

APPROVED

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: ARLINGTON STEEL - 1727 EAST DAVIS STREET - PC #24-026
PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT, VARIATION FROM TRAFFIC STUDY, LANDSCAPE
ISLANDS AND PARKING LOT CURBING

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 14th day of May, 2025 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

JAY CHERWIN, Chairperson
KRISTEN SCHURTZ
JOE LORENZINI
BRUCE GREEN
GEORGE DROST
TERRY ENNES
JOHN SIGALOS

ALSO PRESENT:

RACHEL HITZEMANN, Development Planner
MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director, Planning and Community Development

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, what we'll do, we'll call the meeting to order here.

(Gavel pounded.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Let's stand and have the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Why don't we have Staff do roll call for us please?

MS. HITZEMANN: Dawson.

(No response.)

MS. HITZEMANN: Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Jensen is not here. Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Here.

Thank you.

All right, well, we have a quorum, so we'll go ahead and get started.

The first, or the next item on the agenda is the approval of minutes, and that is for the Plan Commission minutes from April 23rd.

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll make a motion to approve.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes, seconded.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, motion passes for the approval of minutes.

We'll move on to the section of public hearings. Item A is Arlington Steel at 1727 East Davis Street for a planned unit development, variation, landscape island, et cetera. That's the first matter on this agenda.

I would ask Staff on this matter, have the public notices been given?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, very good. So, on that matter, if we could have the Petitioner step forward? If you could just say your name into the mic for the transcript, that would be great.

MR. WERDERITCH: Good evening. Greg Werderitch, Werderitch Construction.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay.

MR. DOWNEY: And Bill Downey, owner of Arlington.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, now if I can just swear you in, because you're both going to be testifying on this, I'm just going to have you raise your right hand.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, there's a Staff report that you would have seen. In that Staff report, there were some conditions of the approval. Are you familiar with these and are you in agreement with those?

MR. WERDERITCH: Yes.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: You are? Okay, thank you. So, what we'll do here is if you can start with your presentation? We can see everything on our screens here, and then when you're done, we'll move to the Staff, and then we'll start asking you some questions. So, please proceed.

MR. WERDERITCH: Okay, you wanted affidavit of ownership?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I think with that stuff, you can work with just the Staff. We can just have the presentation now. Thank you, Michael.

MR. WERDERITCH: Okay, that's the affidavit of ownership. That's the notification affidavit.

That's the site location. It's basically a flag lot. There's a 25-foot wide access to the site where the fabrication is. That's an overview of the site, and in red is where the proposed building will be from the fabrication plan, and you can see the overhead crane system on both ends of the site that are a big asset to the fabrication and loading and unloading of trucks.

MR. DOWNEY: So, it's really like about an 11,000 square-foot addition. The current facility that's there now was built in 1967. It was about a 10,000 square-foot facility. The new facility modernizes the entire project for the employees and for the process and manufacturing within the facility. So, we're really looking at doubling the size of manufacturing capabilities of Arlington.

MR. WERDERITCH: And Bill has gone out of his way to update the facility and make a safe working environment. He's trying to upgrade all facets of the operation.

That's an engineering plan. In the red obviously is where the new building would go, and the parking, detention areas, everything is new. It all has been re-configured.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, so the big thing here, it requires us to put a full fire protection lane in all the way around this circle, around into the new building area and then in front of the existing building area. That's where some of that drive loops around, so you can basically see it's a full loop circle that it does create for fire protection as well. So, it really encompasses all aspects of the needs for the current building requirements.

MR. WERDERITCH: So, some of the features is steel vertical panels with masonry seven feet off the ground which would match the existing building. Interior, we have overhead crane system to move product. There would be a spray booth for the paint process and priming. It's a fully sprinkled building. There is a, incorporated in the 12,000 feet is a 2,900 square-foot build-out for a lunch room, bathrooms, locker room, and offices. So, it's really updating the whole company.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, so if you don't have anything else that you want to present at this time, what I can ask you to do is you can go ahead and take a rest. We'll ask Staff to present their report, okay?

MR. WERDERITCH: Okay, very good. Thank you.

MR. DOWNEY: All right, thanks.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Rachel or Michael, take it away.

MS. HITZEMANN: Thank you.

The subject property is located at 1727 East Davis Street, and zoned M-2 Limited Heavy Manufacturing. The Comprehensive Plan designates the site as R&D, Manufacturing and Warehouse.

Arlington Steel, the Petitioner, has requested a planned unit development to add an additional building on a single zoning lot. They are also requesting to waive the requirement for a traffic study, landscape islands, and parking lot curbing.

Here is an aerial of the subject property that shows how it is a flag lot, with the small portion of the property adjacent to Davis Street with a single drive into the main portion of the lot. The property is bordered by M-2 with Melas Park to the south which is located within Mount Prospect, and there's a parking lot to the west that is also located in Mount Prospect. Similarly, the Comp Plan shows this area as well as adjacent areas as R&D, Manufacturing and Warehouse.

The subject property is 3.2 acres and currently has one 14,000 square-foot building on the site. Arlington Steel fabricates steel products, primarily steel beams and steel tubes that are used in various construction projects. The Petitioner is proposing to construct a new 12,000 square-foot building which will allow the business to expand to make steel staircases.

Arlington Steel currently has 10 employees, five employees per shift. The two shifts are 12 hours and allows the business to be open 24 hours a day. With the new building, the business anticipates hiring an additional 10 employees, five per shift.

So, here is the proposed site plan. Improvements include constructing that new 12,000 square-foot building, 10,000 square feet for a fabrication area with three overhead cranes inside of the building to move product safely, and the remaining roughly 2,000 square feet is to be used for employee locker/bathrooms and two offices.

Paved access roads and parking lots are being provided, as well as code-compliant parking spaces throughout the site. Access lanes are increased to provide appropriate fire truck access, removing the parallel spaces that used to be on the bottom of this site plan and making perpendicular spaces.

Stormwater detention pond is provided to the southeast corner to accommodate the increase in impervious surface. As part of this project, there will also removal of storage containers on the site that were acting as locker rooms and office space. So, this will be an enhancement to kind of the aesthetic of the property. An eight-foot tall chainlink fence with privacy slats to screen equipment and materials is being installed to meet the code requirement for privacy screening.

As kind of outlined here, the Petitioner is requesting to waive the requirement for landscape islands and to waive the requirement for parking lot curbing. Staff supports these requests due to the location of the site off of Davis Street, it's currently located behind the other buildings, and the nature of the business with the cranes and moving of the steel product.

The Petitioner has requested a waiver from the parking study which Staff supports as the increase in 10 employees is not going to greatly impact traffic on the site. With the new parking spaces, 31 spaces are being provided. This includes nine spaces on their 39-year lease with the Mount Prospect Park District that will expire in 2051. The parking

requirement for the site was calculated at 24, leaving a seven-space surplus. Two bicycle parking spaces are being provided per code.

The Staff Development Committee recommends approval of this application subject to the following conditions:

1. The Petitioner will provide striping and signage on the building permit plans, noting that access aisles less than 24 feet wide are one-way.
2. The Petitioner shall work with Mount Prospect to obtain any building permits required for the work done on that southern parcel where the parking is located.
3. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.

With that, I will turn it over for any questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Rachel.

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

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And I'll second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, the motion passes considering the Staff report, thank you.

Why don't we, I'm going to ask the Plan Commissioners if you have any questions before we go to public comment.

Down here?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I have one quick question. Rachel, is there a parcel or a part of this property that's in Mount Prospect, or just a --

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes, there is a, it's not part of their parcel, it is, if you see where those nine parking spaces are to the lower left of this site plan, that is located in Mount Prospect, that is the Park District property. So, it is not located on the subject parcel but it is accessed via their property.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Are they involved in this approval at all?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes, they've provided that, one of the conditions is that they work with Mount Prospect to obtain any building permits that would be required for re-striping the parking spaces.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Thanks, that's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks.

Anybody on this side?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I have a question following that to the Petitioner. Could somebody come up? It's just a general question. I'm glad you're expanding, but what's triggering the expansion requirement?

MR. WERDERITCH: Pardon me?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: What's triggering this expansion requirement? More work or different types of fabrications?

MR. WERDERITCH: Yes, well, they're going to build their own steel staircases and balconies and that type of thing, and then also increase production with the structural part of the goal here.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, business is good.

MR. WERDERITCH: Business is good, yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: That's it. All right, that's all I have, thank you.

MR. WERDERITCH: Yes. Building has increased, since he took over the business in 2019, it has grown substantially.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Very good.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, anything else before we open it up?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, well, we may have some more questions, but for now I think we'll turn it over to the public comments.

Does anybody on the left side of the room want to comment on the Arlington Steel project here? Anybody, back row? All right, and anybody on this side? Moving back, all right, no one would like to speak to that?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, so since we see no interest in public comment on this project, we'll go ahead and close the public comments and have final deliberation by the Plan Commissioners, which I don't know if anything has happened in the last couple of seconds to bring up other questions.

But anything else or is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, one question I wanted to ask, sort of dovetailing it to what Commissioner Lorenzini had spoken to. If one of the Petitioners or representatives of the Petitioner, are you guys affected by the tariffs? You know, business is good right now, but what do you guys foresee? You have a lot of customers --

MR. DOWNEY: Interestingly, a lot of people have asked about that recently.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Of course, they do.

MR. DOWNEY: In 2016 when President Trump at that time took office, he put tariffs on Chinese steel, and those tariffs stopped the import of Chinese steel and allowed US manufacturing of steel to start to blossom again. So, new steel plants are beginning to open up throughout the United States. President Biden continued that same tariff policy to kind of keep the foreign steel off the shores of the United States.

Again, in 2024 now with President Trump, he's elected to continue those same tariffs on the steel. They have not changed; the current tariff market is not reflected in anything in steel today because of those prior tariff arrangements that were made from 2016 through 2024. So, any talk with the new tariffs that you hear today about China is not relevant to the steel industry.

So, all of our steel is US made now which is really nice to see, and there's opening of new plants throughout the United States that we're getting steel from. We are getting tubing from Canada, so Canada is supplying tubular product. US steel market are providing all the I beam, angle, and everything else that we use in fabrication. So, it's all North American product probably in the last eight years. So, it's really nice to see the resurgence of some of the steel growth throughout the United States.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay, thank you. Yes, that's a good summary.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Anything else?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I wanted to make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'd like to make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #24-026, a Planned Unit Development (PUD) to allow multiple buildings on one lot, with the following variations:

- 1. Section 6.12-1.3 to waive the requirement for a traffic study;**
- 2. Section 6.15-1.2B to waive the requirement for landscape islands; and**
- 3. Section 10.2-12.4 to waive the requirement for parking lot curbing.**

This recommendation is subject to resolution of the following:

- 1. The Petitioner will provide striping and signage on the building permit plans, noting that access aisles less than 24 feet wide are one-way.**
- 2. The Petitioner shall work with Mount Prospect to obtain any building permits required for work done on the southern parcel.**
- 3. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.**

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, we have a motion made and it's seconded for approval.

Can we do a roll call for that, please?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes. Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MS. HITZEMANN: Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

Well, that is a --

MS. HITZEMANN: You're not on there. I just noticed that, you're not on this list.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: I am here.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Kris is here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Sorry.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Sorry about that.

MS. HITZEMANN: This must be an old list.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, so we still have a unanimous approval. Congratulations. You can just connect with Rachel for the next step which is final approval by the Village Board. So, I would just recommend you continue your dialogue with Staff. They'll get you kind of the timeline and the next steps for your final approval.

MR. WERDERITCH: Okay, very good. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks for investing in Arlington Heights.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Great to see it, thank you.

(Whereupon, at 7:51 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: CHEZ HOTEL ROOFTOP - 519 WEST ALGONQUIN ROAD - PC #25-010
 LAND USE VARIATION AMENDMENT

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
 Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village
 Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,
 Illinois on the 14th day of May, 2025 at the hour of 7:51 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

JAY CHERWIN, Chairperson
 KRISTEN SCHURTZ
 JOE LORENZINI
 BRUCE GREEN
 GEORGE DROST
 TERRY ENNES
 JOHN SIGALOS

ALSO PRESENT:

RACHEL HITZEMANN, Development Planner
 MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director, Planning and Community Development

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, so we have another petition on the agenda. Let's see, that's B; 519 West Algonquin Road, Chez Hotel, for a land use variation amendment public hearing.

Is the Petitioner here for that? Is there a Petitioner here for that?
She just stepped out?

MRS. CAZARES: Sorry. I'm with my son, my apologies.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Good evening. Staff, have all notices been given on this?

MS. HITZEMANN: They have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: They have, okay. All right, so next step, we'll have the Petitioner or whoever is going to speak come up and I'll swear you in.

Okay, can you raise your hand?

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, there is a Staff report that has conditions. Let's see, I'm just going to ask you if you agree with everything the Staff has in their report but I don't know if that's going to be the case.

MR. CAZARES: I don't, no.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Right, okay. So, what we'll do here is, if you could, before you speak, state your name so we have it for the record? We'll start off with the Petitioner presentation and then we'll move on to the Staff. We can see your presentation here on the screen, sir.

MR. CAZARES: I just want to confirm --

MS. HITZEMANN: I did not receive your updated.

MR. CAZARES: Okay, let me give you this.

(Long pause.)

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes, this is new. Yes, because I had to plug this in now, that might not work, so you might just have to point when needed to the slide. Now, you should be able to use the clicker.

MR. CAZARES: Okay, again, thank you so very much.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Plan Commission, thank you so much for taking time out of your schedule and helping our community develop in a thoughtful manner.

Today, I'm here to propose opening up one of Arlington Heights, in general, the Chez Hotel Rooftop. This first slide over here is a recent picture taken of it. The rooftop features an outdoor fully enclosed cover which is motorized. It allows us to retract, open and close for the elements. It has beautiful views of the skyline of Downtown Chicago and our community, and it's able to serve our guests in comfort. The rooftop also features an indoor seating area that's more traditional, it's fully enclosed. It has restrooms and a full service kitchen up there as well.

You know, our hotel features Starck architecture, the interior design and the amenities of which only my downtown hotel has something to offer. There isn't anything like this in this community, in any of the suburbs, and I will tell you week after week and just of today I have calls from other cities and other municipalities that want my business and want me to develop something nicer, something bigger, something better. I always have their numbers and we'll see how that goes, but I've brought you a diamond to this community.

We have a rooftop with a retractable enclosure that no one outside of downtown in the State of Illinois has. I want you to take that into perspective. The key that I gave

you is actually an electronic RFID card. You know, when you go to the hotel, they give you those flimsy, ugly cards? Well, we give guests access to their rooms and our amenities in such a special way that it, you know, it shows what thoughtfulness we've taken into every account. This has the precedent of thinking beyond the box and sets an elegant tone for a special experience.

I have meetings with my staff on a regular basis, and I tell them like I tell you, people come to our hotel and choose to spend their hard-earned money with us, and we need to make this special. Everything that I have done with this hotel is special, from the mattress to the shower to every detail, even to the sheets. I went personally and inspected those sheets far, far away. Trust me, it was a long time.

The request today is simple, and it is to amend the land use variation #18-028. If you look at this original land use variation that's in your packet, I didn't want to put it on the screen because it's hard to look at, it clearly states that any change to make the space available for the general public will require an amendment to this land use variance, not what Staff is proposing. The reason is, as we've gone through this earlier before, we've talked about this, we've had multiple presentations and there is no need to reiterate all the dog and pony show, and that's what this is becoming.

I propose what the Board unanimously approved and I believe most of the Plan Commissioners over here approved in the past, that modifications to this PUD, I'm sorry, land use variation is that now instead of the sixth floor space being open for private events, it would be open to the public. That's Section 2 modification, well, Section 3 is that the sixth floor space be open to the public provided that the main banquet hall remains unused during that timeframe. So, if there isn't a banquet, we can open the rooftop to the public. In the previous agreement, it was we can have an event up here.

Then, I wanted to add another section, that the sixth floor be open to the public concurrently with banquet hall operations for a term of five years contingent on parking overflow agreements. These agreements have been placed for over 18 years. I've shared this over and over with you, and you know, this is the Village of Good Neighbors. If I wasn't a good neighbor, I guarantee you that my next-door neighbors would have never given me these agreements.

The hotel has been open now for over a year. There are no parking issues or complaints on the record with the Police Department in over 25 years of operation. This Plan Commission approved a 249 parking space variation for 172. Today's request is very minimal and it's been justified by us operating the hotel responsibly, you know, valet service covers a 253-space overflow that is within millimeters of our property line. Let's take that into consideration.

I have a study picture over here to show you, you know, me and Charles, we barely agreed on anything, and the reality is really unfortunate. I took this picture a couple of days ago and, as you can see, our parking lot is empty. You know, the prior Staff was so completely obsessed with the idea of parking that they failed to take into consideration that there are a share of uses in this facility and that we were, I don't know what year it was, 2020-21, whatever it was, and that something such as ride share in our location to that matter, and I would have arguments, I would show a hotel that had 100 percent variation of parking spots that was in Des Plaines, and Mr. Perkins would come back and tell me what did Schaumburg, listen, well, we're not Schaumburg and we're not Des Plaines. That's the correct answer, and we are in the southern part of Arlington Heights in which we are less than 10 minutes from the airport. The highway has been expanded now to over four lanes on each side, and as you can see on this day

at 98.4 occupancy, I have a problem. I have a really big problem.

I want you to take a look at it. How does that reflect the highest rated hotel in Arlington Heights and northern suburbs? How does that reflect having an empty parking lot? The parking lot needs to have more cars. It's a shame that the previous administration was so focused on that and so we see that in real life over here.

I'd like you to pass by my hotel, I know I invited all of the Commissioners to come, and the Village Council did send you notice that you shouldn't attend and I understand that but, you know, you have the right to drive by my hotel, and I really think you should because six days of the week that's how the parking lot looks. So, we do have a problem and it needs to be resolved and I'm asking for your help on that.

But to loosen it up over here, I've been here so many times, I'm not sure if you're aware but I'm a commercial pilot. I've been one for over 20 years. I took a picture of the screen on my airplane, and you know, the hotel is very similar to how an aircraft works. We as owner/operators control all aspects of the operation, as I would an aircraft, okay. You can see those levers in the middle, I have multiple levers in which I can increase, I can reduce, to get optimal flight conditions. We do the same thing in a hotel. Not every weekend is the same. It isn't the same type of group, we don't have the same type of event, but you know what, the one thing we are, we're prepared because we're in charge, we're the pilot and we have control of levers and every lever can fluctuate.

So, if I have a group and I know it's a tighter hotel, I can shut down reservations from the public. You know, where it seems like it's being presented by Staff in the past, it shows that they want to present that we don't have full control. Then, you know what, you go online and you look at our reviews, what is out there is totally counterintuitive to what they say. We have the highest ratings, and you know what, we wouldn't have that if we would have complaints about parking. We would have a complaint, people who are writing online, I took ChatGPT and I said go look at every single review from our hotel. I said tell me how many complaints there are against parking -- zero.

You know what, we're a step ahead. We're a step ahead of customers. We're a step ahead of parking demand, and that's the reason why we offer a five-star experience.

As an example for this weekend on Expedia, we have sold out, you can see we have a wonderful review over here. We're sold out. Why? The customer decided to book the entire hotel. What does James do? James pulls the throttle back on the online travel agency, you're no longer able to book. Just like I can pull the throttle back on reservations for the rooftop, oh, it looks like we're busy, we can reduce the amount of reservations, or when the customer comes two years in advance further away, I can say, you know what, it's going to be a condition of you to book so many rooms in a hotel because it's in our benefit for your guests to stay multiple nights who have come from a different community to enjoy Schaumburg, Downtown Arlington Heights, and stay multiple nights and agree to this amenity, and we have the right to request that from our customers. If they decline, well, then they'll have to go somewhere else, but we have control, we have control to make this a safe and effective flight.

You know, our plan works simply because we have those controls. What you are going to see on the Staff report is they're going to lead you to believe that what is three percent of the year and no more than 10 events is the actual situation, but that isn't, ladies and gentlemen, that really isn't. The Staff has never ever asked me or considered in regards to multiple uses, so the guests coming in to the hotel, attending the banquet and going to the

rooftop. Actually, I've never had a meeting with our Director of Planning, I've only had a 15-minute conversation with these two people over here in six months, and you know, that's not how it used to be over here.

Let's talk about our overflow because we're going to focus on that three percent. We're going to focus on those 10 days of the year, that's what we're going to, we're not going to focus on, you know, 320 days for my parking lot. We're going to focus on that three percent because, you know what, we're in the Village of Good Neighbors and I should have a plan in case there's a big storm ahead.

Look at our location, we have two overflow locations. 18 years, 18 years, an agreement with these two people. Do you know how many times in the last year I've used these overflow parking spots? I'm going to give you, I'm going to tell you a crazy number over here -- the number is zero. Even opening this rooftop to the public, it's going to be zero, too, because, remember, we have control.

You know, these are the assumptions, right, you know. After being open for a year, it's safe to say that the presumptions and the demands for the cars were totally wrong. Guests who attend the function stay at the hotel, and in fact over and over our hotel is filled out in which over 80 percent of the guests share the usage of the amenities. That's a simple exercise over here.

I'm going to give you an example with my family. I recently went to a wedding in Naples. There's four of us, my wife and my two children, we attended the wedding. I arrived on a Thursday; it was a Saturday wedding. On Friday I went to the rehearsal, on Saturday I attended the wedding, on Sunday I went to brunch. You know, according to the Village's calculation, I would have used over nine spots in my period, and that's how we've achieved it over here. Guess how many was used? Zero. That's what happened week after week.

So, we have a big discrepancy over here. 171 parking spots, 23 valet spots that this Plan Commission and Board approved unanimously with our valet plan. Nothing has to change. There doesn't need to be a new valet plan, it's been working perfectly fine. You have approved it. There's no need to beat a dead dog over here. Staff wants to revisit that again. We can't change anything. The Fire Department has approved it. All the egresses, all the life safety issues cannot be redone.

Now, realistically, I have three scenarios over here for you. We have a scenario where there's a hotel and a banquet and not looking at the rooftop. If you take a look at these numbers over here, you can see the demand. This is much less than what we have, the 171 parking spots on site. It's very simple, back to the banquet guests attend the hotel.

We have a second scenario where we have the hotel rooftop. This is most likely going to happen six days of the week, right? Most of our business is on Saturday. I would say every Saturday we're probably booked out for the next two years. So, from Sunday to Friday, if the hotel is totally sold out and we would have a totally full rooftop, then we would have about 86 spots that would be in our demand over here, because it would be common sense that our guests want to use the amenity that we provide.

Our last scenario, this is the worst case scenario. This is what happens very minimally. It's very rare that we have a wedding for 300 people. I've presented it to you before. I've made a list, I've shown you that it's less than 10 times. You know, the majority is about 150 to 220, okay, and that we'd have a full hotel, very fantastic, it's happening this weekend. We have our banquet guests at full capacity, and then we have our rooftop. You

know, we're a little bit tight here, 173 to 181 spots. That's right, you know, I have 171, I'm 10 short, but I have 253 spots that I've been using or have access for the last 18 years and haven't used, and you know, my neighbors are willing to give it to me.

I don't know much about the new Staff over here. I haven't worked with them. I've had a 15-minute phone call and I've had no meetings with them. Mostly, I discussed, you know, maybe I've passed some basic assumptions. Maybe Staff thinks that these are three separate businesses, right, because that's how the Arlington Heights Municipal Code and that's how the parking and traffic study was presented. It was presented in the extreme way.

So, you know, I'm running a restaurant, I hear there's going to be a big wedding, or I'm at the hotel, oh, there might be a party at the rooftop. But you know what, I'm still going to do what I want, I'm going to try to sell out my restaurant and I'm going to try to fill the hotel with guests who are not staying at the event, but that's not what it is, okay. That's absolutely not what it is and we've run the hotel for a year. We've been here for over 25 years and you know that us as Petitioners are very responsible.

In the last call with Staff, they demanded something that has actually never been, never ever, never once in the history which I could find with anybody actually that it be leased in perpetuity. I've told them like I've told Charles; it's absolutely not on the negotiating table. It's impossible. If that's going to be the determining factor, then we can end the presentation and we can just finish. No one would give that, it's impossible. It's a dead fish over here.

Then I said to Staff, listen, I've done a lot of things. I've gone to Northbrook recently. I got a beautiful warehouse that was a former Lou Malnati's warehouse. They gave me a tax thing and they gave me many variations. Recently, I got a call from one of our neighbors who said, you know what, why don't you build here a 200-room hotel and a larger banquet and we want a rooftop, too. I went off and I said, well, there's banquet hall first of all over here, still I may be would like to do something because our project is doing so fantastic, we're sold out for two years and I can't keep up, what can you offer me? Well, we can offer you a temporary agreement where you can try it out and we can see how it works. That wasn't unreasonable personally I thought from the people over here, well, I don't want to deal with me.

You know, back to ride share and back to never considering co-mingling uses, the study is complicated. The study is complicated, you know, I had to go with Mr. Corcoran and I had to meet with him. I said I am a regular person, and some of these words on this study seem to mean co-mingling, but they don't. I said I need you to explain to me what ride share means because maybe Staff assumes that that is the same word as the co-mingling use, but it isn't. Mr. Corcoran is here in case anyone does have those questions because he is the expert.

You know, I've presented you with the support my neighbors. This land use variance has been reviewed and approved by most of all of you over here, also by the Board. It clearly states what I need to do. I have leases that have been in place for over 18 years and I continually renewed from my good neighbors over here. I have a perfect track record in parking. I have an approved valet plan to which you all agreed and accepted.

You know, I've given you the key to our hotel. The key that you have represents one of the most beautiful amenities our community has. I've proven to you that we've planned for the worst with this hypothetical representation of less than three percent of the time if no shared usage is considered. I've shown you my historical track record. You have seen it, you live here, you know me.

Everything was approved and I was given direction by everyone on what to do, because we know you're coming back, James, we know that. If I was not a good neighbor, the fact is the leases that we've had for over 18 years would have not been renewed. On top of that, when Mr. Redhaus contacted me yesterday saying that Staff asked me for that, which was not the case, by the way, I immediately went to my neighbors, and within an hour both of them gave me a modified five-year agreement.

I don't want you to let the false representations of parking deficits sway your decision, okay. These have not occurred. The fact is the real issue here is the hotel needs more cars 98 percent of the year. It desperately needs more cars.

I really hope you all vote in favor of this. I know it's a contentious subject, but here is the thing. I wanted to let you know that I am not only in control, I have a co-pilot, my mother who is the owner and operator of the hotel. It is her life's work, her life's ambition, and our \$20 million investment in the community. I told Charles, Charles, I am not stupid enough to put a \$5 million rooftop, and trust me it wasn't easy because, you know what, it's never been done and you know, God bless, Mr. Torres. Thank God he's gone, but we did it.

I ask for everyone's unanimous approval and definitely to send a message to our new Director of Planning that in order for this community to move in the correct direction, it would behoove her to meet with the Petitioners. Thank you so much for this presentation. Thank you so much for your time, I appreciate it so much. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you. We will move to the Staff presentation.

MS. HITZEMANN: Thank you.

The subject property is located at 519 West Algonquin Road. The site is 2.59 acres and is located within the M-2 Limited Heavy Manufacturing District. The building is currently being used as a hotel and banquet hall, and the Petitioner is requesting a land use variation to allow a restaurant in the M-2 District. Along with the land use variation, the Petitioner is also requesting a variance from Section 6.12-1.3 to waive the requirement for a traffic study, and a variation from Section 10.4-4 to reduce the required number of off-street parking spaces from 257 to 171.

Here is an aerial of the site, and then some project background. In 2000, the Village Board approved a land use variation via Ordinance #00-012, which allowed the banquet hall within the M-2 Limited Manufacturing Zoning District. In 2018, the Petitioner received a land use variation to operate a six-story hotel per Ordinance #18-028. In 2019, an amendment to the land use variation was granted under Ordinance #19-005, and as part of that amendment, the Petitioner received approval for a sixth-floor amenity which functioned as an additional rooftop banquet/restaurant space exclusively for guests.

The following variations were also approved:

- A variation from 10.4, *Schedule of Parking Requirements*, to allow a reduction for the required number of parking spaces from 249 spaces to 172 spaces; and
- A variation from Section 10.2-8, *Additional Regulations-Parking*, to allow a reduction to the required width of a two-way drive aisle from 24 feet to 22 feet for the northernmost drive aisle.

The sixth floor space was approved with the following conditions:

- The sixth floor space shall be closed to the public and shall only be available to hotel patrons and their guests, and for banquet hall patrons. Any change to make this space available to the general public will require an amendment to the land use variation.

- The sixth floor space may be privately booked for events (banquet, wedding, et cetera) provided that the main banquet hall is left unused during the time when the event is taking place on the sixth floor, (i.e., the main banquet hall may not be used concurrently with the sixth floor event space).

The hotel and banquet hall have been operating for approximately one year, and the owners would now like to open the sixth floor space to the general public in the form of a restaurant. This request is to use the sixth floor concurrently with the banquet hall use, thus removing the two conditions on which the sixth floor space was approved in Ordinance #19-005 and requiring an amendment to the existing land use variation.

Chapter 28 of the Village Code defines a restaurant as any building or part thereof where food is cooled or prepared for consumption for the general public and immediate consumption on or off premises. The product description submitted with the application as well as the website for the rooftop space labeled the use as a restaurant/bar. Based on this, Staff has concluded that the appropriate classification is a restaurant.

The outdoor rooftop will have a glass enclosure. The Design Commission reviewed this proposal as part of a building permit and approved the structure. If the Petitioner does move forward, they will need to apply and receive a new business license to be able to serve alcohol to the public. Their current license was uniquely created for their rooftop as an amenity to their hotel guests. It would not cover selling to the general public.

The site plan remains unchanged, but I do want to highlight the areas where the valet parking is being proposed. This will be on the left side and right side of the plan.

Per Chapter 28, Section 10.2-6, collective provision of the Village Code off-street parking facilities for separate uses within a single development may be provided collectively if the total number of spaces so provided collectively is not less than the sum of the separate requirements for each. To simplify, that means that when multiple uses are located within a building or a development, the parking requirement for all individual uses must be met.

The Petitioner provided a parking study per code. The study incorrectly classifies the rooftop use as an amenity and provides that the required parking is based on 30 percent of the occupancy of the space. However, as noted before, the correct classification is for a restaurant which requires one space per 45 square feet of dining space. With the correct classification, the required parking spaces is 257, which equates to an 86-space deficit. Staff asked the Petitioner to provide an updated study to reflect this new classification, but the Petitioner has refused.

The Petitioner's traffic study indicates that the peak parking demand would be 224 spaces. Staff has indicated to the Petitioner they would be willing to work with the Petitioner on the parking requirements if the Petitioner can provide a way through long-term agreements to accommodate the deficit of 53 parking spaces based on peak demand.

The site plan and parking study identifies 23 valet spaces to be used during an overflow. Although valet increases the on-site parking, it also blocks access to approximately 54 parking spaces and makes access difficult for an additional 24 spaces, thus impacting more than 100 spaces through the valet operations. The SDC's preference is that all valet and employee parking be accommodated on lots with parking agreements, allowing those 100 spaces to be open to the public. Staff has requested a valet operations plan that would outline in detail how the valet service would work, but we have not received one to date.

Staff has repeatedly asked the Petitioner to provide updated parking agreements with the neighboring properties. Yesterday evening, the Petitioner did provide Staff

with two letters which have been provided to you on the dais, from adjacent property owners expressing willingness to provide parking spaces on their property for a term of five years. Staff has reviewed the letters and has deemed them insufficient. Standard parking agreements should include but are not limited to mutual term and condition, the number of parking spaces provided, the number of years that the agreement is active, and signatures by both parties. The private letters do not include all of these items although they do include a couple of them.

Furthermore, Brite-O-Matic is one of the businesses that provided a letter offering parking. Staff would just like to note that the lot they are offering is their north lot which is currently gravel and unstriped. This does not meet the parking lot standards outlined in the code, and the lot appears to be used as storage area for materials and trucks, so it's unclear how many spaces would actually be provided on this site.

This list is the criteria for variation approval. The Petitioner did not supply a new response to criteria but informed Staff that the previous response would be acceptable. Staff reviewed that response which focused on operating a hotel and banquet hall. Since the proposed use is for a restaurant to operate concurrently with the hotel and the banquet hall, which increases the capacity and intensity of the existing hotel use, Staff determined it is appropriate to require the Petitioner to demonstrate compliance with the land use variation standards for this public restaurant use.

The Staff Development Committee recommends DENIAL of the land use variation to allow a restaurant in the M-2 District and a variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.4-4 to reduce the required number of off-street parking spaces from 257 spaces to 171 spaces for the following reasons:

1. The Petitioner has failed to provide Staff with requested documentation to review this request.
2. There is a parking deficit caused by the proposed use that has not been appropriately addressed, resulting in concerns the proposed use cannot adequately and safely meet the needs of visitors patronizing the facility for the concurrent uses being requested under the amendment to the land use variation.

With that, I'll turn it back to Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Rachel.

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

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, motion passes. The Staff report is admitted.

Before we open to public hearing, I'd like to ask the Plan Commissioners if they have any initial questions, starting down at the end.

Kris, did you have anything? Kris?

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: I guess I'm just kind of confused why you didn't meet all the requirements. You didn't, that's the general question.

MR. CAZARES: Sure. Now, that's a mis-leading statement over here; I did provide all the documentation they asked for. The traffic study included the rooftop. Maybe Mr.

Corcoran can tell you in his previous traffic study, all of that was provided.

Some of the minor documents, keep in mind, I don't really have much communication with Staff over here, I just got an e-mail. I've been talking to -- listen, I'm having an issue why I'm not able to communicate with your Staff and, you know, this five-year lease, I don't know if the Planning Staff has even the legal authority to determine what's on there. I mean, it's an agreement that me and my next-door neighbor have said we've had it for 18 years, and I don't know if I can demand that. I mean, I believe I don't need it. I don't need any of these agreements. I believe I possibly might if, you know, basically, all hell breaks loose and my employee does things that I can't control. That would be very unlikely because, fortunately, we manage and we own operate this property.

So, unfortunately, I have to disagree. All the information was provided. The valet plan was provided previously and was approved. Mr. Corcoran provided the traffic study as well as the parking study which incorporated the rooftop amenity as well. There may be some small things, you know, some shade trees at the end of a parking lot. Well, unfortunately, we haven't completed the project. There are still items that aren't resolved; there are items that are delayed. We have a generator, a life safety generator that's delayed and we can't do that. I've talked to the Director of Buildings and he's understood that those will be included.

So, I don't really disagree. I just feel that that's not in the context where it shouldn't be discussed where we are. Your time is valuable and so is mine, but that should be really resolved in a different manner, but all of the items that are in regards to amending this land use was provided and has historically been submitted.

I would love to meet with the new director and I would love to have a sit-down conversation. I've invited her to come and debrief her about this because it is very complicated. So, I still welcome the opportunity.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Excuse me, as long as you're staying there, let me ask just a couple of clarifications. You've mentioned you've been there for 25 years or so, but the hotel has only been here a year.

MR. CAZARES: But remember, this was the European Crystal Banquet. It was a Polish restaurant.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Got you, okay.

MR. CAZARES: And actually, that was one of the oldest buildings in the Busse District. That's where Busse himself; that was his home.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, and so, yes, I have seen your parking lot. It looks pretty empty. So, when is it full? Does it ever get full?

MR. CAZARES: It's really, the front is full on Saturday, it's really the only day. It's never completely full, but Saturday would be a day that the front of the lot, I would say 60-70 percent, would be full.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: And that is due to people staying at the hotel?

MR. CAZARES: It's due to the wedding. So, the patrons that don't stay in the hotel, like the local guests, right, one of the Trustees, their daughter would get married, right? They have so many out-of-town guests, they stay in the hotel, but the ones who are local are going to be utilizing really the parking spots.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Even in your busiest days, you're not, your parking, the existing parking lot is never full?

MR. CAZARES: I can't tell, I mean, I don't attend every single event, but I can tell you that we've never used the overflow.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, all right.

MR. CAZARES: So, the valet is more of a convenience for a guest who doesn't want to walk, you know, the 200 steps. It's a perception of elegance that we provide. It's not really used for a mechanical purpose or to resolve a deficit. It's more of a facade that you've arrived with that key. So, yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, Rachel, could you bring up that one slide that shows the parking study? Right there. Yes, right there. So, the restaurant would require 81 spaces, but the amenity space is 62. So, the increase is actually the difference between the 62 and the 81 which is 19.

MS. HITZEMANN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, why is the deficit 86?

MS. HITZEMANN: Right, it's the difference in the code, so the 86 deficit is between the 257 spaces that's required and the 171 spaces that they provide.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: And the restaurant, the 81 spaces for the restaurant, does that take into account that some of the people in the restaurant may be staying at the hotel?

MS. HITZEMANN: It does not, because our code requires that all of the uses have, based on this percentage, we have to account for all of the different uses.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Has there been any complaints in the past about the banquet parking?

MS. HITZEMANN: Not that we know of, but the rooftop amenity has not been open to the public.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. That's all I have.

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Lorenzini, just to add to that, so the 257 is what's required by code. The Petitioner's traffic consultant provided data, trip generation data based on ITE which is a little bit more, let's just say it's a little more liberal. So, they came up with 224 which all the concurrent uses, which Staff was amenable to considering.

So, to your point, it does sort of give a discount if the code mainly would get it down to 224, which would still be more than the 171. So, we are trying to meet what the traffic consultant is saying and what the Petitioner is trying to present. Yes, we understand that not everyone is going to be included and then it's a restaurant/hotel/banquet, but it likely would exceed the 171. That's what we're concerned about.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: All right, so one final question. So, ideally, what does Staff need from the Petitioner to approve?

MS. HITZEMANN: Ideally, Staff is just looking for a natural parking agreement with the stuff that was outlined as a typical parking agreement would have to accommodate those 53 spaces that would be over the provided parking. So, if he can provide an agreement that is, you know, longer term, you know, five years, et cetera, that it outlines that those 53 spaces are provided and provides a valet plan for how that will operate if they need to utilize those 53 spaces, Staff would be willing to work with the Applicant to move this forward.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Michael, did you have --

MR. LYSICATOS: No.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right. Joe, anything else?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No, that's all.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I have a question for Staff. The basic question is why are we here tonight? If you have a petitioner who doesn't provide the information, why are we looking at this tonight when it doesn't have the information that was required? In other words, why am I sitting here for an hour-and-a-half listening to this and it's not a full report? Could somebody answer that, please?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes. So, essentially, Staff can only deny them moving forward with a public hearing if they do not provide the items that are outlined within our Plan Commission guide within the ordinance. He has provided that information and insisted on moving forward with the Plan Commission hearing.

Staff had asked for additional information to better support his application and so we could move to, you know, a Staff recommendation of approval. That is the information that he has refused to provide, but it is his right to move forward with a Plan Commission hearing, and that's why we're here.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I get that. It's just that now we have to take this individual's word for everything.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, to your point, and I think to what Commissioner Lorenzini was asking about on what we need at this point, that was our preference is to get what we needed. There is an avenue for that, there can be a continuation of the hearing. That will allow us to get a little bit more of this information. We are on the right path. He talked about his relationship with his neighbors and the way he operates his business. We understand all those things.

We know those as facts. We know they're a good business; they're a valued business. Recently, the Village has approved the construction of the rooftop enclosure. We want this to succeed, so it's a matter of, a continuance would allow us the time to get those documents back in the way that we need them. Clarification in the traffic study, that would also provide the information we need. Nothing in the traffic study showed the utilization of events.

To your point, we understand he's talking to us. We're not saying that it's not true, but we don't have the information in the traffic study that says on these dates this is how it was utilized on those dates. Staff has been to events recently where the parking lot was relatively full for an event just at the banquet hall. So, we know that it could get tight, and the Staff's job is to protect the Village in those instances where it's going to be overflow parking.

That's why these conditions existed in the first approval, because they understood that concurrent uses could create a problem with the 171 parking spaces. So, an avenue for that would be a continuation. That would be up to the Petitioner to request that though.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: That was actually my next question for you. Can we continue this, get this information so we'd have a full report to look at, and then he can deny or if the Petitioner wishes to do something, excuse me, and we'd have a full report? Are you willing to do that?

MR. CAZARES: You know, I've been doing this for six months.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: This is a yes or no question.

MR. CAZARES: I'd have to take it into consideration and then I'd have to see, need to talk to --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Well, I can just tell you as a Plan Commissioner

here, if this is the report and this is what you're asking, I'm going to deny it.

MR. CAZARES: Understood.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: That's all I have to say.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Bruce.

John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I would agree with what Commissioner Green is suggesting, that this be a continuance until you get the sufficient information you requested from the Petitioner to allow us to make the proper decision on this. That would be my suggestion, for a continuance of this hearing.

MR. CAZARES: Let's discuss it, shall we? I do agree with you, but there should be a timeframe. There shouldn't be where I come in December and we're still here today and I am not allowed to have a meeting and wanting to discuss to collaborate and resolve this issue.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Let's not negotiate, please. Let's not negotiate everything that the Staff is doing for you. I don't want to hear that. I really don't.

MR. CAZARES: I understand that.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: And I'm sorry, John, I didn't mean to jump in, but if there is a continuance, you then deal with the continuance and whatever the timeframe is. We are not here to keep you happy, and everything you're saying about the Staff, I don't agree with. I don't like, I've been doing this a long time and there's a couple of individuals like you who come in and badmouth everybody here on the Staff and I don't like it, and I'm being very frank with you, but --

MR. CAZARES: And I disagree with you. I have a totally --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: -- that's it.

MR. CAZARE: Through the Chair --

MR. LYSICATOS: To the Petitioner's concern and point and to your point, we would recommend a date certain. I think that's required that if we are going to continue the hearing, we would continue it to a date certain. Our next meeting would be the 28th.

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes, May 28th.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, May 28th would be the next available meeting. This would entail the public notice for that meeting. That would give us about a week to get all the information from the Petitioner and then get it into the report and make it available to the public. The meeting after that would be the first meeting in June. So, if the Petitioner wishes to request a continuance, we would offer them the soonest meetings, either the May 28th meeting, or --

MS. HITZEMANN: I believe it's June 11th.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Will they have to publish another notice if it's continued? No, you wouldn't have to publish that.

MS. HITZEMANN: No, this would be this.

MR. LYSICATOS: No, as long as it was a date certain. I'm sorry.

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes, this would be the notice.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, just for clarification. I appreciate it.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, they wouldn't have to go through that one process.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, exactly. All right, just wanted to verify that.

Okay, so any other questions of the Petitioner?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Now, can we get assurance from the

Petitioner you'll provide this information that Staff has been requesting and you have not provided to date by continuing this hearing?

MR. CAZARES: Mr. Sigalos, I have done, I have bent over backwards for this Village. I have millions of dollars invested in this. It's in my vested interest to pursue it with the Staff. Unfortunately, it's been a little bit disappointing of how it's come about. You know what, I don't hold grudges. I will move forward and tomorrow we can start a wonderful conversation. I'd be happy to meet with her and I will try to expedite and provide them all information so they can --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Well, I would encourage you to do so.

MR. CAZARES: Yes, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: That's all I have.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Make sure you provide every historical rehab of the, sort of the activities that have occurred with this. We approved this in the past with the rooftop being an amenity.

MS. HITZEMANN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: And then that went to the Village and they approved it.

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes, they approved it with these conditions.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: My recollection of that is there were some pending parking agreements, and there was a parking agreement which included Pace across the street?

MS. HITZEMANN: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, and my understanding was the Village Board had approved this, and then that was changed, they denied it. Was that when this was going to be a restaurant open to the public?

MS. HITZEMANN: So, I don't know, I wasn't here when this went through. I don't know if the intention from the start was to have this rooftop restaurant?

MR. LYSICATOS: It wasn't. It wasn't, yes. The intention was a little bit different.

MS. HITZEMANN: Okay, so I think that they, in anticipation of it being a rooftop restaurant open to the public was going to create issues, they had the forethought to create these conditions to make it a hotel amenity only to the guests, and then noted that if the Petitioner wanted that changed, he would have to come back before the Plan Commission and the Village Board.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: And that's basically what this is.

MS. HITZEMANN: And that's what this is, yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, those two other parking agreements never came to be? I mean, this is a huge parking variance, this is a 33 percent variance from what our code is.

MS. HITZEMANN: So, he provided those two letters that I gave to everybody up there last night to us for that five-year term. A typical parking agreement has more information on it in terms and conditions, a timeframe, both signatures by both parties, I have an example one here, and any other kind of things that the grantee and the grantor would need to make this an official parking agreement. That's what we're looking for moving forward.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Somewhat similar to a hearing we had within the last couple of weeks between the Park District and the restaurant where the Park District had

granted that.

MS. HITZEMANN: Correct, yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: What was the term? Do you know what the term on that lease was, or I shouldn't say that lease, that parking agreement?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes, it was not my project so I'm not aware.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, I mean, this happens from time-to-time. Okay, that's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: George?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I like the idea of the rooftop restaurant. I think that would be another distinguishing characteristic for the community. We've had a little history here going back to sort of the first rooftop restaurant at what's now Salsa 17 and Carlos and Carlos which would have been a second floor rooftop restaurant. Then when we had 425, the lot when the builders had it, that there could be a provision for not only a rooftop restaurant but a partial use like a hotel space like they do with the Ritz Hotel where, and we need a hotel space that's in this community.

So, it seems to me that the devil is in the detail here. We've got an owner/operator that has a long history, and I think most of us have been to that site for Hearts of Gold or for Chamber events, and we know it's a tight space, but there's also sort of a concept of self-regulation; if it doesn't work, no one is going to come.

So, the tag of responsibility is really on the owner/operator as long as that accommodation can be made. Maybe Mr. Corcoran can add a couple of enlightenment to this Commission that maybe it can work. I've seen it work where there's valet parking off site where you have under-parked areas, that once the owner/operator can take control of it, that it works, and the operator/owner is going to want to be successful. They want to make money and they want to help this community have a certain distinctive feature to make Arlington Heights not only a Village of Good Neighbors, but a cool place to have.

You know, I think I see the elements, and this isn't really our job here to work out these details, but it seems like it's eminently workable. The other factor is that that site has been sort of evolving and it becomes sort of informal, and now that there's a rush of creating formality to it might not make it as feasible with getting legally binding documents there. But there is something that I think that could work out, but there is a little bit of custom and usage that, you know, is sprinkled on this piece of property. Again, it seems to me that it can work out, get the documents together, get the documentation together.

Then the final sort of point would be that we would condition it on the ownership, as long as the current owners are in control, you used that a few times so you must be a big A personality, you've got to have control, you know, kind of relax, and maybe cooler heads can work something out that works out. You've got a great place; you've got a cool place.

MR. CAZARES: I agree with you a 100 percent and I would accept that condition. I would even go to the extent, to the point of if I would lose these informal agreements, I would shut down the restaurant to the public, you know, I have to work with the community and everyone. If I don't work with anyone, then I'm not --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Well, I guess the point is that what you're looking at is a restaurant that can take 80 people, I mean, that's essentially what you're looking for, open to the public.

MR. CAZARES: Right, and I will tell you --

COMMISSIONER DROST: And that to me doesn't sound like an unsolvable

problem where, you know, the Pharisees are going to get you as opposed to common sense.

MR. CAZARES: Absolutely. Absolutely, and it isn't a difficult task to attract patrons to even a rooftop that's not a freestanding restaurant. I know the challenge of having charge of whatever hotel downtown and, you know, there maybe an initial room, things we'll regulate and it will be not an easy management or proposition to attract people to a building which is not freestanding and they don't know a restaurant that's there.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes. No, it's just, and a continuance can kind of, you know --

MR. CAZARES: And I'm agreeing to that, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Mr. Corcoran, he's here, do you want to have the man --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, do you want to ask him now?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Well, he's the witness.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Right.

COMMISSIONER DROST: He was sworn in and, you know, if he has something to say to support the parking situation, let's get them while they're hot, you know.

MR. CORCORAN: Good evening, Steve Corcoran with Eriksson Engineering. I prepared the parking study in your packet as well as worked on the original amendment eight years ago with the hotel addition.

Again, as Staff has mentioned, you're going through it, and just like I was here a few weeks ago or a month ago, the Park District was basically, you take the maximum occupancy of every use on the property for grounded parking and that's your code parking requirement. We know for many different, not just Park District, but shopping centers, restaurants, you know, there tends to be overlap both in time of day as well as interaction between uses. That's what we're kind of talking about.

Just regarding the amenities based on how we accreted it, that's how we accreted it at the original plan over eight years ago, and that's why we kept it that way because that was in the agreement with the Village back then. Now, I give you whether we change it to restaurant or not, it's just going to change the size of the variation, I mean, because it's square footage you need to park cars and people, but I think we got it covered either way.

Then, again, what he's been said so many times, there's interaction between banquet, between a hotel and rooftop facility. We've seen this at other hotels, to stay and then go to the banquet in the same facility. That's great for traffic and the guests at that point because that reduces any chance of DUIs and things like that as a convenience, and especially for people coming from out of town, they don't have to rent a car.

In terms of the traffic study, you know, again, like I always do, we calculate by code, we calculate by ITE, we calculate it by surveys and then any other information we have. You know, again, taking the worst case, everyone is maxed out, yes, we need additional parking. But our client has provided mechanisms for overflow parking, and I'm not going to get into the, it's beyond me as far as the actual wording of the agreement between them and their neighbors.

So, I think we're in good shape again because they are providing more, providing a lot more overflow parking than they really need. Then, I think work out the parking agreements and we should be in good shape.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Could I ask you a question? I guess in your professional opinion, given the change from being just an amenity, to this rooftop space, to open

to the public, I mean, we're looking here at Arlington -- no, I was just going to say, I mean, realistically, what's your estimate of the difference, the net difference between having that just as an amenity and operating it as it is now to Friday-Saturday night open to the public, realistically?

MR. CORCORAN: Well, that's the weird part, because currently, my understanding of the amenity space is that they're using it for internal use only. They have their own kitchen up there, so it kind of acts like a restaurant, it's just not where they're getting their people from.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, so that's the crux of this thing.

MR. CORCORAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Like the concern is, I mean, you know, we've kind of gone through, I mean, we know it's a great hotel and they're doing a great job running it and it's very popular, but the question we're presented with is what is the demand on the site and the neighboring streets and essentially what's then the difference between how it's managed now and now that we have, you know, people coming in from outside in some way? Is there any estimate that you have?

MR. CORCORAN: Yes, well, the difference, so essentially, the parking then and now is zero because they've already come on site for one reason. Then when you open it up to the public, if we use the ITE, the top there is 61 if it is a typical week night, and 70 spaces on a Saturday. If we go back to the code, that's 81, so code is a little higher.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I'm not talking about the code, I mean, we've seen that.

MR. CORCORAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I'm saying from a practical perspective because it's not going to all of a sudden, nobody from the hotel is going to start, you know, that everybody is going to start occupying this, it's going to be a hundred percent from outside, right?

MR. CORCORAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: There's going to still be whatever, a lot of people are using it as an amenity from the hotel, you're just going to have some more individuals.

MR. CORCORAN: I mean, my best guess at this point would be like 50 cars at most, you know, assuming some usage by the hotel/banquet users.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and there's, you know, these other services that you've got. You're going to have Waymo later and, you know, Ubers and stuff.

MR. CORCORAN: Yes, I mean, that's discounting ride share.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

Anything to follow up?

COMMISSIONER DROST: No. That's pretty much it.

MR. CORCORAN: All right, thank you.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, so we had some additional questions from Plan Commissioners. We do need to open this up for public comments on this topic because this is a public hearing. So, we're going to start at this side of the room. In the back row, are there any public comments on this petition? No, nobody?

Okay, seeing none, we're going to move over. I don't think the Arlington Steel guys have any comments. We're going to move back here. I think we have one gentleman coming up.

Yes, sir?

PUBLIC COMMENTARY FOR PC #25-010

MR. MOENS: Yes, thank you, sir. So, I would just recommend that we work to get this project in. This is a, I think it's a benefit to our community here. It's a well-known place and I think that rooftops are really cool. So, I mean, it would be a shame to lose this on a parking requirement. I think parking has become a little overstated lately, because we do have other ways to get around now with ride share and taxis and so forth.

So, I would ask that you either approve this as is asked or to postpone it so that they can work this out in a sensible way, but postpone it to a specific time for it to come back so it doesn't languish on and on and gives the Petitioner time to work through this. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you. Wait, no, I'm sorry. Your name please, sir.

MR. MOENS: Keith Moens. Keith Moens, M-o-e-n-s.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

All right, and I don't think we see any other public comments, I think? No, all right.

We're going to close the public hearing and we're going to come back. I guess, you know, I just asked Mr. Corcoran a few questions but, yes, I mean, I think I generally agree with, you know, Mr. Moens, you know, in a sense that I think this is a project that we'd all like to see accommodated. It's a good business; they've been doing well. I think that the Petitioner is frustrated with sort of the process and the communication and the thinking that, well, you know, we should just be able to do this. But, yes, realistically, where you're coming from is we need to have a little bit more than just a letter on a weekend. Typically, when I, you know, do commercial deals, we would want something, like I would not want to buy a property without a substantive agreement that gives me something, you know, assurance.

So, these are required, and I think the Petitioner was saying, well, you know, we've been doing this for a while. I agree that you don't need to take anything in perpetuity, but it sounds like that's, you know, it varies a little here when you say, okay, well, if these folks are willing to give us five years on this, then let's get something in place that says it. Maybe the agreement is if you lose your parking, then this thing reverts to an amendment. I mean, he doesn't have to tear it out, it doesn't have to go away. But if you open it to the public, I think from my perspective, I would like to see something that says, okay, here are things in place, nobody is getting perpetual use, I don't think we need it in perpetuity, but I do think we have to say if you do want to have it open to the public, as long as you have it open to the public, you know, we should have something in place. It can be a page, or two pages, but it should just be something that says, hey, these are the parties, we're saying that we know that the hotel traffic is on and you can use it.

So, I think it's a very minimal request. I think you'd be surprised how easy you can do it, but I think it can be done. We have some good neighbors here that are willing to do it. It sounds like he's had a good relationship with them. I think you should be able to get it. I'm not as concerned about the striping and all that, I am just concerned that there's space available for this overflow. I don't get the sense that this is going to be a real practical issue, but you know, the Village has to have this in place because we don't want people running across the

street. So, I would get that first thing.

The second thing would be maybe a little bit of traffic study with perhaps just an update to what was already done, to maybe provide some of the insight that Mr. Corcoran did and give us a little bit more of a delta between the current state and future state so that we can get a little more comfort around it. That would be the two things I would be looking for.

So, that's just my comment. I don't know if anybody agrees, anybody else have anything down here? I would be all, by the way, I would be for continuing this because I don't want to see it be denied and give the sense that we don't think it's a good place, but I would like to see it be continued because I would like to give it an approval because I think it is a good project. So, that would be my final comment.

So, do we have anything else down here to add to that? No?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I would give it an approval, too, to turn the temperature down. I like the idea of the non-impervious surfaces where we don't need more asphalt if we've got a good compact base and if you've been using it, and history would prove that out. So, you know, it's not trying to reinvent the wheel, it's trying to enhance what you have. I think it's a great project.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, I guess the next step would be, it sounds, the Petitioner I believe stated, if you want to step up really quick, sir? That you would want to request that?

MR. CAZARES: Yes, I request for it to be continued, and if it's possible, that Staff would allow me to present to the Board before the second meeting in June. After that, I'm having a procedure and I won't be able to present it for over two months.

MR. LYSICATOS: I mean, I would recommend June 11th just so that, one, it gives you enough time to get all the documents in order with all of the details that we've asked for. It also allows us to craft those conditions because we do want to be drafting conditions of approval. That is where we want to be as well, that's what our goal is.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, that would be June 11th at this, the continuation of this public hearing?

MR. LYSICATOS: At this. So, when is the Board meeting?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, Petitioner, so June 11th would be here, you'd still have final Board approval after that.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right. I'm just looking at the calendar to see what would --

MR. CAZARES: I understand. I can send my counsel to present. I mean, obviously, no one has the insight knowledge myself, but after June 18th, I will no longer be able to present for at least two months.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: June 18th?

MR. CAZARES: Yes, but you know, if that's the date, then I can just bring someone else to present.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, all right.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right, because the next Village Board meeting will be the 16th which we can't turn that around --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Right.

MR. LYSICATOS: -- because their agenda has already been gathered by the time we meet. So, it would be the first meeting in July. Just May 28th might be way over tight

just to get everything together.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, no, I get that. I just want to make sure. All right, so it seems to me that the June 11th date is probably the best.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, if the Petitioner is open to requesting for a continuance to June 11th, the Staff would concur with that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, I guess we would just add it to the motion.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, you'd have to make that request and this would be the date.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is that your request?

MR. CAZARES: Yes. Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion to continue to the date of June 11th.

A motion to continue the public hearing on PC #25-010 to June 11, 2025.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll second that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, the motion is to continue to June 11th on the floor. If we can have a roll call vote, please?

MS. HITZEMANN: Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MS. HITZEMANN: Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

All right, the Petitioner has a continuation on this public hearing to June 11th. So, our suggestion is to work with Staff on the items we've discussed and I think, Michael and Rachel will be, you know, work with you to make sure that it's done.

MR. LYSICATOS: And this would serve as the final public notice for that meeting. You don't have to do any additional mailings or postings for that, all right?

MR. CAZARES: Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you very much. All right, so that gives us the, all right, I guess that's for our public hearing.

(Whereupon, at 8:04 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: FULL CIRCLE COMMUNITIES/GRACE TERRACE
1519-1625 SOUTH ARLINGTON HEIGHTS ROAD - PC #23-007
FINAL PLAT OF SUBDIVISION

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 14th day of May, 2025 at the hour of 9:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

JAY CHERWIN, Chairperson
KRISTEN SCHURTZ
JOE LORENZINI
BRUCE GREEN
GEORGE DROST
TERRY ENNES
JOHN SIGALOS

ALSO PRESENT:

RACHEL HITZEMANN, Development Planner
MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director, Planning and Community Development

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We do have Item V, Other Business, Full

LeGRAND REPORTING & TRANSCRIBING SERVICES
(630) 894-9389

Circle Communities/Grace Terrace, Final Plat of Subdivision. That is not a public hearing, but --

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: -- we will listen to the Staff's presentation on that.

MR. LYSICATOS: Thank you, Chair.

So, on January 21st of this year, the Village Board approved Resolution #25-015 which authorized preliminary plat of subdivision for the Full Circle project that's associated with the temporary supportive affordable housing that you saw several months ago. The Petitioner has submitted their final plat for review along with the final building specifications and plans. Engineering and Planning have reviewed those plans and they met all the conditions of Chapter 28 and are satisfied at this point.

In addition, they addressed specific aspects of the approvals, both the Subdivision resolution and the PUD ordinance that addressed the impact fees, vehicular and pedestrian cross access which they provided on the plat. There was a condition about a reimbursement agreement for future public improvements. We've actually worked with the Petitioner; they are going to actually pay for those public improvements and dedicate the land as part of the final plat. So, there will be no need for an agreement since they will be paying for those fees.

So, at this time, we are recommending approval of the final plat of subdivision to then be reviewed by the Village Board with five conditions:

1. Prior to the Village Board meeting, that the final plat, that Petitioner provide those funds that we talked about associated with the dedication for the cul-de-sac at the terminus of Emerson Street;
2. Payment of all applicable engineering fees and the surety bonds, that would be one week before the Village Board;
3. They will also provide the printed mylar with all the signatures that we need before Village Board;
4. Payment of anticipated cash contributions in lieu of the school, library, and park and recreational purposes, that will be done before the time of building permit; and
5. Also, the on-site utility management plan which we've reviewed at this point as well, and that will be done before time of building permit.

At this point, we have actually gone through the vast majority of the building permit review as well, so the project is progressing.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Michael.

Okay, any questions to the Staff on the final plat of subdivision that's within our packet? Anybody have some questions on it?

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, I'll make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of the Final Plat of Subdivision, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to Village Board approval of the Final Plat of Subdivision, the Petitioner shall provide the funds needed for the proportional share of the public improvements necessary for the construction of a cul-de-sac at the terminus of Emerson Avenue abutting the property to the east as determined by the Village or enter into a reimbursement agreement with the Village.**

2. **Payment of all applicable engineering fees and the provision of all surety bonds, public improvement deposits, and maintenance guarantees (as required under Chapter 29 of the Village Code) must be provided one week prior to the Village Board approval.**
3. **The Petitioner will provide a Final Plat, as approved by the Plan Commission, printed on mylar and submitted to the Village, with signature obtained from all parties except those to be coordinated by the Village, no less than one week prior to the Village Board approval.**
4. **Payment of all anticipated cash contributions in lieu of land dedication for library, park and recreational purposes, and school sites to serve the immediate and future needs of the residents be provided at time of building permit.**
5. **An on-site utility management plan be approved by Village Staff as part of and at time of building permit.**

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll second that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, can we do a roll call vote for the approval of the final plat of subdivision.

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes.

Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MS. HITZEMANN: Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Cherwin, sorry.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

That's okay, it's been a while.

MS. HITZEMANN: It's been a while, yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, so thank you. We've got to sign that one after this meeting?

MR. LYSICATOS: We're going to get it before the Village Board meeting, so we'll work with you on that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, right.

MR. LYSICATOS: This one we're just, that's not a requirement of Chapter 29 which is traditionally done that way, so we're just moving it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, okay. All right, good. So, that's the end of other business.

Is there public comment on anything else? On the left side, anybody want to make a comment? No? On the right side, anybody like to make comment. You guys are

still hanging in there, that's very exciting.

Anybody, any other public comments in the back of the room?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right. Okay, no public comments. Then, let's see, I think that's it. Update on previous Plan Commission cases, is there anything that you want to tell?

MS. HITZEMANN: Do we have an update? The Rec Park and the building addition, both of those have moved forward and were approved by Village Board. We're just waiting for final ordinances to be approved. I believe that's it.

MR. LYSICATOS: The same with the East Country Lane Townhomes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes, same with the East Country Lane Townhomes. They're working through their final plat.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, thank you. One issue I just want to bring out, I don't know if the petitioners know it, Lynn Jensen has resigned. Our great colleague for a long time has done a great job and we will miss him dearly, but he has moved on from Arlington Heights. So, we do have a vacancy.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: What are we going to do for bike racks?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I know.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Well, you guys had a bike rack --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: You're okay.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: In the spirit of Lynn though, he did bring up a point to me, I think in the last meeting or I don't know before that, about, but he brought up a good point, about how we used to have essentially a tracking mechanism for projects to see where they are, what the progress is, where they're getting stalled, all this stuff. I know Lynn was very on that, and then it went away. I don't know why, but it went away at some point. I'm thinking that, I think in the spirit of Lynn, or if anybody else doesn't object, I think that would be very helpful for us to make sure that we're all holding ourselves accountable to moving projects forward and making sure people aren't getting frustrated.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, we can make that part of the, we added the line there, Update on Previous Projects.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: We can make that report part of the packet.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, and just however you want to lay it out, with a spreadsheet.

MR. LYSICATOS: And then if you have any questions on them, we can just make --

COMMISSIONER DROST: And, Rachel, we're all in compliance with our ethics reports?

MS. HITZEMANN: As far as I heard, yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay, good. So, we're all ethical.

MS. HITZEMANN: I think we got them in the nick of time.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, so unless anybody has any comments, is there a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, passes.

(Gavel pounded.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Meeting adjourned, thank you.

(Whereupon, at 9:08 p.m., the public hearing on the
above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)

COUNTY OF KANE) SS.
)

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