

APPROVED

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: PC #24-025 - ARLINGTON RIDGE CENTER BUILDING ADDITION -
660 NORTH RIDGE AVENUE
PUD AMENDMENT & SPECIAL USE PERMIT AMENDMENT, VARIATIONS

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 23rd day of April, 2025 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

JAY CHERWIN, Chairperson
LYNN JENSEN
KRISTEN SCHURTZ
JOE LORENZINI
TERRY ENNES
JOHN SIGALOS

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner I
MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Development
RACHEL HITZEMANN, Development Planner

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We'll go ahead and call the meeting to order.
(Gavel pounded.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: If we could please stand, everybody, and do
the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Dan, do you want to go ahead and take a roll call of the Commission?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Or Rachel.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Dawson.

(No response.)

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Drost.

(No response.)

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Green.

(No response.)

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Chairman Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Here.

Thank you.

Okay, we have a quorum, and we'll move forward. Looking at the
agenda, Item III is approval of minutes, the Plan Commission minutes from April 9th, 2025.

Is there a motion to approve it?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So moved.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Second. Okay, the motion is for approval of
those minutes.

All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, the motion passes, minutes are
approved. Thank you.

Moving on to Item IV, we have two public hearings A and B, both
Arlington Heights Park District.

So, I would just ask, Dan, are you handling both these?

MR. OSOBA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, has public notice been given on both of

APPROVED

these?

MR. OSOBA: Yes. Yes, they have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay. All right, we'll start with Item A.

If the Park District's representatives want to stand up and move to the podium? If you could please just, oh, if you have a couple of presenters here, when you all get up, I'll just have you raise your right hand and we'll do a little swearing in if you don't mind, anybody who is going to be testifying on behalf of the Park District. Thank you.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, all right, thank you. There's a Staff report on this item, and the first one is going to be Arlington Ridge Center, what we'll be talking about here, the building addition. There is a Staff report on this and certain conditions of approval in there. Have you read the Staff report, and are you in agreement with the conditions?

MR. KRAMER: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you. So, I will ask you to go ahead and you can start your presentation before we ask for the Staff to present theirs. If you could just, before you speak, recite your name and spell your last name for the court reporter, that would be very helpful.

MR. KRAMER: Absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

MR. KRAMER: John Kramer, K-r-a-m-e-r.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, Mr. Kramer.

MR. KRAMER: Thank you. Let me just start out with a brief presentation summarizing the Arlington Ridge Center, the addition. Respondents today are John Kramer myself, Maggie Krieger to my left, and Monica Goshorn-Maroney to my left as well, too, both consultants who have worked on the project.

Agenda a little bit for the PowerPoint: Existing conditions, proposed site plan, proposed additions and renovations, the variance requests, and then the time for any comments and questions.

Existing Conditions: The existing site, largely the two-story addition is the one item of note that, from an existing conditions perspective, stands out on the slide. Existing photographs of the entrance of the facility, current site plan, the two bubbled areas, one shows the move of the existing and the addition and then where that movement of playground items goes towards the front of the property.

Site Improvements really largely revolve around that move of the basketball court from one side of the facility entrance to the other. Hence, why we called that out, and then we're showing the fence on there because that was an item listed. The existing playground and how that changes based on the addition.

Additions and Renovations: Largely, those are interior facing, new family changing rooms, reconfigured aquatic locker rooms, reconfigured entry vestibule, and then obviously that new multi-purpose room. Level II, because it is a two-story addition, that new fitness studio is what's on top of that additional space. The addition rendering as it looks from the outside, largely seamless as it relates to the existing building. Interior views.

Then the Variance Requests: Parking analysis, the traffic study, the fence height, and then the accessory structures relative to those outdoor playground amenities.

I know that was pretty brief.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: It's okay, thank you. Anything else before we

APPROVED

move to Staff?

MR. KRAMER: No.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you. You can take a rest if you want and we will call you back up here for some questions most likely.

Dan, do you want to share the Staff report with us please?

MR. OSOBA: Yes. All right, thank you, Chair. The 10.3-acre subject property is located at 660 North Ridge Avenue and owned by the Arlington Heights Park District and is currently zoned P-L Public Lands District, and the Comprehensive Plan future land use designation is "Parks."

The Petitioner is requesting to amend the Arlington Ridge Center Planned Unit Development to add the building addition and reconfigure the playground and basketball court, a special use permit amendment to amend the original community center recreation building special use, and four variations. The variations relate to a waiver of the traffic study, a parking variation, fence height variation, and accessory structure variation.

The subject property is highlighted in red and bounded by Salem Avenue, Northwest Highway, Euclid Avenue, and Ridge Avenue. There are existing single-family homes just to the north of the property and they directly abut the property line.

The proposed site modifications include a new two-story 6,100 square-foot addition shown in red, the relocation of the basketball court shown in orange, and the renovation of the playground shown in green. The basketball court and playground are considered accessory structures in the zoning code, and the zoning code also requires that accessory structures be placed in the rear of the property which is to the north of the building or plan right on the slide. Given the adjacency to single-family homes to the north and to maintain the most amount of green open space on the site, the SDC is in support of this variation request.

The Petitioner is also requesting a variation to increase the height of the fence around the basketball court on the west and south ends from six feet, which is code required, up to a maximum height of eight feet. This will reduce basketballs going into the parking lot and would be an ornamental style aluminum fence to match the other fences on the site. The SDC concurs with the Petitioner's justification for this variation request and is in support of it as well.

As the building square footage is increasing, the Petitioner is requesting to increase the parking variation that was previously approved by Ordinance 18-009. The Petitioner provided a parking study that evaluated the parking requirements for the existing facility and newly proposed addition based on the occupancy of the space. The table on the slide shows the new square footage of occupiable space proposed within the building in orange. Overall, the facility will require 807 total parking spaces where 291 spaces are provided on site, which leads to a parking variation of 516 spaces.

As part of the study, the Petitioner conducted a parking survey in March of 2025 that found that the peak demand was 131 total occupied spaces on the site. The SDC concurs with the conclusions of the parking study that find that the increased parking demand due to the building addition will not have an adverse impact on the existing development, and the facility will not be at a hundred percent occupancy which is 2,649 people at any given time. The current parking survey shows the facility functions at current capacity. The SDC recommends approval of the parking variation with conditions of approval similar to the previously approved parking variation that include land-banked parking and coordinating events so that they do not overlap within the ARC.

APPROVED

These are the criteria for approval for the variations, and these are the criteria for approval for special use. The Staff Development Committee recommends approval of the proposed planned unit development amendment and special use permit amendment to amend the original community center recreation building special use permit along with the following variations to Chapter 28, from Section 6.12-1.3 to waive the requirement of a traffic study, from Section 10.4-4 to reduce the required parking from 807 spaces to 291 spaces, from Section 6.13-3.b to permit an eight-foot high fence where the maximum height is six feet, and from Section 6.5-2 to permit two accessory structures in the western side yard where accessory structures are permitted to be only in the rear yard.

The recommendation is subject to the resolution of the conditions as listed on the slide and in the Staff report. That concludes my presentation.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Dan.

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

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Motion on the floor; is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: The motion is seconded.

All in favor of admitting the Staff report?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, the motion passes. The Staff report is included in the public record, thank you.

Before we open to the public hearing, I'd ask the Plan Commissioners if there are any questions. We'll start down at the end by Lynn and Kris.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: No, I'd rather hear from the public, and then I'd have some questions after that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, Kris?

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: I agree.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, Joe?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Can we look at that parking study slide again? So, the current variation requires 516. What is it currently before this project?

MR. OSOBA: Give me one moment. It is 757 spaces.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, 757, and the current requirement, so the delta, Joe, are you trying to ask the delta?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes, what is it?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, the variation to B you have listed, Dan, is 516, but the variation currently, because the requirement is not yet 807 but is currently 50 spots less than 757.

MR. OSOBA: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, right now there's a large variation existing.

MR. OSOBA: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: It is not 50; it's not one for one though; it's not 50 spaces difference. So, it's not a variation of 466 right now, is it?

MR. OSOBA: No. So, currently, the way that it's currently situated, in Ordinance 18-009, it approved the parking variation were based on the occupancy of the building

APPROVED

in 2018 when the Park District studied it, they needed 757 total parking spaces and there are 291 on site.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: 291 currently.

MR. OSOBA: Correct, and that total number of parking spaces on site is not changing --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Right.

MR. OSOBA: -- because the building addition is increasing the square footage and, therefore, increasing the occupancy, the total occupancy requirement and, therefore, parking requirement goes up to 807 total spaces.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, okay. All right, so I guess it is then 466. Joe, I'm sorry to jump on the question, but that's what you were asking, right?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No, that's all right. Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, right now, so what's going on right now is the parking variation requested for 516 spots, and currently in existence right now is a 466 deficit.

MR. OSOBA: That is correct, yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Joe, is that --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes, that's fine.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, anything else?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Gentlemen down here?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I do have --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, I have a question. Can you bring up the slide that shows the site plan? Okay, the basketball court that's over in the southwest corner, when you were at the Conceptual Plan Review meeting, you were requesting a 12-foot high fence. Now, I see you're requesting an eight-foot high fence around this. I'm concerned if that's high enough being it is a basketball court and kids playing basketball and why you went from 12-foot to eight-foot.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Just if you could, before speaking, state your name please for the record.

MS. GOSHORN-MARONEY: Yes, I am Monica Goshorn-Maroney, Hitchcock Design Group. There is an existing eight-foot fence along the pool deck there that this fence will be tying in to. So, that's why it's an eight-foot fence that would tie into an existing eight-foot fence so there's no height variation there. Then the basketball courts are actually rotated from what they were at the Plan Commission so that basketballs will be shot away from parking lots. So, the thought was that the fence could drop because of that new orientation, and that way we'll match with their existing and there is no height variation change in the fence.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, the eight-foot fence will only go, what, on the west side of that basketball court?

MS. GOSHORN-MARONEY: Yes, on the west side, sorry, on the north side and then the west side being up on the plan, and then it stops at the corner where the parking lot starts to turn to avoid any visibility challenges there --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay.

MS. GOSHORN-MARONEY: -- and then it drops to four feet on the back side.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'm just concerned if that's tall enough for a basketball court with kids playing basketball and if balls can bounce over that fence and into the

APPROVED

parking lot there. That's my only concern.

MS. GOSHORN-MARONEY: Well, the balls would be, the way the basketball is oriented, the balls would be being thrown away from the parking lot. So, they'd be thrown to the north towards the hoops.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: But, no, it looks like they're being thrown to the south, isn't it? Am I reading this wrong?

MS. GOSHORN-MARONEY: North is to the right on the plan.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Right.

MS. GOSHORN-MARONEY: So, then that's the way the --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: But I think the basketball, that's on the left, on the south?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No, at the top of the key there is on the westerly, or on the southerly side which is where the parking lot is, John, so the shots would be, unless it's a really terrible shot, the shot would be from west to east.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: You know, so I think the theory there is, you know, that if they're shooting, they're shooting to the east.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: They're shooting to the east, not to the west.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, and if Terry were to take a shot and it's ridiculously off, then it's going to go into the swimming area. So, what is the, I'm sorry, just for clarification, what is the height of the fence between the basketball and the pool area?

MS. GOSHORN-MARONEY: Eight feet, it's eight feet all along the --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: That's also eight feet all the way along, okay.

MS. GOSHORN-MARONEY: Along the north side there.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MS. GOSHORN-MARONEY: On the right side of the basketball court. The fence in that area is also offset from the basketball court so there is a landscape buffer there, too, so players aren't right up against the fence. There's a little bit more space there to capture the ball.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, you're not going into the pool to recover your basketballs.

MS. GOSHORN-MARONEY: Right, and there is no, the pool is on the inside of the building as well, so there is not open water in that area.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, oh, yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Right. Okay, that was my only question.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I have a question I think for Staff regarding parking. It's my recollection a number of years ago, an adjoining property over here indicated to us for approval that they had some type of a shared parking agreement with the rec center, and that's Big Ange's. Now, that's before your time, but, and I don't see if that ever came up. Was that ever, was that shared parking agreement ever formalized? Is that a verbal?

Okay, the Petitioner.

MR. KRAMER: There are six spots that we have under agreement with Big Ange's.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, so there is some type of a formal agreement with them?

MR. KRAMER: With the Park District, correct.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, because I noticed the other day there weren't any signs there or anything. People just have to know that. Okay, that's all I, well, was that part of the parking study? Are they aware of that?

MR. CORCORAN: Good evening. Steve Corcoran with Eriksson Engineering. Yes, it's actually in our report on the first page. We did mention that there are six spaces reserved for them as part of a shared parking agreement.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I missed it.

MR. CORCORAN: And the day we did the count was the weekend before St. Patrick's Day so corned beef was really popular, so there was definitely cars parked there to use Big Ange's and include it in my count.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: In that count, okay. That's all I have, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks.

Anything else from the Commissioners before I open the public hearing here?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, so at this time on this matter, we'll open the public hearing. If anybody has any comments on this Ridge Center project, we can start in the back of the room to the left and make our way forward. No in the back? In the middle rows here? The gentleman with the hat? Anybody else? John, nothing?

We'll switch over to this side. Back of the room, no? Moving up, middle rows? Anybody over here in the front two rows?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Did we miss anybody? No public comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, so we'll close the public hearing at this time. Basically, without public comment, would anybody have any additional questions?

Lynn, I think you might have had?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: No, actually, I think everything has been answered. I'm very supportive of this project.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: They've done a nice job.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, well, public comments are closed at this point.

Any other final comments or questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is there a motion from anyone here?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #24-025, a Planned Unit Development Amendment to Arlington Ridge Center Planned Unit Development; a Special Use Permit Amendment to amend the original 'Community Center Recreation Building' Special Use Permit; and the following Variations:

- 1. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.12-1.3 to waive the requirement for a traffic study.**
- 2. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.4-4 to reduce the required parking from 807 spaces to 291 spaces.**

APPROVED

3. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3.B to permit an eight-foot high fence where the maximum fence height is six feet.
4. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.5-2 to permit two accessory structures in the western side yard where accessory structures are required to be in the rear yard.

This recommendation is subject to resolution of the following:

1. The Arlington Heights Park District shall construct all land-banked parking stalls as identified in the plan prepared by Gewalt Hamilton Associates, Inc. within 90 days upon request of the Village if it is determined, at the sole discretion of the Village, that there is a shortage of on-site parking spaces on the subject property.
2. The Arlington Heights Park District shall work with the Village to adjust scheduling so that major events do not overlap. This may include a reduction in the amount of programming that is allowed on the subject property, if it is determined, at the sole discretion of the Village, that there is a shortage of on-site parking spaces on the subject property. The Park District shall provide an operations plan for the Arlington Ridge Center to demonstrate a reduction in parking demand.
3. At the time of building permit submission, the Petitioner shall provide a stormwater summary, including the existing and proposed impervious coverage and information on if excess storage is available in the existing detention facility.
4. At the time of building permit submission, the Petitioner shall provide an MWRD determination letter.
5. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations and policies.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Joe.

The motion has been presented, is there a second?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, Commissioner Jensen has seconded.

We'll do a roll call of who's in favor of the motion.

Dan or Rachel, you want to --

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes.

Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Chairman Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

All right, the approval, or I should say the recommendation for

APPROVED

approval has been given, so congratulations on that, but don't go anywhere because we've got another one coming up.

(Whereupon, at 7:50 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: PC #25-007 - RECREATION PARK PHASE II & III - 500 EAST MINER STREET
PUD AMENDMENT & SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR PHASE II & PHASE III OF
RECREATION PARK, VARIATIONS

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 23rd day of April, 2025 at the hour of 7:50 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

JAY CHERWIN, Chairperson
LYNN JENSEN
KRISTEN SCHURTZ
JOE LORENZINI
TERRY ENNES
JOHN SIGALOS

ALSO PRESENT:

DAN OSOBA, Planner I
MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Development
RACHEL HITZEMANN, Development Planner

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, what we'll do is move to the next item on the agenda, and that's Item B, the Rec Park. I suppose it's the same group, but I would also ask you to come back up because we have a new matter. So, since I'm such a detail guy, I want to make sure we get this right.

MR. KRAMER: John Kramer again, yes, with my same project team. Are you going to swear me in again?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I'm going to swear you all in one more time.
(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you. Mr. Kramer, if you want to hang around here? I know you'll give the presentation.

I'm just going to ask, Dan, I think I asked you last time around but public notices have been given on this one as well, correct?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, they have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, and then, Mr. Kramer, you've read the Staff report on this and you agree to the conditions that were set forth in there?

MR. KRAMER: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, great. I'll let you go ahead with the Rec Park presentation.

MR. KRAMER: Same project team. Agenda for today, very similar: existing conditions, talk a little bit about community input, OSLAD grant, Park Grant, Phase II improvements, Phase III improvements, schedule, the variance requests.

Existing Conditions: I believe everyone is familiar with the Recreation Park site.

A little bit about our community input: We had several open houses and then correspondence, both at our public meetings for the Park Board which impacted both of these projects.

Grants: Associated with Open Space Land and Development grants, two of them actually. Phase I we're currently underway. We have another one for Phase II, that's a \$600,000 grant, and Park and Rec Grant for \$2.6 million for the bath house portion.

Schedule: Proposed schedules, phasing, obviously Phase I is under construction currently. Phase II, '25 and '26. What each of those entail, we've tried to highlight those because it is a little confusing on the site, so we tried to illustrate those based on color.

Phase II site plan to the north illustrates the prefab restroom, basketball court, the open area dugout, and modifications to a portion of the backstop that's there as well as the reconstruction of the new parking lot in a new location. South site plan largely just focuses on the baseball field and improvements to that. A little bit about the Phase II improvements, showing the basketball court, batting cage, ball field, fence height, toilet room.

Phase III site plan largely goes over the bulk of the renovations to the existing community building, the new bath house building, pool. Phase III improvements, renderings, front entry experience as you come through the half circle drive, new bath house building focusing looking to the west, pool looking to the north, pool looking to the south.

Then the variance requests: Traffic study, again the fence height, light pole height of the existing ball field lighting, accessory structures, accessory structure quantity, and the parking analysis.

That concludes my summary.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you very much. I'll again tell

APPROVED

you you can take a rest. We're going to turn it over to Staff and ask for their presentation.

MR. OSOBA: Thank you, Chair.

The subject property is located at 500 East Miner Street and owned again by the Arlington Heights Park District. It is currently zoned P-L Public Lands District, and the Comprehensive Plan future land use designation is "Parks." The Petitioner is requesting to amend the Recreation Park Planned Unit Development for Phase II and Phase III of the redevelopment and a special use permit for a "facility owned by the Arlington Heights Park District."

The Petitioner is requesting variations from Chapter 28 relative to, relating to the waiver of a traffic study, fence height, light pole height, accessory structures, and to reduce the required off-street parking.

This aerial shows the subject site highlighted in red. It is north of Northwest Highway and bound by Belmont Avenue, Miner Street and Douglas Avenue. A portion of Recreation Park is located to the east of the site; however, no site changes are proposed on that part of the development.

This graphic shows the phases of the planned unit development. Phase I, which was approved by the Village Board in August 2024, is highlighted in red. Phase II is in blue and includes ball field improvements, new dugouts, updated basketball court, a new restroom building, new water service, and reconfigured parking lot and access from Douglas. Phase III is highlighted in green and includes the demolition of the existing bath house, the reconstruction of a new one, locker rooms, building addition to the community center, upgrades to the pool and pool deck, and additional parking along the circular drive. Both Phase II and Phase III are the total subject of tonight's hearing.

As mentioned, the Petitioner is requesting variances from Chapter 28. The site-specific variations include taller fences and light poles than code permits, and then the number and placement of accessory structures. The fences proposed are color coded on this graphic to illustrate the location and height. The blue fence is an eight-foot tall ornamental fence that acts as a perimeter to the pool. The yellow fence is a 10-foot tall chainlink fence that would be used in the outfield of the baseball field. The red fence is an eight-foot tall fence with a 32-foot tall net structure, so a total of 40 feet to surround the infield to reduce errant foul balls.

The SDC has reviewed these fence height variations and is supportive of the request with the condition that the entirety of the eight-foot fence shown in blue is an ornamental style fence. The Petitioner is currently working on a bid for the cost to change this from chainlink as it was originally proposed to an ornamental style fencing. The SDC is recommending a condition of approval that the fence be ornamental to match the rest of the site to provide better visual quality in this highly visible area.

In addition to the fencing, the Petitioner is including modifications and upgrades to the park and expanding the number of accessory structures which are only permitted in the rear of the property. The rear of the property in this case is everything that's to the south of the existing community center. The Petitioner has identified 14 total accessory structures, and some of those structures including the wading pool and the baseball field structures encroach into the front or side yard. The SDC concurs with the Petitioner's requested variations related to accessory structures as it provides additional park amenities located in an efficient manner throughout the site.

Lastly, the Petitioner is requesting a variation to permit the existing light poles at a height of 70 feet where 40 is the maximum. These light poles have existed on the

APPROVED

site for over 20 years and are being covered by a variation request to permit the height via this PUD approval. The SDC is supportive of this request as well.

The Petitioner provided a parking study to evaluate the parking demand for Recreation Park based on the proposed changes. The table on the slide shows the related occupancy of various buildings and amenities that are proposed. The Petitioner provided additional parking surveys from Camelot Park and Frontier Park to evaluate whether the demand was in line with the findings for Recreation Park. The study found that the requirements for Recreation Park were slightly higher than the other two, which is to be expected given the varying size and provided amenities in Recreation Park.

In total, Recreation Park requires 533 total parking spaces where 77 off-street parking spaces are provided, which leads to a total variation of 456 spaces. There are an additional 249 on-street parking spaces that are adjacent to the park. These can realistically be utilized for the park but do not actually count towards the total off-street parking requirement per code. Based on the information provided by the Petitioner, the SDC is supportive of the requested parking variation and concurs with the Petitioner's response to their criteria for approval for variations because the variation does not alter the character of the area and preserves it by maintaining the maximum amount of open space. The request is also harmonious with the spirit and intent of Chapter 28 in the P-L Public Land District, and the creation of three smaller parking lots within the site better distributes the parking throughout.

These are the criteria for variation approval, and these are the criteria for special use approval. The Staff Development Committee recommends approval of the proposed planned unit development amendment to Recreation Park PUD for Phase II and Phase III, and the special use permit for a facility owned by the Arlington Heights Park District, along with the following variations to Chapter 28:

- Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.12-1.3 to waive the requirement for a traffic study;
- Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3.b to allow a fence height of eight and 10 feet for the ball field fencing and pool perimeter fencing and 40 feet for the ball field backstop fencing where six feet is the maximum height;
- Variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.2-12.3.c to allow an existing light pole height of 70 feet where 40 feet is the maximum;
- Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.5-2 to permit accessory structures partially in the front and side yard where accessory structures are only permitted in the rear;
- Variation from Section 6.5-2 to permit 14 accessory structures where the maximum number of accessory structures is 12, which was allowed per Ordinance 24-052; and
- Variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.4-4 to reduce the required number of off-street parking spaces from 533 to 77 spaces.

This recommendation is subject to the resolution of the conditions as recommended in the Staff report, these eight conditions that are on the slide here. That concludes my presentation.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks, Dan.

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

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, motion passes. Staff report is included in the public record, thank you.

Before we open the public hearing, are there any initial questions?

None here. Joe?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes. This light pole variation, is it going to be redirected? I mean, is going to be directed in a different manner or is it going to be the same way as now?

MR. OSOBA: No, it is going to be exactly the same. There's no changes proposed to the light pole. We're just covering it with a variation as it wasn't previously included in any variation or PUD.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you.

MR. OSOBA: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: On the left side, gentlemen? No, okay. Well, you guys are going to have a chance. We're going to open the public hearing and we'll see what happens here.

We'll start in the front. Nobody here from the Park District. Then going towards this side again, left, any comments on the Rec Park? We're going to move on this side of the room in the front. If any members of the public would like to speak? Okay, we'll move -- oh, yes, ma'am. Please make your way to the microphone. If you could please state your name. If you'd like, you can tell us where you reside in Arlington Heights.

PUBLIC COMMENTARY ON PC #25-007

MS. OTTOLINO: Barbara Ottolino, 15 South Belmont, Arlington Heights. I was unaware of the height of the fence around the back of the ball field. Why the 10 feet? That's pretty tall.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: What we'll do at this point is if you could just direct your questions up here?

MS. OTTOLINO: I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: That's okay. We'll keep track of what you're asking, and the Petitioners, or the Commissioners can follow up with these questions. So, if you could just --

MS. OTTOLINO: On the outfield fencing for the ball field.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, okay.

MS. OTTOLINO: Raising that to 10 feet, I was wondering why. Why that change?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, any other comments or is that it?

MS. OTTOLINO: No.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Kramer, if you want to provide an answer for that, we'll take care of that now.

MR. KRAMER: The walking path that goes behind it predicated the height addition through that section.

Monica?

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: It's currently at --

MR. KRAMER: Behind the baseball field, the existing, the fence height rose to 10 feet because of the walking pathway.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: The yellow area shown on this we're talking about.

MS. GOSHORN-MARONEY: Because with the improvements and Phase I being a little bit closer to the ball field than the existing condition --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Could you talk into the mic so everybody can hear you?

MS. GOSHORN-MARONEY: I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

MS. GOSHORN-MARONEY: With the improvements to Phase I that's currently under construction, the new walking path and the tennis court are now closer to the ball field than the existing condition. So, the intent is to raise the fence just in the section adjacent, closest to the tennis court and walkway to 10 feet to block any homerun hits that might affect pedestrians using the walkway.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, and what is it currently at?

MS. GOSHORN-MARONEY: I believe it's currently at four feet in the back. Oh, sorry, that's six? Six feet in the back, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, thank you for your explanation.

Commissioners, any questions on that point? No? All right, thank you.

Any members of the public behind in the middle rows? Yes, sir, come on up.

MR. HANSEN: I'm Greg Hansen; I'm at 304 North Haddow Avenue. I just want to recognize the Park District, all their work they've done and the outreach to the public being the community in the area, not only in just postings but collecting e-mail addresses, sending e-mails, having special meetings to come to this final plan. I know that it's strongly supported in the community, and I appreciate, you know, all the things that you as the Plan Commission look at here and, hopefully, you know, with the SDC, the research that you've done, that they can move forward and keep on the timeline for the pool being opened to support the community. So, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, thank you for your comment.

All right, in that same row, is there anybody? In the next row behind? Sorry, yes, sir.

MR. WHITEBLOOM: I'm Myles Whitebloom. I live just across the street from Rec Park to the north, at the intersection of Haddow and Miner. I didn't know, you know, if this is the time, you know, the things you guys have talked about, for instance, things of lighting and that type of thing, are you interested in our thoughts on that, about any general lighting thing?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: This is your time. This is a great time to bring it up, if you have any questions or concerns.

MR. WHITEBLOOM: Okay, got you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, feel free.

MR. WHITEBLOOM: So, one thing on like the pool lighting, I don't know if we can go to the slide where it was on there at one point? They're kind of round it looked like at the top.

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Was that in the Petitioner's? Let's see. Right there?

MR. WHITEBLOOM: Yes, exactly. So, I'm just wondering if those are the exact type of lights that are going to go in, which is great if that were, or is that something that somebody put in there? Is that exactly the design? I'm wondering.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, we can ask that question of the Petitioner.

MR. WHITEBLOOM: Okay, the reason I'm --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, go ahead, continue then.

MR. WHITEBLOOM: The reason I'm concerned is we live right across the street from the main brick building, and we get plenty of lighting, just our whole side of our house is just lit up the way the, because there were some LED lights that had been installed around the current pool and they project north. So, these would be great because it looks like they go down. So, that was my concern, that we don't get all that light pollution going north.

Along the same line, speaking of lighting, I didn't see a picture of the turnaround. I know you guys are adding parking to that area. From a lighting standpoint, we get a lot of light there as well that, instead of just being directed down, you know, and I understand from a safety standpoint you want to keep the area lit, but it just sprays out. So, my concern is, depending on the height of the lights, the ones that are there now are probably almost as high as the street lights, probably 25 feet, whatever those are, but the ones that are currently installed that have just been installed over the past few months as part of the redo of the park along the walkways, those are about 15 feet if I had to guess.

So, obviously, the higher they are, the more spray you get. But 15 feet would seem appropriate to me to put around that turnaround, but I don't know. I assume that's been made part of the plans at this point but I don't know, I'd like to think that they would consider that. These LED lights are great of course from an energy standpoint, but they are super bright. The ones in the pool right now, they've got to be like 1,000 Watts, they just spray and they're very bright.

The other thought along those lines was I know right now the lights are round, maybe if they're shorter things would be better, right. These round ones, you could see they face down and that's great. But if they want to maintain that height that they currently are of probably 25 feet, I'm hoping, and of course there is an expense with this, but to run the lights on the inside of the circle so they face towards the building, if you know what I mean, versus currently they're on the outside of their turnaround. So, that's why we get that spray because the lights make like 180 degree arc, and so obviously on the pool side you don't get any light. I don't know if anyone has a street light in front of their house. I'm right in the corner so I notice that kind of thing, and the street light is, literally it's about 180 degrees, maybe even more.

So, if those lights were on the inside of the circle, that would solve the problem. Of course, they have to rerun the electric, you know. So, I mean, I'd be glad to talk to anybody about that design and what we deal with from that standpoint. That's just for the lighting.

The other thing is the speakers that they're going to be putting in. I don't know if this is part of that as well, you know.

Do you want to hear about that?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Let's hear it, sure.

MR. WHITEBLOOM: Okay, we hear the music, right, we hear the music right when they open at whenever, I'm not sure what time it is, 6:00-6:30 on weekend mornings.

APPROVED

On the summer, we got the windows open and the music goes on, and depending on who's running the pool also, then it's louder than others, but part of the issue, the main issue --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And it's good music or what?

MR. WHITEBLOOM: It can be, as long as it's country, I'm fine. But to be honest, if the speakers were just facing, instead of facing north, if they were facing south, you know, into the park, that would be fine. But, so I just want to suggest those kind of things because nobody else would realize that, I don't think, you know, from a design standpoint, the way the lighting and the speakers, so if they could consider that for sure? Because right now, the speakers are, there are a couple of them that are facing north.

The other thing is, and I was told this is the time to talk about it, too, it's just a minor thing but the elevator building addition in the front there, it's that little circle right in front of the grassy area. There was discussion of possibly putting a tree there and it's still not in the drawings right now. But putting a, you know, as big a tree as possible right now and of course it's going to grow, but that would kind of block that addition a little bit, you know. That was part of the Design Commission, it's one of their suggestions, but maybe, I don't know where it stands right now. Hopefully that tree to the left, they're going to keep that, by the baby pool. It's there, I'm glad to see it there. We've lost so many big trees as part of this in the park, some really big, beautiful old trees. I like to think that they won't take down any others, if possible, except maybe the one that's right next to the baby pool, but I'm hoping that the others will, or the one actually inside the fence of the baby pool, they're probably going to have to take that even though I see it over there.

So, anyway, if they can consider that, planting a tree there in that circle would be, it would soften the front, that would be great.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay.

MR. WHITEBLOOM: What else? From a traffic standpoint, I noticed that it looked like it was waived, the traffic study. If you ask me, just from a safety standpoint, I don't know if they have to do an official, you know, traffic study, I don't know what's involved, but just from a safety standpoint, right there when kids are crossing going down Haddow, going south towards the pool and they have to cross Miner, I mean, we've been there about 22 years and I'm just shocked that nobody has gotten seriously hurt or worse because it's partly the parking. There's no signs that say no parking; you could park right up to the corner there.

I don't know if you can picture this, but along the north side of Miner, you know, facing west, and so at a minimum, that has to be done. There have to be signs there, maybe give it like a 25-foot spot or opening which says no parking in the corner, because kids, you know little kids, they're just going to, they look but then they just bolt across the street. All that's there is the crosswalk, and of course, you know, we have our state law but that doesn't help because, and sometimes it's not the driver's fault, you just can't see someone is standing at the corner. When I'm making a left turn and many of us who live in the area, if you're going south on Haddow making a left turn onto Miner, it's tricky to see the cars when you're in your car. Definitely if you have a little kid who's four or five feet tall, you're not going to see them at all.

Now, with the increase, you know, redoing this, I'm sure there will be more and more people, more people than ever, right, using the park, I'm sure that's part of the plan with the nice park that they're creating. So, that's got to be considered. I don't actually want to have flashing lights, you know, in front of my house but something needs to be done before someone gets hurt. That's all I'm suggesting, and a big part of that is no parking to the corner there right along Miner, along the north side.

APPROVED

I could, I'd be glad to talk to anybody about these details if they want, this might not be the time. But I think that's the main thing to really be careful of people parking, because the way the traffic pattern is around the loop right now, obviously all the loops would typically go counterclockwise including this one, but when people making a left turn out of that loop, you know, they're looking at traffic, you know, both ways and then you got kids crossing over and it's a tricky spot. One of my thoughts was to turn the traffic pattern so it goes clockwise, but then I'm sure that would be an issue with people turning left out of the loop, you know.

So, you know, that's a tricky thing but if that could be considered. So, when I saw that waiving the traffic study, I don't know what that involves. But if they can consider the safety issues of the kids crossing, not only to the north but also going back, not only going south, but going back north across Miner. So, those are my thoughts right now, it's probably enough. Thank you, guys.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, thank you. We appreciate you sharing. You know, this is, I would encourage you also to communicate with the Park District in more detail on this stuff. You know, they're available; they're very receptive I think and, you know --

MR. WHITEBLOOM: Yes, I don't know how that, I don't know how it all works, you know, between --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, they're right here, so after this is --

MR. WHITEBLOOM: Because after listening to you guys and the Park District, I didn't know, because once it's all, if it's not done as part of the main --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, well, you know, your comments are here on record and this is good. I'm glad you spoke, these are all very, you know, very helpful comments but, you know, this is just part of the process. There will be an opportunity to speak at the Village Board if you also have comments and, you know, I would just engage them. It's a great group and I think they're very receptive. So, after the hearing, I would just encourage you to maybe give them your information and see if there's some more dialogue that can continue on it.

MR. WHITEBLOOM: Got you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: But thank you. Thank you for your comments.

MR. WHITEBLOOM: All right, sure. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Good points.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, anybody else who would like to speak back there? Oh, yes, sir.

MR. TOBIN: Hi, my name is Mark Tobin. I live at Belmont and Miner.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Mark.

MR. TOBIN: I'd like to add on to what this gentleman had just said about the traffic. The cars, they come down Arlington Heights Road and they try to beat that light, and they'll come up and there's a stop sign at Belmont and Miner. They never stop. They'll either go through it or fly through it. I can stand out there with my dogs in the morning, there are so many cars that do not come to a complete stop, and that's both ways. People from the east going west, they want to make that light, and then the people that are coming down Arlington Heights Road, they will either turn on Miner or the street before Miner and then come up to Miner and shoot and go down Northwest Highway east.

I'm just afraid that the kids are going to get hurt. I see that they put a, today there's a mound right at the park where, maybe to distract the kids from running straight, they have to go up and over this mound of dirt. They had put grass on it already today, but they don't stop, there's a stop sign there.

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: This is Belmont and Miner?

MR. TOBIN: There's a stop sign there, but they don't stop. I had asked before, they had put a red stripe on the pull-down which is a reflector. They had put the red flags on, it's not helping on the majority.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you, Mr. Tobin.

MR. WHITEBLOOM: Just one more thing?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: You know what, we're going to move on to the next. We've got to kind of keep rolling here.

Anybody else in the back? Yes, ma'am.

MS. HUG: Good evening. I'm Andrea Hug. I live at 215 North Haddow, right down the block from that park and Myles and kitty corner from Greg, so we're all right in the same neighborhood.

I have a couple of questions. One is why do the lights need to be 70 feet tall? It seems really high for the baseball diamond.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, that's the existing height. So, the height is not changing.

MS. HUG: But they're 40 now, I thought it said. No? Well, it suddenly seems really high and it shines into my bedroom.

The second part that I had a question about is, is it possible to get a stop sign at Haddow and, what is that street? Miner, Haddow and Miner. So, it would be Belmont, and then Haddow stop sign, and then also at Douglas, because that would slow the traffic from, you know, the people who are cutting through. There's three stop signs; it's right in front of the park. There are two crosswalks that go in between the two sections. So, the street comes here, the crosswalks are here, and so it seems like that would be a good place for a stop sign.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: You're suggesting like an east-west on Miner stop sign and Haddow?

MS. HUG: Yes. Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, noted.

Any other comments or questions?

MS. HUG: No, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thanks for your comment.

Anybody else from the public who would like to speak on this project?
(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, seeing no further hands, we will now close the public hearing and follow up with questions from our Commissioners. I'll start by Lynn.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sure. Well, first of all, I think the comments from the public were quite good, and I'm wondering why we can't do what you've done a lot throughout the Village where you have the crosswalks that actually have a sign that says it's a state law to let pedestrians have right of way. Someone didn't want the flashing signs, but most of this will occur during the day and early evening, so why can't we put at least one of those there to slow things down? Because I live in an area by Sunset Park where they have a driving range, and they're very effective there. So, rather than maybe putting stop signs every block, if you have one place where you have a very visible stop that you have to make if you have anyone trying to get across the street.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Lynn, could I ask maybe if Mr. Corcoran wants

APPROVED

to speak about reviewing this concept because there are a couple of questions involved with traffic control. If you or one of those other Petitioner representatives would like to speak, I think regarding stop signs, safety precautions, I know this traffic study is, you know, I don't think you feel that the overall capacity of stuff has, you know, changed, but we do have an opportunity here to make some enhancements for safety. If you could speak to that a little bit?

MR. CORCORAN: Sure. First of all, as far as putting some No Parking From Here to the Corner signs, I'm all for that. I can't spend my client's money, but between you and the Village, they can work that out as far as the actual implementation. But, yes, no, I'm all in favor of that to increase the sight triangles for, you know, so that cars and pedestrians can see each other before they cross Miner. So, that's a great idea, a great thing to do.

The cut-through is a little more difficult issue and I don't have enough information to come up with a definitive answer to stop that. I mean, I know what they're doing, as the gentleman or the folks mentioned that they're trying to avoid the traffic signal on Northwest Highway and Arlington Heights Road by cutting through the neighborhood.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, that's less of a Park District issue and more of an Arlington Heights enforcement issue.

MR. CORCORAN: Right.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, to the public who commented on that with, you know, the cut-throughs and stuff like that, the point we're making here is the Park District controls the Park District property. That's not to say there's not an issue, but there is not much they can do in the course of their project to do that. That's something that we would ask the Staff to check in with the Arlington Heights Police Department, let them know that the neighbors have expressed a concern about this and it's going to continue to be a concern as this project, you know, goes forward. So, our request would be that Staff notify the Police Department that the public has expressed significant concern and that they're going to have to observe and potentially increase enforcement in this area to address these issues.

MR. CORCORAN: And then the last issue about putting a series of stop signs along Miner, first of all, the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices prohibits the use of stop signs as for speed control. You know, the idea is if they're stopped more often, they're going to drive slower. We find a lot of times what they'll do is, yes, they'll stop if you're lucky or they'll roll through, right. You know, I don't think the rolling is going to stop just because we have three stop signs overall, but then they speed up, you know, between stop signs. So, it's not, it kind of defeats the purpose as far as speed control along Miner.

But, again, anything we can want to do to enhance the pedestrian crossings, the visibility with the, you know, the state law signs, maybe some --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Are there items for markings on the pavement itself even short of, like we said, maybe flashing lights aren't the answer or maybe they are, but I mean, just pavement markings and more --

MR. CORCORAN: More pavement markings and, you know, to make it more visible that there is a pedestrian crossing there. I'd have to look at what signage is or isn't out there now, but we can always add more signage. Then of course, section lights is something we could do and that could be done incrementally. You know, re-stripe those crosswalks, maybe add a few more signs, and then restrict the parking near the corners to improve visibility. Those three things right there at a relatively low costs will improve the safety situation. Then if it's still felt that it's dangerous, you know, then we can start looking at the flashing lights as an alternative in the future.

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, sorry, Lynn, I kind of jumped on your question.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: No, that's fine; it's good discussion. So, you know, I'm in favor of that. I'm not suggesting we have the flashing lights everywhere but they have been pretty effective in a lot of areas in the Village, especially where I live, there's a lot of people trying to get to Sunset Park. I think there were also some very good comments about the speakers and the noise, and I'm hoping we can do something to mitigate noise spilling over into the neighborhood.

So, I don't have anything really further than that. I just think the comments that had been made by the public need to be taken into consideration when this goes before the Board. Staff should do what they can to make sure those issues go before the Board, and hopefully people will show up at the Board meeting.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, on that point, Mr. Kramer, if you or one of your colleagues there wants to speak to that point on the noise, it seems like, you know, we're there a lot, you know, I've got my kids, with all the lifeguards and swim teachers and stuff, and I get it, it's, you know, we're not going to be able to, you know, kind of sterilize the environment of noise. It's a fun place; there's a lot of noise going on but, you know, being involved, I was involved with a large project that involved noise and lighting and everything on the North Shore with school enhancing its football fields and, you know, noise came up and part of it was, you know, sort of directing it and making sure it goes.

I mean, is that something that the Park District can consider if it's facing to the south, it still has the same effect for the people in the pool but maybe helps our neighbors out a little bit? Is that something the Park District has looked into or can at least suggest to the people right in the facility?

MR. KRAMER: Preliminarily, I think we're looking at it both from a sound and a light perspective. Obviously, technologies have changed since Recreation Park was originally built.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. KRAMER: So, we put in provisions to put a public address system within the facility. Those will be identified and localized to where that sound stays projected within the pool service and does not largely bleed over into the general areas. So, I think that will be a basis for design when we look to make recommendation on that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes. So, that would be an enhancement over the existing system to sort of control the sound a little better; is that correct?

MR. KRAMER: No existing system will remain. The existing systems will be removed and we will replace it in its entirety to allow public address both within the new bath house that's a new construction and obviously the existing facility. None of what currently exists will remain even to some degree. Same with the exterior lighting that's on the building as well as what's proposed, the focal distance of those lights will be reviewed and photometrics will be reviewed to make sure that that light stays within, notwithstanding the ball field lights which are not getting changed.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Right. Okay, so just to kind of close the loop on the noise, the existing system that the neighbors have heard is going to be changed over. Then you will, when the new system is designed, there will continue, I mean, I'm sure there will continue to be music and all that stuff associated with the pool but it will be done in a way that's, you know, more I guess you could say smartly designed for optimal performance and not as

APPROVED

much noise spillage; is that correct?

MR. KRAMER: Correct. It will be localized into the areas it's intended. We don't want to blast unintended messages or sound to other areas off property, off target.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, and then could I ask you a little bit, to speak a little bit more on the lighting? You heard what Mr. Whitebloom had said about the lighting in the front. So, there was a comment about the 70-foot ball field lights. That's just not changing, it's just a matter of it was never in the record that that was approved, so we're adding it as a variation. We're not making them higher and they're not changing the lighting is my understanding.

The lighting around the front part, the north side of the building, there was some discussion around the turnaround. You know, again, having been involved in projects myself, I know the extreme I would say technological enhancements now to lighting is, you know, spillage and everything, the photometrics are really, really topnotch. The amount of, you know, light spillage is really reduced with wall lighting, you know, regardless of how high it is and everything else, it really is well focused.

Is that, as you're implementing your new lighting, can you talk about that a little bit? I mean, the type of product, I mean, is it sort of state of the art type of lighting that's going to be used?

MR. KRAMER: I'm going to let my colleague answer for me.

MS. KRIEGER: I'm Maggie Krieger with FGM Architects. Yes, we've studied the photometrics for the new lights and they are LED and more controlled in how the light is spilling out of the fixture. I believe, I'm going to have to triple check our photometric plan, but we've got zero foot candles at the property line.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay.

MS. KRIEGER: I'm not familiar with what the existing condition is, but if it is an older fixture, it probably is spilling over and that's what causing some of the disruption for the neighbors.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, so by that study, you've looked at it and that would suggest that the neighbors, well, if they look at the property they'll see the lights, but unlike maybe the current state, it won't be shining in their living room or whatever.

MS. KRIEGER: The light will hit surfaces on the Park District property which will, you know, be reflective in some nature but won't spill onto their property.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, one of the residents had suggested sort of reconfiguring the lights, but given what you're saying, that wouldn't necessarily make a significant difference. As long as you've got the correct photometric plan and the foot candles and stuff all work, it doesn't necessarily matter which direction they're going; is that correct?

MS. KRIEGER: Correct. We can take another look at it to see if that would help mitigate some of the concern that we've received, but --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MS. KRIEGER: -- I know that we've studied it to maximize the foot candles that we need in the parking area with the fewest amount of light poles from an economy standpoint. So, if it makes sense to shift, we can, but I know that those new heads are focused in where they're throwing light and where they're not throwing light.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, and then is that also a similar system with the pool?

MS. KRIEGER: Correct.

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, and then I guess another question we had here was about the northerly side of the building with the little landscaped island. Was there any consideration given, apparently the Design Commission had recommended that a tree go in that little island in front of the elevator room. Is that something that's under consideration still or what's the status of that?

MS. KRIEGER: I believe it is something that we discussed and something that came from feedback at the Design Commission. There was also some thought that if we put a tree there, it is getting in the way of wayfinding to this new entrance for accessible access to the community building. So, that's something that we're still considering.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay. All right, well, I think, you know, there were some comments on that, so maybe consider that, and if there's any more public feedback to you, you know, consider it please. I'm sorry, I've talked a lot, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: From a layman's perspective, so if I'm standing across the street from the park with the new lighting system, I'd be able to see the park property illuminated, but that light shouldn't be coming across the street.

MS. KRIEGER: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, so that should seem to resolve some of the concern that was expressed. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes. John, you have any comments?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, I really don't. I think some of the public comments were very well put and I don't have any other questions.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I do have one other one. Can the speakers actually be going at 6:00 a.m.?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes. They are, yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Those are early swim meets, Terry.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: That's pretty early. You'd be getting calls from me.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, it's been, they've been doing that for decades.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes, I know.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any other questions? Any motions?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Let me just comment. The issues with the safety of the streets, as the Chairman said, that's really out of the control of the Park District. But it would be good for the public to show up at the hearing with the Trustees and express your concerns and give more pressure put on whatever is needed to get some of the safety stuff done which like I say is beyond the Park District's reach.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, well said. Well, I think the control is out their reach but I think we have some opportunities here to potentially make some enhancements with the plan outside of the enforcement, and I would ask you to please consider that as you go on to the next step and see what kind of maybe additional considerations that we talked about, Mr. Corcoran, that we could make in order to address some of the issues we spoke about.

Anything else?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: If you're ready for a motion?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I'm ready for anything.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, great.

MR. KRAMER: May I ask one question?

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'd like to make a motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I'm sorry, you know what, the Petitioner did have a question.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. KRAMER: May I ask one question?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. KRAMER: Staff, relative to the fence around the back side of the pool, I know you mentioned that the District was going to go out and get an alternative price for that. That's predicated, the fence height is predicated on the Illinois Department of Public Health review of that. If the basis of design was chainlink and we look at aluminum and aluminum is prohibitive, how does that work for us?

MR. OSOBA: We would take a look at what you submit to us and we would evaluate it based on the variation criteria, and that would be a recommendation that if it does get changed, it would be probably a modified recommendation that the Plan Commission would give to Village Board.

MR. KRAMER: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, Lynn, did you hear that?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, I did.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, I'd like to make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #25-007, a Planned Unit Development Amendment to the Recreation Park PUD for Phase II and Phase III (Ordinance 24-052); a Special Use Permit for a 'Facility Owned by the Arlington Heights Park District'; and the following variations:

1. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.12-1.3 to waive the requirement for a traffic study.
2. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3.b to allow a fence height of eight and 10 feet for the ball field fencing and pool perimeter fencing and 40 feet for the ball field backstop fencing where six feet is the maximum height.
3. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.2-12.3.c to allow an existing light pole height of 70 feet where 40 feet is the maximum.
4. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.5-2 to permit accessory structures partially in the front and side yard where accessory structures are only permitted in the rear.
5. Variation from Section 6.5-2 to permit 14 accessory structures where the maximum number of accessory structures is 12, which was allowed per Ordinance 24-052.
6. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.4-4 to reduce the required number of off-street parking spaces from 533 to 77 spaces.

This recommendation is subject to resolution of the following:

1. The Petitioner shall provide revised construction plans at time of building permit to address public works and engineering corrections regarding the MWRD permit, pavement cross section and one-way circular drive striping and signage.
2. The Petitioner shall provide revised construction plans at time of building permit to add a

APPROVED

parking lot island with landscaping adjacent to the pedestrian walkway in the east parking lot.

3. The perimeter fence surrounding the pool and pool deck shall be eight-foot open aluminum fencing to match #5 perimeter fence detail as shown on Sheet A0.4 within the Recreation Park Community Building renovation and new pool and bath house plans drawn by FGM Architects with last revision date of 3/7/2025.
4. The Petitioner shall provide an operations plan for the preschool in the community center as it relates to drop-off and pickup operations for the preschool prior to this petition being heard by the Village Board.
5. The maintenance vehicle drive access to the south of the ADA accessible spaces in the eastern parking lot shall be striped to indicate no parking, access drive or similar as shown on revised construction plans at the time of building permit.
6. The Petitioner shall comply with all Design Commission recommendations of approval from the motion made at the 2/25/2025 Design Commission meeting.
7. The Petitioner shall dedicate all necessary easements to the Village prior to the building permit issuance.
8. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations and policies.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I didn't know if you wanted to clarify anything.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I don't know exactly how you would do it because it's a conditional thing. So, if you have some suggestion, I certainly would accept it right now.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, well, you've raised the motion. You could maybe suggest that with respect to the, let's see, I'm trying to think.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Why don't we ask Staff? You've got any suggestions, Staff, as to what modification we might make that would capture it?

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes. So, to the Chair, which condition are we, I just want to refer back to it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I think, Michael, we're going to be talking about the variation number 2.

MR. LYSICATOS: I see. It's number 3?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is it 3 or 2? The light pole? The light pole is 3 per the recommendation. Let's see.

MR. LYSICATOS: I think the light pole is fine. We're talking about the fencing, or the light poles?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, the light pole is fine. Oh, yes, I'm sorry, I'm looking at the wrong one.

MR. LYSICATOS: Go back to the last slide there please, Dan. Number 3 right there, correct?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Fencing around the pool.

MR. LYSICATOS: Aluminum fence to match the perimeter fence, is that the condition we're --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: That's the pool fencing.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, I think, is that the condition, is that what you're referring to?

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I think you're referring to the baseball fencing, aren't you?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, yes, they've been worried about the prohibitive cost of doing what the Staff had --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, so maybe it would be --

MR. LYSICATOS: No, it's the, so just to clarify for your edification, it's the fencing around the pool that I think we're discussing.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Oh, I misunderstood.

MR. LYSICATOS: The fencing around the baseball field will be a chainlink fence.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Got you.

MR. LYSICATOS: Just because that's more appropriate for the use for the field. We were discussing with the Park District matching the aluminum, it almost looks like a wrought iron fence, but it's an aluminum fence, around the pool. Originally, it was designed as chainlink, we are asking them to consider the more decorative style fence and there's --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: But there's a question about the cost differential, right?

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct, and the review it just had from, which entity was it? The state?

MR. KRAMER: IDPH, they weigh into the fence height. My concern, again, we know we have an aluminum portion of the fence to ring the front of the building. The wading pool that we have equalized an aluminum fencing; the back L that goes around the back side of the pool we would ascertain. The original basis of the design was chainlink and we'd like to stay with that, but we will, we are getting pricing for it to be an aluminum. If that becomes cost prohibitive, we would like the ability to come back and seek the chainlink as approved.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, do we really need to make a modification now is I guess the question.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, I mean, it's your motion, but we can let it sit.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, I don't know that we have to make a modification at all. I don't know if it matters. We can maybe push that to a permit item to be, whether that's approved at permit. I don't know if that gives you enough time or if that's something that's going to be after you get permits. Do you know if you get that pricing before you get that permit or it would be after?

MR. KRAMER: It would be before.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, Dan, do we want to make that to be confirmed at the time of permit issuance? Would that help?

MR. OSOBA: We can modify the Staff Development Committee recommendation number 3 to have an effective date essentially that they need to provide that at the time of building permit, if that's something that would work.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And, Dan, you'd recommend making a change on this proposal, right, this motion?

MR. OSOBA: If you'd like to make that motion.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'd let you articulate it, but that would be fine with me. If you'd state what you'd like to have put in there, what you were suggesting.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: The date of the permitting?

APPROVED

MR. OSOBA: Yes, correct, to the day of the permitting is when --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, your motion right now that you just made is exactly how it's written, but I think your modification would be to extend the date to the date of permitting to explore that fencing option.

MR. OSOBA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sounds good.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is that correct?

MR. OSOBA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, so the motion on the floor is what Lynn just stated with the modification to recommendation number 3 to extend that date to the date of permitting to consider alternative fencing.

All right, is there a second for that motion?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll second that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, why don't we do a roll call?

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Chairman Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

All right, the motion passes. You have a recommendation for approval from the Plan Commission on the project, and it will go next step to the Village Board on both these projects. If you could continue to coordinate with Staff and then be open to some additional public comment to the extent, they have some further comments on what was discussed here, we would appreciate it.

MR. KRAMER: Absolutely, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you. Congratulations. Good work.

Let's see. No more public hearings. Next on the list is other business of which there is none.

MS. HITZEMANN: I do have one thing I want to remind you all, that the Village's Economic Impact Statement Form is due May 1st. I will send you an e-mail reminder with the link to it. It shouldn't take long. Terry, how long did it take you?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I didn't do it yet.

MS. HITZEMANN: Sorry. John, how long did it take you?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I don't know if it took me five minutes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes, it should be hopefully pretty fast. I will send out the link again in an e-mail tomorrow, but for those of you who have not done it, if you could please do it before May 1st.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I usually take it down to the wire, sorry,

APPROVED

Rachel.

MS. HITZEMANN: That's okay.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: You should have gotten mine today.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: If you remember what you did in the previous year, it's a lot easier. It took about two minutes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Okay, so thank you. That's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: One question I have is did we, we had some transition with the Board and all that, did we ever elect a Vice Chair of this?

MS. HITZEMANN: We did not.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay.

MS. HITZEMANN: So, that is something that we are still looking at with the turnover now with the Board. We wanted to time it up with the same kind of timeline, so at the next meeting we may discuss a vote for the Vice Chair, but with some people absent, we wanted to make sure we had as many people as we could.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, okay. Yes, I would just say we do that because there will be some meetings I'm sure that I'll be having to miss here. I want to make sure that we're kind of squared away on who that is.

MR. OSOBA: Chair, just one kind of point here. We just need clarity on that motion so we have it exactly written down.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: That it's to extend the date of that condition number 3 to the date of the permit, and I think based on the discussions, that in order for it to be enforceable, we would need the motion to read, if it is not approved or rather if the aluminum fence is not approved, it would revert to the chainlink fence, because we don't have that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I think that's the clarification, that's what our understanding was when we approved that. Is there anybody that disagrees with that?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, I think that's correct.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Well, it's awfully vague to me. I mean, subject to --

MR. LYSICATOS: Could we re-vote on it just in case?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Whether or not it's cost prohibitive based on whose opinion, and what's cost prohibitive?

MR. LYSICATOS: Right. So, basically, I think we're asking that condition number 3 would be confirmed at time of permit and potentially have, I think we're trying to say that it would be confirmed at time of permit or an alternative to the chainlink fence which was originally provided by the Park District so we have a condition that's enforceable, that at time of permit they will either confirm that it is this option or the chainlink fence so we have something. Because if they're changing one of our conditions, not meeting a condition, we'd have to come back for a vote. We don't want to have to come back. We want to have to have the mechanism in place where Staff can approve that based on our review.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, so procedurally, do you want to restate your --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I don't know if I could restate it.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, Dan, do you want to take a shot at --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, you want to extend it to the time of permit and if it's too cost prohibitive, you'd like to revert to the original recommendation?

APPROVED

MR. LYSICATOS: To allow, yes, so basically, you're correct. If the Park District deems that it is not feasible, that Staff would have the discretion to revert the design to the chainlink fence that was originally proposed.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Great, that sounds like a good articulation of it. You could write it up to go to the Board.

MR. LYSICATOS: Pull that from the minutes just because I, hopefully just to confirm it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Right here, I'm putting it together right now.

MR. LYSICATOS: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I'll give it to you.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, we're just going to throw out decorative. I don't think chainlink is decorative, but that's okay.

MR. LYSICATOS: No, that's what we're saying. There were the two designs is the aesthetics of it essentially. Yes, so we just wanted to clarify, that way when we write the motion and we send it to the Village Board, it's one clean motion for them that's enforceable. Do we want to re-vote through the Chair?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, I'm just writing this out for Lynn.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, absolutely, thank you.

(Slight pause.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I think this will work.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Do you want me to restate the entire thing again or what? What did you want?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: You don't have to read every number. All right, so I've asked Lynn to restate the motion on the Recreation Park.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, we're looking at number 3, is that right?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, why don't you just remake the motion there, Lynn?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, motion to recommend.

A *revised* motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #25-007, a Planned Unit Development Amendment to the Recreation Park PUD for Phase II and Phase III (Ordinance 24-052); a Special Use Permit for a 'Facility Owned by the Arlington Heights Park District'; and the following variations:

1. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.12-1.3 to waive the requirement for a traffic study.
2. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3.b to allow a fence height of eight and 10 feet for the ball field fencing and pool perimeter fencing and 40 feet for the ball field backstop fencing where six feet is the maximum height.
3. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.2-12.3.c to allow an existing light pole height of 70 feet where 40 feet is the maximum.
4. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.5-2 to permit accessory structures partially in the front and side yard where accessory structures are only permitted in the rear.
5. Variation from Section 6.5-2 to permit 14 accessory structures where the maximum number of accessory structures is 12, which was allowed per Ordinance 24-052.
6. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.4-4 to reduce the required number of off-

APPROVED

street parking spaces from 533 to 77 spaces.

This recommendation is subject to resolution of the following:

1. The Petitioner shall provide revised construction plans at time of building permit to address public works and engineering corrections regarding the MWRD permit, pavement cross section and one-way circular drive striping and signage.
2. The Petitioner shall provide revised construction plans at time of building permit to add a parking lot island with landscaping adjacent to the pedestrian walkway in the east parking lot.
3. The perimeter fence surrounding the pool and pool deck shall be eight-foot open aluminum fencing to match #5 perimeter fence detail as shown on Sheet A0.4 within the Recreation Park Community Building renovation and new pool and bath house plans drawn by FGM Architects with last revision date of 3/7/2025. Resolution of this condition shall be extended to the date of permitting to consider alternative fencing. If the Park District deems it is not feasible, then the Arlington Heights Park District may proceed with the fencing as originally shown in the plan.
4. The Petitioner shall provide an operations plan for the preschool in the community center as it relates to drop-off and pickup operations for the preschool prior to this petition being heard by the Village Board.
5. The maintenance vehicle drive access to the south of the ADA accessible spaces in the eastern parking lot shall be striped to indicate no parking, access drive or similar as shown on revised construction plans at the time of building permit.
6. The Petitioner shall comply with all Design Commission recommendations of approval from the motion made at the 2/25/2025 Design Commission meeting.
7. The Petitioner shall dedicate all necessary easements to the Village prior to the building permit issuance.
8. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations and policies.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, that is the motion.

Thank you, Lynn. Good work. Sorry for my terrible writing.

Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll second that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, so the motion is seconded. Why don't we take a roll call vote please?

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

APPROVED

MS. HITZEMANN: Chairperson Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

All right, well, congratulations again. It has passed as corrected and clarified. Thank you, and the same still stands.

All right, so finishing other business, I don't think we had anything else. The impact study, we mentioned the Vice Chair, and I don't think we have anything else.

Is there anything, I guess what I'll do is kind of open for public comment but, you know, if there's nothing else, okay, anything else anybody wants to talk about? Open for public comment. Yes, sir?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you, Chair Cherwin. Yes, I just wanted to comment on this last procedure. It was very confusing. Now you've got two motions you approved, so we don't know which one is which.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: The second one overrides the first one.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: That does not override anything; you've got two motions that passed. You didn't eliminate the other one; you've got two motions that passed right now. So, you know, next time, please clarify your motion before you vote on it, or put it on the floor early so you can amend it properly so we all know what's going on, because right now it is so confusing with two motions passed. And taking recommendations from the Staff when you're in charge as the Chairman, you need to recognize that confusion.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, any other comments?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: We've got a bike rack.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: What do you mean a bike rack?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: There's a bike rack.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Where's the bike rack?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: In the park.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Oh, public comments? Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Mine was addressed.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: No, I was not --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No, you weren't, okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay, okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any other public comments? No other comments? We're good.

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, we'll close the public comments.

Is there a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: I move to adjourn.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right.

APPROVED

(Gavel pounded.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Motion passes. We're adjourned, thank you.
(Whereupon, at 8:51 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. 2025.

NOTARY PUBLIC