Dan, are you handling this one for the Staff?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, I am.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, so have all public notices been given on this?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, they have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, do we have the Petitioner here then to present? Okay, if you could please state your name and spell it into the microphone for our reporter, that would be helpful.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Hello, my name is Inga, it's I-n-g-a, and this is Artsiom,

## APPROVED

the Petitioner. I'm going to be --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Can I have your last names, too, please?

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Sorry, what was it?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Your last names.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Mine is T-k-h-o-s-t-o-v-a, and his is C-h-e-r-e-p-o-v-i-c-h.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, and I just have to swear you in real quick because you're going to be speaking on behalf. So, if you could just raise your right hand? (Witness sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, thank you.

Really quick, there is a Staff report that you probably received from Dan.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Were you able to read this?

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, and there were some conditions of approval in there. Do you agree to those conditions?

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, good, thank you. So, go ahead, please proceed. Thank you.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Okay, hello, everyone. We wanted to talk a little bit about our plans for the tattoo parlor.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Can you come closer to the mic?

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Oh, yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: You can turn it up a little bit, too.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, turn it up so that we can get the full --

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Is it working?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, that's better.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, thank you.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: So, we wanted to talk a little bit about our plans for the tattoo parlor and why we're applying for the land use variation. So, the goal behind the tattoo parlor is pretty simple. We just wanted to create a welcoming space for people to come and get their tattoos done and express themselves in whatever way they want. We believe that our main priorities are safety and so we really want to focus on that.

So, just to tell you a little bit about the space, it's an 800 square feet space. It's located on the first floor of 417 South Arlington Heights Road. It has three rooms, each of them has a separate working station. It has a reception area and a small room behind the reception area as well. All of them are equipped with professional equipment and also all the materials are disposable because, as I said before, our main priority is to keep everyone safe.

Based on some research data, the demand for tattoo services is pretty high right now, especially among millennials and the Gen Z. So, since there is no competition in the area, we believe that we can be a great choice for people and like a top destination for people to come and get their tattoos done. Also, we're planning to engage with the community by posting on social media and also hosting some events, and maybe offering some discounts on special occasions. So, that maybe will influence people to advertise for us as well.

Also, in terms of the work hours, we're planning to be open from

## **APPROVED**

Tuesday to Sunday, from 11:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., and we want to introduce the online appointment booking system, as well as take some walk-in clients. Yes, so we're going to be hiring two or three full-time tattoo artists, so we believe that it's not going to be a problem to find a time spot for walk-in clients.

When I was reviewing the comments from round one and round two reviews, I noticed that there has been a concern about the parking. So, there's 11 on-site parking spaces for visitors, but we talked to our landlord as well and he provided us with some agreement for, like a parking agreement with the church that is located across the road at 401 South Evergreen Avenue. So, they are offering 20 additional parking spaces for us as well, so we'll be notifying clients that they can use those parking spaces as well. We also are planning to put signs outside to let them know as well so they can park there.

Yes, so that's pretty much what we have for today. If you have any questions, we will be happy to answer them. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks. Well, what we'll do now is we'll turn to the Staff and ask for their report.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: You can go ahead and sit down. We may have some questions for you in a little bit --

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: -- and then we'll turn our attention to the public and ask if they have any questions.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Dan?

MR. OSOBA: Good evening, Commissioners. The property in question for this petition is located at 417 South Arlington Heights Road within a multi-tenant commercial building. The property is zoned B-2 General Business District, and classified as commercial within the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map. The Petitioner intends to lease a 1,000 square-foot tenant space for a tattoo parlor which is not permitted within any zone districts within the Village, and as such a land use variation is requested with this petition for this business to operate within the B-2 District.

The subject property is shown in red on this slide, on the east side of South Arlington Heights Road, a couple of blocks just south of the downtown. The Shree Swaminarayan Gurukul property is highlighted in blue shown on the west side of the subject property. The subject property owner, 417, LLC, and the property to the west have entered into a parking agreement which is included in the Plan Commission agenda packet, and further details on this agreement will be discussed later on in this presentation.

The Petitioner has provided this attached floor plan showing four tattoo studios and a reception area in the 1,000 square-foot unit. The tenant space is on the ground floor of the existing building, and those double doors on the slide face South Arlington Heights Road just to kind of reference you. The Petitioner has also provided business hours from 11:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., with tattooing services occurring between 12:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. The estimated number of employees is going to be three or four.

The Petitioner is not proposing any business signage at this time. However, any signage would require a separate permit from the Village.

This slide shows the current site parking layout which was resealed and striped during the Plan Commission review process. During review, Staff found that adding

## APPROVED

signage, striping, and removing one parking space would ensure that traffic circulation flows efficiently and safely through the site. The SDC is recommending conditions of approval to add one-way striping to the site, add 'Entry Only' and 'Exit Only' signage facing South Arlington Heights Road, remove the one parallel parking space highlighted on the slide here, and add signage indicating off-site parking availability at the property to the west.

Then, as an added note on this, the Faith Lutheran Church to the south of the subject property has provided a letter indicating their concerns regarding parking on the site. The full letter from the church was received after this Plan Commission packet was published, but it's been provided along with the motion sheet for this petition so you should all have a copy of that letter at this point. Staff coordinated with the church to discuss these concerns last week, and the SDC recommended a condition of approval to provide notice to the Village if the parking agreement that's been signed is modified or terminated to ensure that parking is accommodated for all uses on the site and the Petitioner intends to ensure that the customers that they have to their business are parking within the proper spaces on the subject property or across the street. If you have any questions related to that added letter from the Faith Lutheran Church, I'd be happy to answer them, or I believe we have several members of the public from the church as well.

This shows the existing parking requirements for the uses within the subject property. The parking requirement is 17 spaces overall, while 11 spaces are provided on site. Tattoo parlors are not identified specifically in code; however, previous applications have used the beauty salon ratio of one space per 250 square feet to calculate parking. As mentioned previously, the site property owner and the property owner to the west entered into the agreement for 20 additional spaces within their surface lot facing South Arlington Heights Road. That property owner requires 63 parking spaces on the west based on their seating occupancy of the sanctuary, and 72 parking spaces are provided on their site. Staff reviewed the overall parking including the agreement between the two owners and found adequate parking to accommodate these users who are provided by the Petitioner based on that parking survey included and the difference of operating hours between the place of worship and the tattoo parlor.

The Staff Development Committee recommends approval of the land use variation for a tattoo parlor within the B-2 district subject to the conditions included in the Staff report and listed on the slide. That concludes my presentation.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks, Dan, appreciate it.

Is there a motion to include the Staff report?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So moved.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And a second. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, the motion carries, Staff report entered. Thank you, Dan.

As far as questions, we'll start with the Plan Commissioners, if you have any questions before we open it up to the public.

Lynn, we can start with you.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Just one. Do we have other tattoo parlors now in Arlington Heights? Isn't there one over on New Wilke Road?

MR. OSOBA: There was one on New Wilke Road. I don't believe that is

## **APPROVED**

currently in operation. The one that I know is currently in operation is on Golf Road.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: That's a relatively new one, isn't it, Dan?

MR. OSOBA: I believe so.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Do we know what happened? It didn't have enough business with the one on New Wilke?

MR. OSOBA: I don't know exactly what happened with the one on Wilke.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I think I'll reserve questions for after the public.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Do you want to suggest a market study?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: No.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Inside joke.

John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: You know, I had this question, too, but I didn't realize the one on Wilke Road is closed, because they came before us here not too long ago.

They were open because I've driven by there occasionally, I haven't driven by there recently so I didn't realize it was closed. So, right now we clearly have one tattoo parlor in Arlington Heights?

MR. OSOBA: To my knowledge, yes. We have the one on Golf Road.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, and I really don't have any other questions. This letter here from Faith Lutheran Church which will not allow them to park there, this won't cause any problems though that they have a written agreement with the, I don't know how you say that, Shree Swaminarayan Gurukul, so that will provide sufficient parking?

MR. OSOBA: Yes. The overall parking between the two sites with the parking provided on 417 and the parking to the west is adequate to supply the demand and the requirement for the uses on 417.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, thank you. No, I have no other questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Go ahead, Terry, yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Do tattoo parlors require a special permit?

MR. OSOBA: They require a special permit from the state, but not from the Village.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, I believe there is an additional one that is a tenant at JC Salon in North Point Shopping Center. I get my hair cut there, I've noticed one there for four or five months.

Can you go to the site and parking exhibit that you have? Can you show me where the ingress and egress to the site will be?

MR. OSOBA: I can't show you with my notes but, so on the slide on the bottom left is going to be the ingress from South Arlington Heights Road.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: What is the wide square, that's not a building, right?

MR. OSOBA: That is a building. So, the building is essentially skinny in the middle, and the white part of the building that faces Arlington Heights Road has a drive that goes underneath that portion. That white portion is the second story, so there is a drive that goes underneath and loops around clockwise from the bottom left to the bottom right of the slide.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: It's kind of like a portico on both sides but there's structure over it.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Oh, okay, okay. So, okay, it's a portico, okay. That's all I have.

## **APPROVED**

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I'm going to wait for public comment.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, I'll wait for public comment, too.

So, I guess at this point, we can go ahead and open it up for public comments. The way we're going to do this is if you want to comment from the public, we'll ask you to come up to the podium, state your name, if you want to say where you live, that's fine, too, although not required, but if you could maybe just spell your name for the record.

We'll start on this end of the room. Sir, we're starting here and kind of just going this way, if you'd like to speak. Please make your way up and let us know your name.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTARY FOR PC #24-011**

MR. PEABODY: Good evening. Thank you for entertaining my comments. My name is Joseph Peabody. I live on Pine Street just behind the proposed parlor. I've been a resident of the community for 20 years, raised my sons here, and proud of our community.

I definitely respect the artistry of the tattoo. I definitely respect promoting diversity in art and safety, and I applaud the Petitioners for that. I just don't think this neighborhood is the proper place for a tattoo parlor. I think that tattoos have an underground type element associated with them. You saw the photos that were displayed by the Petitioner with skulls, with books about sorcery and wizardry and witches, and they just attract an element that's kind of that underground element.

It's cool, but in this community, it's a family-friendly community. There's a church right next door. There is a middle school just a couple of blocks west. There's a driver's ed facility right in the building with impressionable younger teenagers. I just think it sends the wrong message. I think it undermines the family-friendly community that we've worked hard to build here in this area.

I think it sounds like a great shop. I think they should get a shot in town. I don't think this location is the right one for the reasons I've stated, and I would be strongly opposed to seeing it there. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, sir.

All right, if we can kind of just make our way down if we'd like to speak? Same thing, if you would please state your name?

MS. DYER: Hello, my name is Kim Dyer. I live at 425 South Pine Avenue where I've lived for 39 years. I have a very, very strong disagreement with the idea of putting a tattoo parlor in that location.

I have no qualms about the idea of somebody wanting to have a tattoo, and I don't think that I want to say that you can classify any one specific personality to people who have tattoos. But what I can say is that if it becomes, some of the people who want to have body art all over, it is scary to young children who would be playing on the little pre-school playground right next to the church. If you go over there, you will see they have a lovely little playground area.

I also would say that we have already added a driver's ed facility which causes huge problems when they decide to practice three-point turns on the 400 block of Pine going in and out of all of our driveways. I've already had to make multiple calls to the national owners of that property to explain that we are not a driver's ed street, that that needs to be done elsewhere.

The building has already had phone calls from residents for parties that they've thrown on Saturday evenings causing loud noise. The building next to them that

## APPROVED

houses Northwest Metalcraft, both the owners of the Northwest Metalcraft and a neighbor of ours, I represent a few of us tonight because, unfortunately, this meeting was announced at a late date and it's the time of year when some of the residents have already gone for their winter vacations somewhere else. We have been told that there has been prostitution in that building at times and that the police are aware of it. I didn't ask the police personally, but I can tell you that I have a neighbor I represent who was told that, and the people at Northwest Metalcraft told me that again today.

So, if we already mix a building that has questionable things going on in it with people who are both really well bred and make great decisions and people who may not be making great decisions and maybe scaring children just by their looks, I think it's not the time and place to put something like that. I think we need to look at the safety of our citizens. I know for a fact that the church did not get a notification. So, to say that they notified the church is not correct. The church's letter which I have a copy of stated that they did not get notified and also stated that they will not share their parking lot with the tattoo parlor.

So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Before I move to the next one, I just want to clarify a few things. Do we have confirmation that the appropriate notices were sent?

MR. OSOBA: The Petitioner provided a PIN list that included the church and all properties that are required to be noticed. The Petitioner indicated that they submitted and mailed those notices on the correct date.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, do we have evidence that appropriate signage was posted?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, we do.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: There were questions about the timeframe of those notices going out. Did they provide evidence that they went out in the code-required timeframe?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, they were sent prior to 15 calendar days ahead of this meeting.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: There were issues that were raised about criminal conduct on the property. Is there any evidence that we have of that from the Police Department?

MR. OSOBA: I don't have any specific evidence, and the Police Department did not add an additional comment regarding any criminal concerns with the property.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Did the Police Department see this petition come about?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, they did.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And they provided no comment?

MR. OSOBA: No additional comment other than their typical comments, yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, maybe that's just something we could clarify for the record, if you wouldn't mind looking into it since it was brought up?

MR. OSOBA: Sure thing.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

We will continue. If there's anyone in the same row that would like to speak, you're welcome to.

Okay, so why don't we, in the back of the room, sir? No, okay. We

## **APPROVED**

can move on to this side of the room. Gentlemen on this second row, we want to start here on the end. Why don't we go on the far, why don't we, yes, go ahead, that's fine. Come up and please state your name for the record please and spell it.

MR. COATES: My name is John Coates, C-o-a-t-e-s. I am the President of Faith Lutheran Church, who is also getting over a cold so I apologize for my voice.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No problem.

MR. COATES: I'm here to convey a sense of the letter that I sent to the Commission dated December 13th. I believe you've all received a copy of that letter. In it I state how Faith Lutheran Church, despite proper protocol addressed by the Commission, no letter was sent to Faith Lutheran Church. It came to our attention from a neighbor on Pine Street who I happen to know because I live in the Scarsdale Subdivision approximately three blocks away from the church. He shared it with me, and of course I was quite alarmed to read everything.

So, if there has been representation by the Petitioner for the zoning variance claiming that they mailed it, that is either an incorrect statement or the post office lost it. What we did receive was a stamped envelope delivered to our church subsequent to my December 13th letter to the Commission, and it was not sent via postal service. It was just put in on a mail slot. So, again there is culpability or credibility regarding delivery of the letter to Faith Lutheran Church. We also own a parsonage which is a home residence for our minister that resides on Pine Street, that was also a PIN number that should have received a notice. Nothing was sent there.

Having said that, the issue we have is we have been at that location for 75 years. We just recently celebrated our 75th anniversary. If I could ask for the photograph of the property again to be displayed? It will make it easier to point out where.

If you see the, no, no, if you could go up to, advance two slides please? There you go. If you see on the picture to the left, it says Faith Lutheran Church, and immediately to the left of it is the playground that we have for our preschool students.

Our objection is twofold. We know outside of this Commission, signage will not be addressed, or signage will be addressed, but it's not part of this Commission. But in the event any movement of this at least forward by the tenant is approved, we specifically object to any type of signage, be it painted on the windows or hung or whatever that appears on the south side of the building because this is where three, four, and five-year-olds will play, and it's also two of the five entrances we have into our church on Sunday that we find objectionable to be in a Christian environment.

Again, we have, you know, we are good citizens. We've provided good relations to the community. We support businesses in the community. We just believe that the presence of a tattoo salon conveys the wrong message to those that are going to be part of and that are a part of our church and growing church. As some of you may know, we went through some rather difficult times recently with a new pastor that came in, and without going into the details, we suffered a sustained blow to a number of our congregants who exited because of his presence. We are in the process of rebuilding and have done tremendous things since then.

One of the things that we've done in the community is during the summer months we host the Kiwanis Club of Arlington Heights of which I'm president. We host the Meals at Night once a month for people who are either in need or without homes or find a need for a hearty meal during the summer. We open our doors and offer that community service through the Kiwanis Club of Arlington Heights. In addition, we have a ministry that also once a month provides dinners to our homeless and needy. So, we are an active part of this community. We feel that a tattoo signage anywhere on the south side of that building will be a detriment to

## APPROVED

those that visit our church for ministry and/or for coming to service.

With respect to parking, in the course of conversation, there's been an implication that our parking spaces adjacent to 417, which you can notice in that diagram, it's the gray area that's striped, we just spent \$6,000 or \$7,000 this fall to resurface that area largely due to parking elements that were abusive to our road surface, I mean, you know, cutouts, dig-outs, et cetera. In exchange for that, the lease that we've held with the, it's really a use agreement with the owner of 417, has been nothing but a nightmare for us to receive fair compensation in order to cover normal wear and tear.

We're not doing this as a money maker. We are not a, we're a 503(c) corporation. We're not in business to rent things out for profit. What we asked for was a stipend in donating towards offsetting our cost of maintenance and operation in good condition of the parking lot. Those numbers were substandard of what the owner of the property, which is outside of the lease, but the owner of the lot, and as a result in October of this year, an agreement we had in place beginning in August of 2022 was canceled on October 10th.

What I have is a letter to that effect which is dated yesterday because since October 10th I believe the date was, yes, October 10th of 2024 when we terminated the agreement, the owner has not only continued to allow his tenants to park on our property, but when myself and our trustee chairman, who is with us tonight who oversees our physical property, went in to the tenants and spoke to them and said we'd like to speak to the manager, is there one here we can talk to, we were told no, there is no manager, and if the concern is parking, we'd have to talk to the landlord who owns the building at 417. Well, this abdication of responsibility to problems just compounded the issue that gave us a sense that the owner of the property did not convey notice to his tenants that no one can park in our lot any longer. This continued throughout October-November up until the middle of this month. He owes us two-and-a-half months of parking considerations for which he has not paid us and intends not to pay us.

The point I'm making is if there is a variance provided where increased traffic will take place into this building at 417, I want to make it clear that there is no agreement, and I have a letter that I can introduce into evidence I'd like you to put in the record, I'm not sure who will receive it, but it was a letter that was authored and signed by our chairman of the trustees. His name is Mr. John Schnittker. He is two seats over from where I'm seated. He will probably have something to offer as well. But the point is there is no agreement, period, black and white, so that anybody that finds increased traffic going into 417 for whatever purpose needs to follow whatever agreements the landlord has made or the tenants themselves have made, but the property of Faith Lutheran Church for parking is specifically excluded.

As I've shared my concerns about the tattoo parlor, we personally don't believe, from a common-sense perspective as well as from a religious perspective, that tattooing is something that is not supported by the Book of Passages and by our Lutheran Church Missouri Synod. I'm not here to speak about the finality of that. I'm simply saying that when you have children and you have people coming in to worship in God's house, the sign of a tattoo facing the south side of our property is not a welcome event. Again, we realize that is probably discussion at a later date should this approval be advanced, but I want it to be known in the record.

That's all I have. If there's any questions, I'll answer them. If not, I'll be seated.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: For now, that's good. Thank you, Mr. Coates. We may have follow-up for you.

MR. COATES: Thank you.

## **APPROVED**

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I'll just make a note here for the record that the letter that was presented is a letter to Mr. Mehta, the property owner of 417, LLC, from John Schnittker, Faith Lutheran Church Trustee Chairman, essentially confirming termination of the agreement for permitting tenants and guests to park on the property. There is more to it, but we can pass this down if anybody would like to see the contents further.

Thank you, Mr. Coates.

We'll make our way down the aisle here. Gentlemen, if you have anything to add or say? One at a time would be good, and please, again, state your name for the record.

MR. SCHNITTKER: My name is John Schnittker; I am the Trustee Chairman at Faith Lutheran Church.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And the author of said letter that was presented?

MR. SCHNITTKER: Correct, correct. So, I just want to add a few things besides what John has said. I'm going to start with the fact that we received this, I e-mailed Dan a copy, I took a picture of this. Yes, we received this on Monday. It is not postmarked. It's not 15 days before this meeting, and it was illegally placed in our mailbox because I don't believe the post office would like somebody just placing anything in a mailbox.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Noted.

MR. SCHNITTKER: So, this is what we got in our parsonage and in our church.

The other thing I wanted to touch on is the history we've had with the landowner. We've had issues with homeless people that were staying in, he has a patio area out there. This has occurred approximately two years ago over the summer where, it was when the building was vacant and he had some patio furniture around in that patio area. We found, our pastor complained about homeless people walking through the backyard and then actually staying in that area at night. So, I had called/texted Vik and I mentioned to him that, you know, could you do something about that because the furniture was there for quite a while, plus the perimeter was broken, the fence was broken in so these people are able to come and go as they pleased.

So, I didn't get any response from him. Finally, I talked to him and I said can you do this. He didn't really, he says no, I don't have time for it. I said is it all right if we clean up that area? So, basically what happened, myself and Tom which is another board member with me on the trustees, we removed all the old furniture back there. Then, at the time, our treasurer repaired the fence closer to us so nobody could come and go as they pleased. That seemed to rectify that problem.

The other thing that we had to do was put a fence on the north side in the backyard. I don't know if you can see it in that picture, but we put a fence because it was a major thoroughfare for people walking through that parking lot from Northwest Metalcraft through our parsonage into that area that I just discussed. Then, not only in that area, then sitting around our picnic tables that are right on the, just east of that playground we have some picnic tables there.

So, that's about all I had to add. John really touched on the major points that we've, you know, it's just the history of, and we don't have any cooperation with this man that owns that building. It's just real troublesome working with him and that's the main reason we terminated the agreement with him. That's basically all I have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, sir.

## APPROVED

MR. SCHNITTKER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Sir, do you have any comments? You're good, okay, so there are no more members of the public here, the Petitioner is still here. So, at this time, we will close the public comments and we will come back to the Plan Commissioners which I know we had some comments before.

I personally, you know, I just kind of gave my comments earlier, so I guess I could --

COMMISSIONER DROST: You're the Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, I forgot about that, thanks.

So, you know, when I look at the land use variation, it's kind of a weird creature of how we do things, right. It's not a permitted use. We have these permitted uses in certain districts where they're, just by right they can do this because it's zoned for something. Special use, where it's been determined that it is compatible and everything else, but maybe because it needs a drive-through or something like that, you need to go through an extra process. Land use variation is very specific. It's like very much a case-by-case basis where kind of if we were to approve a land use variation, thank you, Dan, for the support up here, you can see the standard by which we would have to do it, and it's very specific to location in my opinion.

So, I think, you know, the parking issue here is one I have a question about really quick. So, thank you for the variation approval, I had talked to that, but I'm going to jump back real quick. Could you put up the parking thing really quick? Then we can go back to the variation criteria. The table, if you don't mind, Dan.

Okay, so we've got the surplus except the 20 shared parking spaces, but the 20 shared parking spaces are located across Arlington Heights Road, right?

MR. OSOBA: That's right.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We're going to have like freshly tattooed people running across the street after they get tattooed to get to their cars?

MR. OSOBA: They would have to cross Arlington Heights Road, yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: That's a little bit of a concern for me. Usually I'm not a stickler on parking, but this is a really tight spot. Obviously, the church isn't going to be changing their position any time soon for this property.

So, and then if you could, Dan, really quick, go back to the criteria? From my perspective, I just don't see that this particular use in this location justifies the land use variation given all things considered and kind of the parking arrangement and, you know, what's going on there and how this property is set up compared to its neighboring specific properties, and after hearing from the neighbors as well. So, that's just my personal opinion. I thought I'd share that with the folks up here.

Why don't we continue on? George, why don't you start?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and that's where I was going to go, too, with the criteria on the variation approval. But I think what I'd like to hear the Petitioner come back up and tell us is a little bit more of the experience background, what kind of artists that you will be hiring, basically more about your business than, you know, what kind of an environment are you going to set. I saw some of the, you know, description, the pictures of the ambience of the tattoo parlor, but we need a little bit more to, you know, get a sense of where you guys are coming from, what you've been doing in the past, and trying to at least lay a foundation here for we know what we're doing and we'd be good neighbors.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Yes. So, he moved here like about two years ago I would think, and he has about eight years of experience in the tattoo field.

## APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, from where?

MS. TKHOSTOVA: From Belarus.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Where?

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Belarus.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Belarus, okay. Thanks.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Yes. So, I heard some comments about that people are concerned about like symbolic, like different skulls that we had on the pictures, but I know he has some inside the building, but they are not visible to the outside, so I don't think that children would be scared. He also, like this large room that he has which is all covered, like which is all surrounded by windows, that is like the inside of it is visible to the outside, it has like a starry night painting inside of it, like on the walls. So, it catches a lot of attention from the people, but in a good way I would say.

So, yes, he has a lot of experience in this. I would say he is a professional.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Oh, so he is the artist then?

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Yes, he is also an artist. I also have a lot of tattoos that he made for me as well so I can say it on my own. Also, the tattoo artists that he is planning to hire, they are also experienced artists. Yes, he's known them for a while so he can trust them as well. So, I don't think that it's going to be a concern in terms of the professionalism.

What was the other question, sorry?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Well, what your experience was and how you are, have you sought other locations? This basic approval criterion is pretty specific as it was stated. The whole point is, you know, how did you find this location? What have you been doing? Belarus is where the basic skill sets were --

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And do you do that, too? Are you a tattoo artist?

MS. TKHOSTOVA: No.

COMMISSIONER DROST: What's your role there? Sort of like the --

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Oh, he's just my friend. I'm helping him because he doesn't speak English really well.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Oh, okay.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: So, I'm just helping him to communicate all this.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I see, okay. I just wanted to get that relationship. So, you're not really involved.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: No.

COMMISSIONER DROST: You're here as sort of a translator?

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Yes, I'm really like a translator, yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Trying to get used to the system that we have here.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I mean, you know, as far as, so that there would be a little bit of support or comfort level.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, so okay. I'm looking, you know --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Do you have any more questions?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'm just curious, you know, what I'm going after

## APPROVED

is the hardship, you know, not getting a return, and it doesn't make sense to me.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, I mean, you know, that's why I'm not supporting it.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Because it just is sort out of the blue.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, the business itself, there's nothing really wrong. It's really more the location.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: It's this business in this location is causing issues because we really have to look at specific locations when we're talking about land use variations. It's like, okay, is this a particular one, and obviously, we've had some issues. It's not really designed easily for, you know, people, you know, swinging in and out on a regular basis. You've got the weekend issue with the church traffic, and you've got the parking across the street potentially. So, all those things kind of equate for me --

COMMISSIONER DROST: And the reality is there's always going to be some problem with any kind of development, whether it's tattoos or whether it's a six-story high-rise/mid-rise. The idea is the compatibility and meeting that criterion.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, this would be like, I could see this at like North Point or something like that making sense.

Anything else, George?

COMMISSIONER DROST: No.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Mr. Terry?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I think I know the answer to this, but the property owner, your proposed landlord, he's not here, right?

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Oh, no.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, there were some comments made by the church group that it appears notice was just stuck with a stamped envelope in their mailbox.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: So, I can explain that. So, basically, their address and I think three more addresses, it didn't have the name on it, so when we received an e-mail that they didn't receive the notice, we just decided to make sure and we just put the notices in their mailboxes so they would have a notice just in case. It's just their address and three more addresses that didn't have an addressee name on it in the PIN list that was provided to us.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, Terry, I would say from a notice perspective, I mean, that could be a question for Hart if someone wants to challenge the validity of the public hearing. The fact is these people are here, so everybody that's here has essentially somehow one way or another been notified. So, in my opinion, I think we'll just continue with the public hearing. If somebody wants to challenge the validity of it, they can do that, and Hart would probably be the guy to say yes or no.

George, do you have any other questions?

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, and that's the point, you know, the fact that the neighbor showed up and the neighbor is here, it equates to waiving notice, but --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: That's how we typically handle it.

COMMISSIONER DROST: -- it's the others, too. If there's other --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, if there's somebody else out there that didn't get noticed, then they could challenge it potentially, but --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: -- that's not what we have right now, so we'll just continue on and note that it could be an issue for validity of public hearing if that's the case.

## APPROVED

COMMISSIONER ENNES: That's what I'm thinking. I have no problem with tattoo parlors. I believe this isn't necessarily the right location for it. That's all I've got.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I agree. I don't have a problem with a tattoo parlor, but this is not the right location. I share the comments. I agree with the comments by Mr. Peabody, Ms. Dyer, Mr. Coates, Mr. Schnittker. This is just not the right location.

We mentioned about the tattoo parlor that was on New Wilke Road, it closed. Did you look into maybe locating there? That was approved. I don't know if there was any comments from any of the surrounding neighbors there, but that is not next to a church. I just don't feel this is the right location at all, and I would suggest maybe looking to the one on North Wilke Road.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I don't know what caused it to close.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Lynn?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I was going to go to the same place that John did. That particular strip mall that we did approve that, I don't remember if there was even much discussion or public comment on that one.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, because --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: -- of the location.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: We eventually approved that. So, I have the same concerns, given what the neighbors have said, especially that you have two churches there, and part of the parking is across the street. So, I don't think this is a very good location, but I think there are locations in Arlington Heights that would work. Clearly, this Commission and the Board have approved other tattoo parlors.

So, I think I have to agree with my fellow Commissioners that probably you need to seek out a different location.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right. thank you for your comments.

Would anybody like to --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and another comment is I think there has to be a dialogue that's developed with the property owner of the proposed location and the neighbors. I mean, I kind of sense that there isn't, you know, that support. The Village, you know, has for a long time had on their decals and its logo a Village of Good Neighbors. We try to be inclusive, we try to bring people together, and the way that it's done is through balance. You know, there's a lot of opportunity here and sometimes you just have to kind of shop around a little bit, but we're very conscious of being part of the world and how things evolve, and there's a dynamic going on all the time.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well said, George.

Would anybody like to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I would make a motion.

**A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees denial of PC #24-011, a Land Use Variation to allow a tattoo parlor in the B-2 General Business District.**

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And just to clarify, with a denial, it would not be subject to anything. It would just be a straight up denial, correct?

## **APPROVED**

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, and is there a second to that motion?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, can we take a roll call for the motion on the floor right now which is a denial of the Petitioner's request for the land use variation?

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Aye.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: Chair Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

All right, the record can show that the motion has passed to deny the request for a land use variation. To the Petitioner, this is a recommendation, so we are not the final decision maker. The Village Board of Trustees will make the decision. We're just giving them a recommendation that we're denying your variation. So, Dan will shepherd you to the next step of the process. Please reach out to him so that you can understand the next steps involved. Thank you for coming in. Thank you for sharing your petition. Good luck.

MS. TKHOSTOVA: Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 8:18 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)

## APPROVED

PLAN

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

COMMISSION

RE: ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

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 18th day of December, 2024 at the hour of 8:18 p.m.

### MEMBERS PRESENT:

JAY CHERWIN, Chairperson  
LYNN JENSEN  
GEORGE DROST  
TERRY ENNES  
JOHN SIGALOS

### ALSO PRESENT:

MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director of Planning & Community Development  
DANIEL OSOBA, Planner I  
RACHEL HITZEMANN, Development Planner  
DARKO BOJIN, Assistant Planner

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, next we have on the agenda is no

LeGRAND REPORTING & TRANSCRIBING SERVICES  
(630) 894-9389 - (800) 219-1212

## **APPROVED**

more public hearings, but we do have an Annual Review of the Comprehensive Plan.

So, Michael, would you like to proceed?

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, thank you, Chair. Good evening, everyone.

As per our Code, Section 6-201(e), we are providing our annual report on the Comprehensive Plan and the Official Map. I'd like to start just with a brief summary with the Comprehensive Plan amendments that were made this year. There were three of them. Probably the least noteworthy of them was 2201 North Chestnut Avenue. This was a townhome development that was approved with an auto repair shop to the north of it, and you had approved some new townhomes.

The two probably more substantive and very thorough pieces that the Board reviewed earlier this year, the first one is Recreation Park, the Comp Plan amendment that was associated with the renovation of the Phase I of the park. This one followed a really robust public outreach element that the Park District led in determining how the park was to be used, led into their master plan, and ultimately Staff agreed with the recommendations that they had made for the park and actually corresponded with some of the long-range planning that we had done for the frontages along Northwest Highway.

The second piece was the Red Flag Resolution which was a significant undertaking by the Staff that was recommended by resolution from the Village Board to the Plan Commission over a several-month period. We made a number of amendments to the Comprehensive Plan that were put through just a couple, I think I believe a month ago, by this board and ultimately it was endorsed by the Village Board.

Both of these were very robust public processes that we don't regularly undertake. We feel that this is probably the largest undertaking that we've done in considering the Comprehensive Plan and amending it. So, to that end, we do not recommend any additional amendments at this time, but we will be spending the next year revisiting some of the topics that you've seen that seem to be recurring to see if there is an additional topic that we should approach at some point next year for further amendments at next year's report.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Michael.

Just so that the members of the audience know, the public hearing on the other matter is over. Feel free to stay, but you won't offend us if you want to take off at this point. So, thank you, but of course you're welcome to stay.

All right, so Michael, on this Comprehensive Plan, thank you.

Why don't we, I guess since there's no real, there's no public hearing here I guess, so we'll just have members of the board provide any comment. What they ask of us is to recommend approval of the Comprehensive Plan change and if we are to recommend it, then it would go to the Board for final approval, is that the process?

MR. LYSICATOS: At this point, we're not recommending any additional amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, I believe it would just be a motion to accept the report and recommend no additional changes to the Comp Plan or the Official Map.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, yes, and the only comment I would have is, as I think I've made clear, I'm not a huge fan of the red flag thing because I think it's a little bit very particular and inconsistent with the overall plan. I don't think it's a good process but, you know, I essentially don't really matter in that process. So, I don't know if anybody cares, but that's just my only thought.

John, Terry, any thoughts? Anything?

## APPROVED

COMMISSIONER ENNES: No.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Just echoing the same sense, it's almost like you need an algorithm to figure out --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, I'm --

COMMISSIONER DROST: -- and then it just confuses.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: -- not sure who gets the red flag and why and what you have to do to get one, but --

COMMISSIONER DROST: But notwithstanding the effort to try to find some, you know, the positivity of it was to try to get some harmony in those spot locations.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, and that's not a dig on Staff at all.

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, no, not at all.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: You guys did a great job with it, trust me.

MR. LYSICATOS: None taken.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Mr. Jensen?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I have exactly the same feelings. I never understood the red flag process at all, but that's beside the point. I mean, we're basically, you need a motion that we accept this report and have no further recommendations --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: -- to make on the Comprehensive Plan, so I'd make that motion.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Oh, George --

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll second it then. You were talking and I interrupted you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Awesome. Yes, he was anxious. So, a motion by Mr. Jensen on the floor, seconded by George Drost to accept the report.

I think we can do a voice vote on that, or do we have to do roll call?

MR. LYSICATOS: Either way is fine.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Why don't we do a roll call? We'll make it fun.

**A motion to accept the report that, pursuant to Chapter 6, Section 6-201(e) of the Municipal Code, the Plan Commission has conducted an Annual Review of the Comprehensive Plan and Official Map for the Village of Arlington Heights and recommends no additional amendments at this time.**

MR. LYSICATOS: Great, give me one second. Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: Chair Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, thank you.

For the record, the motion passes. So, we accept the report, and

## **APPROVED**

thank you, Staff, for your work on it.

All right, so that gets us through other business. The last thing we have is public comment. So, we'll open up the floor if there's anybody else --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Well, other business?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Isn't that it?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Oh, I thought we had any new business, I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No. Usually you got me though, but I think on this one I got it right for once.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, okay.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, so public comment, is there any public comment? Members of the public, Mr. Keith back there, do you have anything?

## **GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTARY**

AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, all right, thank you. Oh, yes, ma'am?

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Can I?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Absolutely.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: I have a cramp on my leg so excuse me. We were under the impression that there was going to be a discussion on the master plan by Barry Vogelmaster, are you familiar with that? I've spoken with you several times, Eileen McCullough.

MR. LYSICATOS: Oh, hi, yes.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: 2100 North Chestnut.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: And he is proposing a plan for the existing property at 2020 and 2100, and do you know the other addresses, Sheila?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, that's it.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Okay.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right. So, we are working with the gentleman, the Petitioner at this time, on how he wants to develop those properties. I know there has been a couple of different proposals that have come forward. We are working with, there's two individuals, correct?

MR. OSOBA: There's a 2201 North Chestnut, that's a different one.

MR. LYSICATOS: I believe so. This is the larger one, the larger redevelopment one.

MR. OSOBA: It's not the one that I'm working on.

MR. LYSICATOS: Okay, that gentleman has just been in a few times today.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Wait, just so I understand, what street are these properties on?

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Chestnut.

MR. LYSICATOS: On Chestnut.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Ridge, it would be between Ridge and Chestnut.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, we've received interest in these areas for potential subdivisions and future development. We've gotten a couple of different recommendations that have come forward by a couple of different petitioners, spoken with both of them, just making

## APPROVED

substantive comments on how they wanted to move forward. I don't know if they reached back out to you about interest in your properties. So, I mean, we are talking to a couple of individuals at this point that are looking to do projects. We're making recommendations based on the code, the subdivision code, and also the zoning code, to bring any kind of projects that they're recommending into conformance with those standards.

So, at this point, it's early in the process where we consider the Staff Development Committee process. This is before we get to Conceptual Plan Review. So, we're working through that at this point to find out what would be feasible according to code to redevelop that neighborhood and bring a number of elements into conformance similar to what we've talked about earlier today which is a lot of the infrastructure issues, things of that nature, which is a challenge. It's one of the later annexed neighborhoods in Arlington Heights, and thus came after some of the large public improvements happened. So, I think that's been the largest probably dynamic in that.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: So, there's no timeline that you can give us when any of this would --

MR. LYSICATOS: No, at this point, I know you've been working with them a little bit.

MR. OSOBA: Tentatively, January for Conceptual Plan Review Committee meeting, and then that would have to go through the Plan Commission process and ultimately end up at a Plan Commission meeting here. That has not been formally scheduled yet, but that is still tentatively what we're aiming for.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Okay, the homeowners in question, will they be notified in any way about this?

MR. OSOBA: The Conceptual Plan Review Committee meeting is not a notification meeting, that is just a meeting. Then anything that would go to this body, the Plan Commission, would require public notice.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, ma'am, would you state your name just for the court reporter?

MS. McCULLOUGH: Eileen McCullough, M-c-C-u-l-l-o-u-g-h.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, yes, and so I think as Dan mentioned, the room you're in, next door would be where we have the Conceptual Review Committee which isn't a public hearing, but the public is welcome to show up.

MR. LYSICATOS: And it is noticed through the Village website.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, it is noticed in that regard according to the Public Meetings Act, and it is a public meeting, but --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: -- it wouldn't be the mailing, the mailing is only for the public hearing.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: You would specify what area you're meeting on or is it just, you know, general?

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, it would have an agenda. It would have all the submissions, right. It would have all the submissions that the Conceptual Plan Review Committee would be considering, so any of the site plans or designs or potential subdivision. Usually those will be all part of, whatever the board sees would be part of the public record and would be in the agenda online.

## APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: That's like a preliminary stage, and then once they get comment and feedback from the members of that committee, then they may adjust their plans or whatever, and then there would be the official, as Michael said, there would be the official notice. You would receive a mailing, there would be a sign posted, and then that would be the public hearing.

Yes, but you know, if you're interested in attending the Conceptual Review, those are posted typically every Friday, is that right, Dan, on the website? Do you have access to the Arlington Heights website? Yes, so on Friday, they'll post what's going to happen at the Conceptual Review meetings which are typically on Wednesdays, Wednesday evenings before our meetings here. So, that's how that process works.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: So, at this point, you have no idea how you're going to move forward with this.

MR. LYSICATOS: We haven't gotten into the detailed review as of yet. We're approaching that point, but not yet.

MS. MCCULLOUGH: Okay, thank you.

MR. LYSICATOS: You're very welcome.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Anybody else from the public would like to comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, at this time, we will close the public comment unless there's anything else? Is there one?

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, just one question. We have a new Executive Director of the Planning Department?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We do.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Any announcement there?

MR. LYSICATOS: Well, we do have Emily Rodman who is our new Planning Director. She does intend to attend a future meeting. She didn't have availability tonight to join us, she apologizes, but she does plan to visit all the different boards and commissions to introduce herself, but this is her second full week and it's been a great start. I think Staff is excited to have a full platoon if you will of planners now and moving forward.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I would just also, Darko is new to us, if you want to introduce yourself, Darko?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, Darko.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And then I think everybody has met Rachel, but Darko, why don't you just, if you go and like just let them know --

MR. BOJIN: Yes. I'm Darko Bojin; nice to meet you all. I'm the new Assistant Planner with the Planning Department and I have a couple years now of experience in municipal planning, both at the Village of Wheeling and the Village of Hanover Park. Glad to be part of the team.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Where did you get your education?

MR. BOJIN: I have a Master's in Planning from the University of Illinois-Chicago.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, well, welcome, Darko, we're happy to have you. And Rachel, has everybody met Rachel?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes. Hitzemann, correct?

MS. HITZEMANN: Correct.

## APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We're also glad to have Rachel, and now Dan is a grizzled veteran --

MR. OSOBA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: -- and there's Michael of course.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, that's it, I'm an old guy.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: With your years of doing it, I guess.

MR. LYSICATOS: Now, I don't just feel like the old guy, I am the old guy.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, you don't look like the old guy though, let me tell you.

MR. LYSICATOS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Does the new Executive Director know what she's getting into?

MR. LYSICATOS: I think she's well versed.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, she's got a great team, so that's a good start.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is there a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll second it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: There's a motion to adjourn. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, motion passes.

(Gavel pounded.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We're adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 8:31 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