

APPROVED

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

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

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 11th day of June, 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 of Planning and Community Development

APPROVED

(Gavel pounded.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, we'll go ahead and call this meeting to order.

If we can stand for the Pledge of Allegiance, please?

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

We'll have roll call, please.

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes.

Dawson.

(No response.)

MS. HITZEMANN: Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Here.

Thank you.

All right, noted that we do have a quorum and we can proceed. Item III on our agenda is the approval of minutes from 5/14/25.

Is there a motion to approve those minutes?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Motion is on the table.

All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

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

Item No. IV is public hearings. There's one today. It's a continuation; and this is for 519 West Algonquin Road, Chez Hotel. So, I think at this point, we will continue on from our last meeting.

We had an initial presentation by the Petitioner. We had an initial presentation from the Staff. I think some adjustments have probably been made to those. So, unless the Staff objects, I would invite the Petitioner up to maybe summarize where we've been over the last few weeks and note any changes, and then I can turn it back over to the Staff for the same.

MR. CAZARES: Absolutely. James Cazares, Chez Hotel. We have a --

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Can I just have you raise your hand, again?
(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you. I don't know if we had to do that, but I figure why not.

All right, thanks, James.

MR. CAZARES: We revised some of the parking agreements, the letters. We added some of the conditions that Staff recommended. It isn't a formal lease, but it's something with more substance that Staff was looking for. So, I felt it wasn't appropriate to ask for a formal lease, but we came to I guess a medium on that in trying to gently get our neighbors to sign that, which they have.

We have a couple of outstanding issues in regards to valet over here, in regards to where show vehicles would be parked. Historically, we parked the vehicles in front, but I determined that it's better to just remove that and to just use regular parking spots, you know, we're a luxury hotel; we'd like to present a luxury image. This is part of our internal operation over here.

I do have a little bit of issue with removing the depiction of the valet plan in our site plan. You know, that site plan basically predates myself and is over 20 something years old. There's always been an issue here in the Village with parking on our site, and I don't have a problem to remove the depiction, but I'd like to still count those parking spots. So, that can be I guess discussed later at the time or we can try to hash that out.

Otherwise, there are some shading trees that need to be done in the parking lot. I talked to the Building Director today. He's under the understanding that we're on a temporary certificate of occupancy. I am under the understanding that we have a final certificate of occupancy, so we'll try to resolve that as well. I do have a final certificate that I received, but the Village believes I have a temporary, but otherwise, we will put those shading trees out there.

I think that's about it. You know, I just want to recap my last presentation. We really don't have a parking deficit here. We really have a parking surplus. I've fought with the Village and with Charles and with Staff for many years on this. The sad thing is that we have, today we're at 95 percent and we have over 100 something parking spots. I think we should have the highest and best use.

Us as the operators, having been here for over 27 years, I think we can do that responsibly. Just by looking at this room and not having any of my neighbors here hooting and hollering and saying these people are totally nuts and I'm having parking issues really is a gentle way to say that, you know, we're good neighbors. So, I think let's try to get this approved.

I still believe this hotel should be 120 rooms, and maybe one day I'll decide to come back and add another tower over here, but for now, we'll leave it as is. So, thank you so much, and I hope to invite you all when the public is allowed to come.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Could I ask you real quick, just to go through and just for clarity, I know you brought up a few points, but just so we understand where you're coming from, there is in the Staff report several, I think there's eight conditions outlined and I think you were kind of generally walking through them, but --

MR. CAZARES: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: -- am I to understand that you're taking the position, if you could maybe reference those eight, and I'm sure 8 is fine so we're kind of, you know, 1 is okay, so we're looking between 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, do any of those stand out to you in

APPROVED

particular as your main concerns or you object to? Are there some that you're fine with?

MR. CAZARES: Yes, I'm generally in agreement with all of them. I think that we just, we need to work out the finer details. My understanding is those trees would be completed once the generator was done. So, we have some items that are I would say not relevant to the Board or just internally happening that were delayed due to Covid and construction. We didn't want to plant some of them because we still have some construction that's going to be happening on the property, but in general, yes, I am in agreement with them.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay. All right, thank you. Well, you can go ahead and take a seat for now, and I'll turn my attention to the Staff.

If you have any updates, Rachel?

MS. HITZEMANN: I do.

So, to just kind of briefly remind everybody where we're at, so the subject property is 519 West Algonquin Road. They're in an M-2 District and they're looking for a land use variation to allow a restaurant to be opened to the public. They're also requesting variations to waive the traffic study and to reduce the required number of off-street parking spaces from 257 to 171.

Here is the aerial of the subject property. Then, I'm not going to go into the project background. I think we kind of covered that last time, but it is in the slide.

So, for the progress update from the last meeting, we did hold, Staff held a meeting with the Petitioner on May 29th to address outstanding items and to kind of all be on the same page on what we're looking for to move forward. Per that meeting, the Petitioner had submitted a comment response letter addressing round one comments, an updated valet plan, and updated parking agreements. Staff had reviewed those updated plans and provided a new comment letter. So, it wasn't just Planning Staff, but it was also the Engineering Department and the other Staff, Building, et cetera.

We want to stress that, you know, good progress has been made since that last meeting to move this application forward. There are a just a few outstanding items that we still need to address to keep continuing to move forward. I'm going to kind of outline these in the presentation. I do want to stress we have had a good working relationship with James and we think that this can get to where it needs to be; we're just not quite there yet but we can talk about it as we move forward.

Just a reminder, this is the rooftop space that we're talking about. The restaurant component on the sixth floor with that enclosed structure.

So, this is the site plan. You can see for the red, outlined in the red are those valet spaces that we are requesting to be removed from the site plan, those valet spaces. This is really a request from the Engineering Department. They have concerns with the access flow of not only emergency vehicles but also just vehicles on the site and how many parking spaces for the public that it would block if those spaces were to be used for valet, specifically on the north side of this, those three spots. Engineering believes that there is not enough room to kind of navigate around those if vehicles were to be parked. So, our request is to have those removed and really have most of the valet parking centered into that green area along the southernmost part of the site, anticipating that those parallel parked valet spaces would block basically both of those rows from parking where they could use both of those rows plus the parallel spaces as valet spaces which would accommodate their need to kind of remove those other valet spaces.

So, the parking study was revised by the Applicant to the restaurant

APPROVED

use classification, so we appreciate that. Per code, 257 parking spaces are required, but per the study, the Petitioner indicates that a peak demand would be 224 spaces. Staff is amenable to the Petitioner using 224 spaces as their peak demand as what we would require provided that they could provide agreements for the roughly 54 off-site spaces that would be needed. So, the valet plan identifies those 23 valet spaces to be used during an overflow. We would require that most of those be removed and just keep that southernmost parking. While the valet increases the on-site parking, it blocks those other spaces, so that's why we would want to concentrate it on that southern portion.

Staff has requested a revised site plan before the Village Board meeting showing the elimination of those aisle valet spaces, and specifically where show vehicles will be parked. But as James said, it sounds like he's parking those in regular spaces, so just clarifying that on the valet plan for the site. Then, also for the valet plan in terms of the narrative, before the Village Board, we're going to ask that that southernmost parking be noted as the primary valet area. I know this is kind of different than what we've told you in the past and we acknowledge that, but I think from a planning perspective, Engineering would prefer that all of the parking be off-site.

We understand from a planning perspective and a functionality that most likely if you have excess parking demand, you're going to use your valet first. So, we want to be accommodating of that and say that the southernmost parking access drive is where the valet should be, and then it should be the Brite-O-Matic site, and then the hand therapy site. So, we would like that clarified, how access to the southernmost two rows of parking would be restricted to patrons if valet is determined to be needed, a staging plan for how that part of the site would be utilized, clarification again regarding where show vehicles will be parked, and anticipated hours of valet operation on days that it is implemented.

The Petitioner has provided updated parking agreements that include many of the requested items that we outlined last time in mutual terms and conditions, the number of parking spaces, number of years, et cetera. The one element that we are still requesting is automatic extensions of the agreements which has not yet been provided. I think the specific language on the agreement is they agree to talk about extended automatic extensions. We would really just like to have that automatic extension be built into place.

So, here are the two agreements that we have. You'll see in both pictures that the Chez Hotel is outlined in red, and then in the first picture, the Brite-O-Matic north lot is the yellow. That's what we would be anticipating as their second option. Then, that hand therapy is the third and last option because they would need to go on to Algonquin Road into that site and then onto Algonquin Road to come back.

So, we are, Staff Development Committee does recommend approval of the land use variation to allow a restaurant in the M-2 District. We do have those eight conditions. One is an updated response to the land use variation criteria. Those other two, the next two relate to the valet plan as discussed. The fourth one is the parking agreements. The outstanding landscaping items, that must be installed this planting season, so if you're anticipating that it's going to be planted this year, I think your generator is coming in the next few weeks if I am understanding correctly, so they should be able to meet that.

Then, so those first five are really prior to Village Board, so if you do choose to recommend approval of this, the Petitioner will need to provide that to Staff before it goes to the Village Board meeting. These next three are kind of as it moves forward as an approved ordinance in that they must retain off-site parking agreements for 54 spaces and what

APPROVED

would happen if the agreements lapse, and that the valet parking may only be used between the south two parking rows.

With that, I'll turn it over for any questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Is there a motion to submit the updated Staff report?

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

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll second it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, the updated Staff report has been voted into the public record.

Thank you.

Rachel, I guess before we go on, I just have a couple of points for clarification here. The show vehicles?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: What are we talking about?

MS. HITZEMANN: I think they're the higher-end vehicles. So, if somebody comes in with like a Maserati or some other higher-end vehicle that's a show, you know, a showy car, that they would like to, yes, park it closer to the entrance for people to see.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, then I guess I just, I'm really, you know, I'm having trouble with the, can you put up that site plan that shows the highlighted aisles? Yes, that is the one. Where does, so I'm looking at the red valet parking and put aside the issue of, you know, okay, there are some cars that are going to get boxed in here, what's the emergency issue here for circulation? How does this affect the emergency vehicles?

MS. HITZEMANN: So, it shouldn't, in theory, affect the emergency vehicles because they will use the access that's closest to the building. I think Engineering is concerned, you know, let's say that there are emergency vehicles that are parked in that access drive, how if they are then. So, let's say, does this work? Yes, somewhere, there it is. So, let's say there's an access vehicle or an emergency vehicle here, if there are people parked over here, how they would be able to get out if these were also used as valet. So, it may interfere with that, and I think Engineering's point is really just that these will block people's access through the site and they're really against that, I think.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, I guess, you know, I mean, in terms of that, yes, but we have, I mean, isn't this, this is like it happens a lot I think when we go to restaurants. I mean, I feel like, or something crowded, you can always have valets and sometimes they're blocking and that's just the nature of valets. You've got to ask the guy and say, okay, move, but I don't know. From my perspective, I think like, yes, it's a little, I mean, it's difficult to manage, but I would think that the hotel is in a better position than some engineer in our department to determine what's most feasible for managing on-site traffic with this.

If it's not good for their guests or it's not, I mean, I don't buy the whole emergency vehicle; I think that's a non-issue. I think they're just grasping at straws there. I don't know, I guess I just, I'm not as concerned about it. I feel like the hotel is going to be able to manage with their valet if they're putting wherever they're putting people, if it's a, you know, longer-term banquet person, maybe they park in there. I mean, they have an incentive to make it

APPROVED

not miserable for people to have to, you know, get to their car, and if they don't do it right, it is going to be a logistic issue. So, I think they're incented more than our Village engineer to figure out the best way to handle the parking on their spot.

I guess on the southern part of it, the valet, the green area down there, is that kind of, that's the same, I'm just having trouble figuring out the two different valet issues. The issue down there in the green area, that's where you want the valet to be and that's where you want, so you want to move it off the red and --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: On to the green.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: -- on to the green, yet you have the same issue back there.

MR. LYSICATOS: Well, he was proposing to have both. The Petitioner was proposing to have both the green and the red as valet on any given occasion. So, what that does is it reduces the overall then supply of the parking for the now public uses. I think that was, Planning is concerned with having both operating at the same time as now you've taken out essentially half the parking on the site as valet, which is likely to be to the banquet use or the hotel use. So, you're starting to reduce the amount of general parking available --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: For the public, but --

MR. LYSICATOS: -- for all those concurrent uses, right.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: -- I mean, but --

MR. LYSICATOS: So, we thought either/or kind of allows it to be a little more flexible.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: -- wouldn't that, from your, I mean, even if, wouldn't it seem like the event would kind of dictate what's appropriate for that, if it's a major event that's, you know, that's a big banquet or they have a wedding and a full hotel, I think they would be incented to, you know, use that auxiliary parking first so that people aren't having to go find their way into Brite-O-Matic or whatever to park. I mean, so I guess my concern here with this is it just seems like we're trying to really be extremely prescriptive on how they run their business and how they manage their clients, and I feel like this is their business and they have an incentive to make sure it runs as smoothly as possible. We don't know that, you know, how it's going to work and how they may need to adjust.

My fear is just that we are basically telling them, kind of micro-managing this thing. I don't know why we would do that because I feel like they're, as long as we're okay with the overall number, and personally, I'm looking at the agreements and, you know, I feel like they're probably good enough for me, but they have this auxiliary parking I guess, so I don't know, that was my only point.

I'll ask you guys if you have any questions of the Staff or the Petitioner; however, you guys want to address it. So, why don't we start down by John this time.

John, do you have any?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, I had a question on these recommendations 1 through 8, and I think you mentioned that 1 through 6 has to be resolved or provided before the Village Board meeting. Why aren't they provided before our Plan Commission meeting?

MS. HITZEMANN: So, it would be 1 through 4.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Oh, 1 through 4.

MS. HITZEMANN: And 5 would be, to be done this year, essentially.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Right.

APPROVED

MS. HITZEMANN: The reason they are not done before this meeting is that the Petitioner would like to move forward with this as timely as possible, so he requested to be at this meeting date. So, we are trying to accommodate his request by then requesting that, making sure that these conditions --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: But the reason that this was continued today from a few weeks ago was because the Petitioner hasn't provided you all the answers to everything that you requested at that time. Has he given you all the information you ask now? I mean, I see you're recommending approval, but I just want to make sure you've got everything that you've asked for; that he's provided them.

MS. HITZEMANN: We've made progress to everything that we need. He has amended some of the items, but we still have, you know, 1 through 4, things that need to be updated to get to everything that we need, but we're on the right track, which is why we felt comfortable with recommending approval.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, but what if he doesn't agree to these 1 through 4? Then it's a waste of time.

MS. HITZEMANN: That's his choice.

MR. LYSICATOS: Well, I think the forum for tonight is if the Plan Commission is comfortable with these conditions, that would be their recommendation to the Board, or if there's a will to alter any of these conditions after the hearing and after you hear testimony, we would obviously work with the Plan Commission and Petitioner to alter those potential conditions tonight. But as the Petitioner wanted to move forward and have the follow-up or the continuation of the public hearing, we put forward what we would like to see as those conditions of approval. So, that's to answer your question.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, you feel comfortable with it then, the information --

MR. LYSICATOS: With these conditions. If the Plan Commission, and there are some points that are already being raised that we're obviously amenable to and would talk through, we obviously would work with you and the Petitioner to see if there's anything that would change if and when you got to your motion.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, and my last question is Item 5, the outstanding landscaping, why hasn't that been done? If he's got a certificate of occupancy, doesn't the landscaping have to be done before you get everything approved for occupancy?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes. However, this project was done in the middle of transitional periods, plus it was reviewed by a third-party, Building Review. So, I think between all of that, some things may have fallen through the cracks and I think there's a discrepancy on whether he has a final occupancy or a temporary occupancy, so that's really a question for the Building Department. But in theory, if he did have a final occupancy, then they should be completed prior to him receiving that, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: He should. Here we are in June, this is planting season, why isn't it being done?

MR. CAZARES: Yes, the planting season would be in the fall would be the best time. Right now it's the peak heat; it would not be optimal right now. The reason why I stated why they're not done right now is because we have to add a generator. It wasn't on the plan. So, our former Director of Building decided that he was going to be the authority on jurisdiction and he was going to impose rules that were not on our approved plans. We agreed to do that to settle with him. So, in that agreement, those items were also, verbally with Staff and

APPROVED

Mr. Recklaus, was to be deferred.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: But, again, as far as planting of trees required and the number of parking stalls and so on, that has nothing to do with your generator.

MR. CAZARES: Yes, it does, because the trees are located on the eastmost portion. That is where the work is going to be starting next week and it's going to be coned off and there has to be underground work; there has to be excavation for gas lines. I mean, it's not a generator house; this is a generator the size of two cars over here. So, that's going to be placed over there by those lots. So, unfortunately, we're not able to do it until it's done. We anticipate that being completed in about 60 days; the generator actually is arriving next week.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, Staff, again, you're okay with that then?

MS. HITZEMANN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay. All right, that's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks, John.

Terry, anything further?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: For Staff. Rachel, your understanding of these parking spots, valet parking spots that block existing parking spots, would people who come into the restaurant or the banquet be using those regular parking spots and then valets would be parking cars across them?

MS. HITZEMANN: So, as it's set up, yes. These spaces could be used for people who are parking their cars at the restaurant, et cetera. Then if valet was then implemented and they were allowed to park here, they will be blocking those people, which is why we're requesting --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Why would they, if they parked in one of those spots and then it got busier and valets blocked me, I've got to go find a valet to move a car?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes.

MR. CAZARES: No, well, can I --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: We never encountered that in a restaurant.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Wait, hold on for a second, Mr. Cazares.

Yes, I mean, what I'm saying is the stacking of cars, I think what it is --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes, valet cars.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Well, they can be moved, but this is public parking.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, it's parking for their facility.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I understand, but it's any customer. I've been to the facility a number of times and I've always parked in those spots. I've never had valet parking behind whether it existed then or not, but to me, it's a huge inconvenience if I go to a facility, any restaurant, and I park in a spot and I come out and now I've got to deal with finding a valet and identifying the car that's blocking me in?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, I think it is. I mean, it happens to me when I'm in the city and stuff like that when people are double-parked, but wouldn't you want to ask the Petitioner how he plans to handle it? Because I think it's a business operations issue.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: No, we ask --

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes, so it is part of the operations. Now, he may

APPROVED

decide, you know, he knows when peak times are so he may decide that valet is going to be utilized at the beginning of the night when he is not that crowded, and then as he gets more crowded, you know, valet will still be in service. So, they will know where to park the cars, but that is technically one issue that could arise. Now, will it? Who's to say? But with this plan, that is an issue that could arise, which is why we've suggested that the green area be used for valet because those marked parking spaces will be blocked regardless of, you know, if they use valet. So, patrons really can't park in those spots because they all will be used even though they're not designated valet, which is why we're recommending it there to kind of increase the valet to make up for the red area as it would be functioning that way anyway.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, to clarify, you don't want any valet parking in those red spots on this site map?

MS. HITZEMANN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, that problem goes away.

MS. HITZEMANN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay.

MR. LYSICATOS: But I think the concern, to Rachel's point, is that if you consolidate where all the valet is happening, those are all valet spots, because once you block a car in, the blocked car becomes a valet spot by default essentially. You have to go get the valet to move to get to their car. So, if you consolidate all the valet to the back of the site and make those high, and those are also the biggest turnover spaces because they're at the front of the building.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right.

MR. LYSICATOS: That's the first spaces people are going to drive to, you're going to have the biggest turnover, we thought it would probably be ideal to have them all at the back, and then if you have a really big event, you have the overflow adjacent to it and then the second overflow to the east which would be on the bottom of that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And I don't disagree with that necessarily, Terry. I just don't want to, like if there's a good reason for it and they need to use it, I guess I don't think it would be optimal, but like I said, do you want to ask the Petitioner how they plan to --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: No, I wanted to understand Staff's understanding of how this was going to work from their discussions with the Petitioner --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: -- and I just --

MR. CAZARES: The valet, the updated valet plan that we provided, our plan of attack is to not valet the cars hopefully on the property. If we actually need it, we're going to use the Brite-O-Matic parking lot, right? We want to let the guests use the south parking storage over here. As the rooftop opens, you know, we have to take a step-by-step approach. Our approach is, first, to limit the public usage, to look at events that are coming, to see, you know, what concerns, how our guests, how this is going to be.

You know, this over here has basically never been done. We never use these valet parking spots. In the history that the hotel has opened, we usually have a surplus. You know, we'll have to see. Our clients will dictate this is going to happen. If our clients don't feel comfortable with us parking cars far away that's not in their visual presence, we may have to do some in the front. I don't know. You know, we have to swim and tread down the river over here a little bit before we can really make a solid plan.

You know, our customers give us our best feedback. So, you know,

APPROVED

in your comment with your Rolls Royce, you won't want me park it in Brite-O-Matic, probably not. So, hypothetical, this is a contingency plan in a worst-case scenario.

MS. HITZEMANN: To that point, we're not limiting the, like if he wants to use valet and park people's cars in the marked spaces, we're saying that that's okay; we're allowing that or permitting that. It's really just those spaces in red that are the parallel valet that would block the other spaces. So, if he does have a Rolls Royce that he wants to park in a marked parking space and have it valeted there, we're not saying that that's not allowed. Obviously, we would prefer that the green area be used first, but it's really just the issues of the parallel spaces marked in the red.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay. All right, thank you.

MR. CAZARES: Exactly, yes. So, I mean, thank you.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, that was one of, we didn't specify that being, the whole parking lot could be valet.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Could be.

MR. LYSICATOS: It's using the drive aisle, because then that becomes substandard to our code. Our code says you have to have 24-foot drive aisles and all of the such. If, you know, if that was the case, everybody who came in here could say I want to just park in the aisles of my entire parking lot, we wouldn't let that go. So, that was the point.

The whole lot could be valeted and it gives them flexibility. They can valet park everybody's car in the site if they like. It's the using of the drive aisle that we would prefer just be in that one location because we feel it just could really interfere with a bunch of operations in that regard. So, yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: It's my understanding that there was a proposed or a projected limitation on how often there would be valet parking. This is an exception rather than any kind of a norm?

MS. HITZEMANN: That's our understanding. It wasn't totally clear on their valet plan; it does say a limited use. I don't know what limited use, you know, what number that is. Maybe James can fill us in.

MR. CAZARES: It would be to the management's discretion, you know.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, it could be everyday?

MR. CAZARES: It could be everyday, you know, we would forecast and see what's going on. When we would have compression; we would have valet. Right now, we have valet most every Saturday for each wedding, but we don't use the aisles and we have ample parking spots available, but we have that because it's a service that we provide.

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

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks, Terry.

George?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, this seems to be event dependent. Basically, I'd cede the, you know, decisions to the person that, you know, puts their money at risk on these, on the entrepreneur. Again, I think it has to apply some sort of common-sense rules. I don't see this as a, you know, 365-day problem. It's going to be a problem on limited occasions or special occasions, but I wouldn't want to over-regulate and get into the micro-managing of, you know, the business of Chez Hotel.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks, George.

Anything else?

COMMISSIONER DROST: No.

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, down at the end.

Kristen, any questions?

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: I think if Staff thinks it's okay, I'm good with that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, Joe?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes, so on this site plan, how many parking spots are on this plan?

MS. HITZEMANN: There is 171 striped spaces, and then this current plan shows 23 valet spaces.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, so that gives us 194 spots. How many spots are in the off-site?

MS. HITZEMANN: It's approximately 55.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: And where is that site located?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: It's in the Staff --

MS. HITZEMANN: So, there's two sites. There's the north lot here for Brite-O-Matic, and then the lot here for the hand therapy.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, then who is going to be, to the Petitioner, who is going to be parking in those spots, the off-site spots?

MR. CAZARES: The valet plan that we submitted, it would be the valet that would park off-site.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, it would only be valet in the off-site?

MR. CAZARES: Yes. Yes, we would open the public parking, but these are all hypothetical situations, right? We're hypothetically planning for something that's most likely not going to happen, but if it were to happen, the valet would then park the cars. We don't want to block patrons that self-park like Mr. Ennes said over here, right? The hotel guest usually checks in before an event. If the event is at 6:00 o'clock, the wedding, the guest is going to check in say around, they'd want to check in at 2:00 or 3:00. If they have a car, then they would have parked in the parking lot. So, it's going to behoove us not to impede their access.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No, I agree with what Chairman Cherwin is saying. We don't want to manage your business; you know your business. So, theoretically, what if all the green spots and red spots were full, or all the spots were full and somebody wants to park their own car, they have to go to one of the off-site spots?

MR. CAZARES: That will happen if I don't operate the hotel or I'm dead. I can plan very well. We can forecast it very well on this property over here. We know exactly who is coming to the hotel and where they belong.

As we open the rooftop to the public, we're going to progressively stage it so that we can see what the patterns are, right, because we don't know the patterns. I know the hotel patterns. I know that on Saturday, most everyone who stays in the hotel is attending the wedding because I specifically block that from the OTAs which is our online travel agencies. I'm specifically marketing the property that way.

So, as we open this to the public, we will stage and kind of learn on how it should go, right? If somebody may have a problem, then we park it at Brite-O-Matic or here or there, so we have to take it step by step, unfortunately.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, going back to the last drawing here, where is the drive aisle we're concerned about?

MR. CAZARES: The red one.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: The red, okay.

MS. HITZEMANN: It's the red areas.

MR. CAZARES: The red area.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes, okay. Again, I don't think we should dictate how the manager plays it. I'm just concerned about anything related to safety.

MR. CAZARES: Yes, and we are, too. You know, I think we can come to an agreement that if we do use those spots, maybe we cone off that entire area so that, you know, again back to the operation, okay, we know guests are coming in. We're really looking at a Saturday possibly five times a year, you know, okay, maybe we have to pre-cone that off in the afternoon, and any guests that come in and self-park have to park on the east side or on the south side or something like that, but I'm sure that we'd be more than able to handle that.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: If you are anticipating you're busy, how many valet people would you have?

MR. CAZARES: How many valet do we normally have? I don't know. Five guys, yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, and then going to the issue of if somebody has parked their own car behind the, or their car is parked behind the red valet parking spots, the inconvenience of that, well, if they get upset or anything, I think it's self regulating --

MR. CAZARES: Well, sure, because the reviews dictate our business, right? You know, if customers complain --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: That's what I was just going to say.

MR. CAZARES: If a customer complains, you know --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I was just going to say that if those customers don't --

MR. CAZARES: If you think I'm Type A, you should see why we have to be, we've got Type A plus coming into the hotel. So, you know, we'll have to make a plan of attack on that, right?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Let me finish my point.

MR. CAZARES: Yes, of course, sorry.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. So, yes, they could upset somebody if they're blocked in with the valet parking, but that's your decision on how you're going to manage it. So, I don't think we should be dictating that.

MR. CAZARES: Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: That's all I have for right now.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, Mr. Bruce?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I just have, the smartest thing I've heard here tonight is putting the valet parking in the off-site spots. That would solve all these problems, I think. Now, is the off-site to the east up on the, I'd like the other drive, go back to the other drive. There's more rows on it. Is it up to the top of the page? Is that the one that you can go through, or is it the bottom? East and west?

MS. HITZEMANN: So, it would be at the bottom and then it would be over on the --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, now which is the one that you have to go out on the road to come back in?

MS. HITZEMANN: Down here.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, so the one on the top you can get to from

APPROVED

here?

MS. HITZEMANN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Why wouldn't you just put the valet over there and be done with all this? Then Engineering is happy and you're happy --

MR. CAZARES: Well --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Wait, and I'm happy and everybody's happy if that's the case, or is that not a possibility?

MS. HITZEMANN: So, that was the first thing that Staff requested specifically, Engineering as well, is to maintain those 55, 54 spaces roughly that are provided off-site for valet. Per how operations work, we assume that if James could accommodate the valet on site, that he would choose to do that instead of parking in his neighbors' properties.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Do you choose to do that? I don't want to get a blow-by-blow here because I want to get out of here tonight.

MR. CAZARES: Of course.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, would you rather have the valet in the red and the green area, or would you rather have the valet parking in the off-site spot?

MR. CAZARES: I can tell you how it's been done the last year.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, what would you prefer?

MR. CAZARES: The parking for valet would be in these spots.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here, on-site?

MR. CAZARES: On-site, yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Why would you not want to have it just across the little street there?

MR. CAZARES: Because I don't have a parking issue. I understand the figures and numbers and you see the deficits.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, okay, okay.

MR. CAZARES: Right.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Let's not go there again.

MR. CAZARES: Right.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: We see it as a parking issue.

MR. CAZARES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, if the Village has a parking issue, you have a parking issue, okay? Whether you like it or not. Now, I'm not trying to be --

MR. CAZARES: Of course.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: You know, I just want to get to the understanding here. So, if there is a parking issue, is there any reason why the valet couldn't be put into the off-site spot?

MR. CAZARES: There's no reason.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Hang on, I'm talking to Staff, please.

MS. HITZEMANN: There is no reason, no. It would just be from a safety perspective in terms of you're going to get on and off of Algonquin.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, no, no. I'm not talking about the one over here. The one that's connected.

MS. HITZEMANN: Oh, connected in the back?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes. Is it in the back over here?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes. So, it would be --

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It's over here?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes, it would be right here. There is not really a safety issue. They do use that as a storage, so we're not sure how much, you know, will be --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: The valet is a controlled driver and he works for the Petitioner.

MS. HITZEMANN: Right, right.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, what would be a --

MS. HITZEMANN: So, the only issue would be we don't know how many spaces would be there actually available at a time because they do use that as a loading dock area. So, that would be the biggest issue, but it's minor compared to other issues.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, to me that would be the, your valet guys are your hired guys, insured guys, and they don't have Terry there having to park his Rolls Royce back there.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I thought it was a Bentley.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Or a Bentley, maybe it's a Bentley; I can never tell.

COMMISSIONER ENNES : Yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: In other words, that might be the answer to it.

Mike, you're looking like there's something you need to say?

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, no, just to be clear, we are okay if the entire site is valet.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, no, I --

MR. LYSICATOS: It's the matter of blocking the spaces, and if they do get to that 224. Again, it's the rare event, that's what we're planning for. So, the dichotomy of what we're trying to solve with the valet plan is if they do get to those big numbers, we have the overflow, the parking agreements are very close, that makes sense. But if they get let's say close to that, the first stage of overflow is parking in the aisle, we believe this is a bit of a compromise to say instead of having to, you know, start using those agreements, you get a first shot with the aisle and you get an extra 10 or 20 spots, but then those all become valet exclusive because you've blocked the aisle in stages.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Right, no, I get it, I get it. Believe it or not, I intend to come to an agreement with the --

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, right.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, I think that there is enough, I think the stuff that's at the end here is not striped; isn't that correct?

MS. HITZEMANN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: And so, that would be hard for the public to park there, so to me that's only a valet parking area anyway.

MS. HITZEMANN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: And so, as long as you know that, then you have the option of putting yourself there. I, too, agree that it seems like the parking is something that he can work out. So, I do agree that we don't need to try to micro-manage exactly, here's 13 cars here and here. As long as there is space for this overflow to hit 224, I think it can work.

MR. LYSICATOS: And that's what we've received. So, the number that James has provided is hitting that 224, so we think that's a really positive development. That's why we are --

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER GREEN: And I agree. I'm in agreement with you, Mike.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right, the only condition that Engineering raised with us is they're not completely comfortable with cars blocking drive aisles. We don't allow that on any other parking lot, so our compromise is if that condition, the only place we would want that condition to exist is that rear lot because it essentially blocks in everything.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I hear that, too.

MR. LYSICATOS: That's it, because there's high flow, their turnover spots are going to be in the front of the site, and we're just wary about anything being parked in the aisle there.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: And I agree. If they have show car parking, I'm sure you're going to take care of this and you're not going to block in some of your best patrons that come to your restaurant only because the valet is behind them. So, I feel confident that here you will figure out where to put these guys, the valet in the back, and that everybody will be happy and there should be enough spots.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Do you agree?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, I mean, I agree. I'm looking at it like I don't want to pin them in to say you have to use the auxiliary parking, because a lot of events just aren't going to draw that many cars.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Right, but the valet is nice because he's hired them and he knows how to do it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, but you may never need it for a lot of their events, so it's like, well, I don't want to pin him in to having to use the supplement first.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: And we're in agreement.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes. So, I mean, that was where I was coming from.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, to your point, Chair, do we want to modify the conditions that take away the staging requirement? We don't have to get into the staging. We'd just say the off-sites are valet only.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All valet as well, yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: And the only place we would allow the aisle parking would be in that southern lot.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, I think that we have, I mean, for me personally, I think Conditions 2, 4 and 7 to me aren't conditions that I necessarily would need. I feel like 6 is where it all is, which is we're telling the Petitioner, listen, this is a conditional land use variation because it's up to you to manage it properly. If it doesn't get managed properly, whether they're in the back or whether, you know, wherever they are, if we're getting complaints from petitioners or neighbors of there's issues going on, then you're going to have to solve it. If you're not going to solve it, you're going to be back to square one where you can't open to the public. That's, to me, that's where everything is --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Right.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: -- which is we'll give yourself enough leeway to run your business and do that, but if there's problems and you can't manage it, then this goes away. I feel like the same thing goes with their license agreements on the parking. It seems to me like they've got enough buy-in from their neighbors that we don't need to push him more with more terms on all this. If it goes away, they need to report to us, No. 5, or No. 6, and if those go

APPROVED

away, then there's a red flag for us, we have to monitor it more. Then if we're starting to get complaints from these folks next door, oh, no, these guys are parking on my lots, they're not supposed to, then we've got to work it out. If we can't, then this isn't going to work.

So, in my opinion, 6 is where the rubber meets the road here, and I think that's an important one to keep in. 2, 4, 7, in my opinion, I don't need them and I don't want to overly restrict the guy, but that's my thought.

But before we, I guess, go any further, I would just like to officially see if there's any questions from the public. I don't see anybody unless I'm totally losing it.

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, seeing that there's no members of the public, we'll close the public hearing officially and bring it back to the Commissioners for any follow-up questions.

Yes, Mr. Joe?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I have one more question for the Petitioner. So, when do you think would be the peak valet parking time just for weddings and --

MR. CAZARES: Just for an event? Yes, I would say on a Saturday night would be the peak valet. That's historically where it's been in the last year.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, if somebody wants valet parking, how do you decide if you're going to park in the green space or the red space?

MR. CAZARES: I think the plan of attack is regular space, and then followed by our overflow Brite-O-Matic or hand surgery.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, if a person, if you've got red spaces and green spaces available, how do you decide where you're going to park the car, in the red or green spaces, if you have availability in both spots?

MR. CAZARES: If the parking lot is full, correct?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No, if somebody pulls up in a car and they want valet parking, how are you going to decide if you're going to park in either the green spots or red spots?

MR. CAZARES: Well, there would be a multitude of determining factors. If there are spots open, we would just use the regular unmarked spots. Once the parking lot would be full, we would then go to the overflow.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, well, hold on. The question is, valet parking, how do you decide if it goes into a red spot or a green spot if there's availability in both locations?

MS. HITZEMANN: I think to Commissioner Lorenzini's point, say you've parked all of the valet in the striped spots, you've used up your two off-site parking, and all you have left is red and green, where would you park? Which would be very rare.

MR. LYSICATOS: Well, and just for clarification just through the Chair, so the red and green, just to clarify, the red and green, what we're trying to show in that exhibit is the aisle blocking spots. It's not that those are valet zones, it's that that's where the Petitioner has proposed parking in the drive lane. That's what that is. It's not to say that those are valet areas, the entire site can be valet parking. We have no, that's up to their discretion, and to the Chair's point --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, you're just saying before you start stacking the aisle, you'd rather have them do it in the back.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right, and that was the red flag for our Engineering

APPROVED

Department is they're not comfortable with cars parking in their drive aisles. So, that's the heart of the recommendation in the valet plan, that if they do that, the only place we want that happening is in the green area, but it's up to them and their business plan, whatever works best for them to valet those cars anywhere that they see fit. If they feel it's better on the east side, they can do it on the east side. If they want to fill the ones in front of the building, it's up to whatever works for them, and we're fine with that.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you for your clarification.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, is there any other comment?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, the comment would be, based on what you said, how do you kind of edit this proposed resolution, you know, as to do we just make it subject to Nos. 1, 6 and 8?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, I would say if you're going to make the motion, then you have the option --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Well, no, I'm just saying because I thought, you know, simplification here because 4, for instance, where you've got automatic renewal after five years, but it can be terminated at any time by either party makes it only whatever the notice requirement is, a 30-day, 5-day, 1-day.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So, it doesn't have really much impact.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I was thinking the same thing, George.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, Staff would just to kind of work through I think No. 4. I think that makes sense to the Chair's point, No. 6 gives us all the leeway we need --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Right.

MR. LYSICATOS: -- to figure something out. So, we can eliminate 4. No. 1 is okay. No. 2, we just, what we're requesting there is that the site plan be updated so that the drive aisle spaces aren't shown where that red area is, that was something specifically our Engineering Department did not want in any of the drive aisles. We're comfortable with it just being shown where the green is.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And, Joe, maybe 2-Section 1 is okay to keep in.

MR. LYSICATOS: 2-1, and eliminate No. 2-2.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And 2 maybe just comes out, George.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes. Yes, all right.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, 1 is okay. 2-2 is eliminated. No. 3 is essentially, I don't think we need the show vehicles, because again, they can valet anywhere they want. So, we can eliminate No. 3-4.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, right.

MR. LYSICATOS: Because the valet plan is just showing us how they're going to rope off if they use the drive aisle. That's really our biggest concern there. No. 4 is eliminated. No. 5 is okay. No. 6 gives us our flexibility. I think No. 7, is No. 7 redundant at this point?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, it feels redundant.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, it feels redundant with number --

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, we're eliminating No. 7. That will just go to the

APPROVED

ordinance, whatever the language is in the ordinance, so we can eliminate No. 7. Then, No. 8 is fine. So, we would eliminate No. 2-2, No. 3-4, No. 4, and No. 7.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay.

MS. HITZEMANN: The only thing with 7 is that it does say that all other on-site parking spots can be used for valet services. So, maybe we leave that part, but we take out the valet aisle parking may only be used between the south two parking rows on the property.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So, that first sentence is retained?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No, the first sentence is eliminated.

MS. HITZEMANN: It would be the last sentence that's retained, all other on-site parking spots can be used for valet services, but must be maintained in striped parking spaces.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay, the last sentence.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, I'll take it from the top. Our modified recommendation to the Plan Commission is that of the eight, we eliminate 2-2, 3-4, 4 in its entirety, and the first sentence of No. 7.

MS. HITZEMANN: Do we want the first two sentences of No. 7?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, first two, I think. Yes, eliminate the first two in No. 7.

MR. LYSICATOS: Oh, two, I'm sorry. Yes, and eliminate the first two sentences of No. 7.

COMMISSIONER DROST: All right, is the Petitioner following this?

MR. CAZARES: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, that's the revised recommendation from Staff.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, is that okay with you?

MR. CAZARES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Why are we eliminating Item 2, the elimination of access valet spaces except in the southernmost two rows of the lot? I mean, so --

MR. LYSICATOS: That's 2-2.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: -- 2-2 is what we're eliminating?

MS. HITZEMANN: Where specifically show vehicles will be parked.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We don't need to know where John Sigalos' Rolls Royce is going to be parked.

MS. HITZEMANN: Assuming that the show vehicles will be parked in striped spaces, not just right in front of the hotel in the non-striped space.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, the spaces that are shown in red are going to be eliminated for valet parking?

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, thank you.

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, well, if there are no other questions; is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make a motion if that's okay?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, you can make a motion. Go ahead with the motion.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay.

APPROVED

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #25-010, a Land Use Variation to allow a restaurant in the M-2 Zoning District, and the following Variations:

1. Variation to Section 6.12-1.3 to waive the requirement for a traffic study;
2. Variation to Section 10.4-4 to reduce the required number of off-street parking spaces from 257 spaces to 171 spaces.

This recommendation is subject to the resolution of the following:

1. An updated response to the Land Use Variation criteria shall be provided before the Village Board meeting.
2. A revised site plan is provided before the Village Board meeting showing the elimination of access aisle valet spaces except in the southernmost two rows of the lot.
3. The valet plan will be updated prior to the Village Board meeting with the following items:
 - 3.1. The southernmost two rows are noted as the primary valet area;
 - 3.2. How access to the southern two rows will be restricted to patrons if valet is determined to be needed;
 - 3.3. Staging plan for how the on-site valet will be utilized; and
 - 3.4. Anticipated hours of the valet operation on days that it is implemented.
4. Outstanding landscaping items must be installed this planting season. These include: landscaping that is absent near the northeast corner of the building per the approved landscape plan, and three code-required trees that have not been installed. Per Chapter 28, a four-inch caliper shade tree must be provided at the end of each parking row.
5. Petitioner must retain off-site parking agreements for 54 parking spaces. If the agreements lapse, the Petitioner must notify the Village. If it is determined, at the sole discretion of the Village, that the subject property is creating a parking problem or creating an unsafe impact on traffic along the private access drive and along Algonquin Road, the Petitioner shall work with the Village to resolve the situation through the staggering of event times, the limiting of event sizes, restrictions on hours/days of operation for the banquet hall and restaurant, contracting with the Police Department to provide traffic control personnel, the addition of further off-site parking areas, or any other option as determined appropriate by the Village. If a resolution cannot occur, at its sole discretion, the Village may revoke the land use approval.
6. All other on-site parking spots can be used for valet services but must be maintained in striped parking spaces.
7. The Petitioner shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and Village codes, regulations and policies.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

That's the motion; is there a second?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll second that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, we heard the motion.

Can we please have a roll call in favor of the motion?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes.

APPROVED

Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MS. HITZEMANN: Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

All right, the motion passes.

There is unanimous approval for the recommendation as it was stated. There are some editing I think that needs to be done, but I think we're all on the same page.

Thank you, Michael, for your --

COMMISSIONER DROST: You earned your pay, guys.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes. Thank you, Michael.

All right, so, congratulations to the Petitioners, you have an approval.

This next goes to the Village Board. Please continue to work with the Staff so that you can make your way forward to the Board.

All right, that will conclude that matter and that is the last of our public hearings.

Is there any other business?

MS. HITZEMANN: No.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Now, what's the update to previous plan?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: That's okay --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: What's that?

MS. HITZEMANN: Update on previous Plan Commission cases?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, I just see it on there.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, okay, so no other business. No public comment. No. VII, Bruce is referring to the Update on Previous Plan Commission Cases. I think we had brought it up to the Staff last time to have some format so that we can start tracking progress so we're making sure petitioners are moving along the process smoothly.

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes. So, the Park District, all the Park District ordinances have been approved by the Village Board. The Roast 808 at Salt Creek is working through their building permits. East Country Lane Townhomes have submitted for their final plat and they're going through review for that. Then Arlington Steel is going before the Village Board on the 16th. Those are kind of the last projects that you've seen.

Does anybody have any specific projects they have questions on that we can provide an update for you?

Yes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I don't have a question on a specific project, but

APPROVED

I do have a question. There is a, it's my understanding that there is a change coming out in regard to affordable and low-income housing. Does the Department have any plans to create a zoning class for this type of property, or include this kind of property in any zoning class? For two reasons, so that developers know where to look for property, and so that adjoining property owners know that that's a viable option for a property that might be next to them.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, I can fill in. So, as of this point, we have no plans to change the Village's Affordable Housing Ordinance at this time. We have one in place already. So, the ground rules for how we determine how much affordable housing will be required in multi-family projects is pretty set at this point. Any changes that might happen on the state level, we'll have to assess, but at this point --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Shouldn't there be zoning for this type of property that allows it?

MR. LYSICATOS: We haven't discussed that. Again, our Affordable Housing Ordinance covers how affordable housing is constructed as part of multi-family projects. So, that's what the Village uses at this point in its implementation plan. We have not discussed in any detail any changes to that recently. So, if we do, we'll bring that forward to the Ordinance Review Subcommittee and discuss it at that point.

MS. HITZEMANN: And, you know, affordable residential housing, even if it's a whole unit, is typically allowed and permitted where any residential housing would be permitted. The fact that it's affordable versus not affordable doesn't really apply. It's just if it requires a special use for whatever reason, or a PUD, things like that, that's when it would be noticed.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: In the original program, when we were advised about it, the thing we were told about it is that every apartment building, condominium building, would have a certain number; however, now it seems like there's been a rush for full 100 percent buildings. That's more my concern and things --

MR. LYSICATOS: Well, I wouldn't assess it as a full rush for a 100 percent buildings. I think we just had one, the Full Circle development, which was a 100 percent, but beyond that, in the last two years, I don't think we've had any other approvals. I know Crescent Place was a 100 percent; that was approved several years ago, constructed a couple of years ago, but I don't think we've gotten anything since.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: What about the one on Rand?

MR. LYSICATOS: I believe that is Crescent Place.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes, that's a 100 percent. They have other properties; the property right in downtown here is a 100 percent.

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: The facility at South Arlington Heights Road --

MR. LYSICATOS: The Full Circle development.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: The one by the library, didn't that convert to a 100 percent when it was proposed to like 30 or 40 percent?

MR. LYSICATOS: I think that's the one that Commissioner Green talked about in the downtown.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Maybe.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Well, Terry. I was the one on Rand.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, yes, that's Crescent. The one by the library here that was originally billed as a partial and then, you know, obviously, people --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: They just did their own thing and converted it.

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, yes. I mean, it's hard to, I mean, the reality is --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Well, but we should be able to control properties in our town --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: That's right.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: -- and not have a developer come in and just say, oh, we're going to do the minimum percentage and then convert it to a 100 percent.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes. Well, I don't disagree with you, but there's a terrible ordinance that we have and they passed it; I didn't.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: What I'm saying is --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, I mean, we have a terrible ordinance. I mean, I don't know what to tell you.

MS. HITZEMANN: To your point, we're not planning, we don't have any plans to amend that ordinance at this time. As it stands now, anywhere that residential could be built, it could be built a 100 percent affordable. If it did need a zoning entitlement just like any other residential building that would need a zoning entitlement, it would come before you obviously for review, but that's kind of the gist of it; otherwise, it would just need to go through a typical building permit process.

MR. LYSICATOS: Again, I don't know the legality of restricting something from becoming affordable housing.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'm not saying restricting it; I'm saying allowing adjoining property owners to know, and developers to know where properties are.

MR. LYSICATOS: Where affordable housing can be built?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right, yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: That's what I'm saying, I don't know that that law allows us to restrict where affordable housing could be built regardless. I would have to look into that. I don't know. So, I don't know if there is even a pathway to that legally. So, we would have to look into that if you want an answer on that.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: It would be nice.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I have a question about a project. The one that we're talking about with the through-street and it was off of Walnut and the east-west street that's going through it and somebody built a house there.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, the one on Ridge.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Where are we with that one?

MS. HITZEMANN: We are in the process of getting a legal opinion on whether or not they can submit the application without the technical owner of the property signing off on them submitting that application. So, essentially, for those who are not aware because this has only gone to CPRC and has not come before the full Plan Commission yet, there is a property on Chestnut and Walnut that is very long, and the owner of that property has tax parceled the property into several different pieces of property. Now, a tax parcel is different than a subdivision in that they're not legally buildable lots until they are fully subdivided.

So, they are coming in and looking to subdivide that property, and there's a lot to that on kind of the Comprehensive Plan and what the Village has intended for that property long-term. What they do lot-wise in terms of utilities, et cetera is something that we've gone back and forth with them about, but they have chosen to move forward with a Plan Commission application. However, because they do not have technically the owner's signoff to

APPROVED

submit that application, we cannot technically move it forward to a Plan Commission hearing until they provide us with that. They are challenging that they do not need that signature because those lots have been tax parceled, so we are in the process of getting attorney opinion about whether or not they can move forward.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, have we found out how the house was able to be built in what was supposed to be a right-of-way all the way through? Basically, I want to know who did that.

MS. HITZEMANN: So, it's our understanding that that property had a portion of a right-of-way dedicated, but not the full right-of-way that the Village would need. So, when they came in for a building permit, they met all of the zoning and building requirements and engineering requirements to build that house. But at the time, the Village did not request for that additional right-of-way to be granted which, if they did, it probably would have resulted in that house not being built, but for whatever reason, we didn't request that and I don't know, we don't know.

MR. LYSICATOS: We're not sure exactly what the history of that was.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: What house is this?

MR. LYSICATOS: It's a roadway, but I don't know that ---

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, wouldn't that more or less free up the Village from the idea of connecting the two? It's never going to happen because there's a house in the way.

MR. LYSICATOS: I mean, we don't want to sort of go through the details of what the petition might be. I don't think that would be appropriate for us to sort of pre-suppose the application, but --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, but I'm just --

MR. LYSICATOS: -- it would not, we still have subdivision regulations and there are some areas where it could happen. So, this doesn't necessarily --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: After that lady that presented this at the meeting, that was a long time ago and I just don't know why it's taking so long to come up with a resolution one way or the other.

MR. LYSICATOS: We have given them information, and then they are determining what they want to do on their end and obviously working through some of the technicalities to have an actual formal application at this point. Technically, it's not a complete application because of the point that Rachel made about the actual submission without the actual landowner being a party to the petition.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Is this a Hart Passman --

MR. LYSICATOS: This is our Legal Counsel. We are running it by Legal Counsel, so we actually have one point of view, they just have another. So, we're just clarifying how to move forward.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, I'm just going to be curious to what happens.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I think our point on the update, just as a clarification, I appreciate the rundown, but I think our plan is to have like a grid, an ongoing grid that gets passed out every two weeks with the rest of it. As soon as someone submits like an e-mail or a package, that's when the clock starts ticking. It's not just kind of where things are. We need to know where they are in the process because we need to hold ourselves accountable at the committee level and everything else. So, once something is submitted, we want to be able to

APPROVED

see where things are moving.

MS. HITZEMANN: So, are you talking about a Plan Commission application submittal or just an e-mail to our department?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Anything. If somebody is submitting a plan like officially getting the clock going, if they have an application, if they've signed the application and they've sent it in, then --

MS. HITZEMANN: So, the official application wouldn't start until they submit an official Plan Commission application.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, okay, so at that point. Yes, so if they're starting the process and they haven't gone to Plat and Sub yet or Conceptual Review, we need to know when that clock starts ticking so that somebody who's caught in Plan and Sub and it's been going on for an inordinate amount of time, we need to know about that because we need to know what's getting hung up and what we can do to move things along.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: A timeline, just the start and finish.

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes, the issue we're, so Plat and Sub and Conceptual Plan Review is before they submit an actual Plan Commission application. So, at that point, it's really just been e-mails back and forth with the Planning Staff. So, just I'm trying to get a clarification on when we want the timeline to start because, technically, they haven't submitted anything like official that they submitted an application until they submit the Plan Commission application.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, yes. So, I think then we start with that. If, I would say if an application has been submitted, then that's probably where we need to start. If it's incomplete or it's this and that, if it's just an e-mail, that's fine, I don't think we need to keep track of that. But even if it hasn't gotten to the Conceptual Review Committee and it's hung up on Conceptual Review before it comes to the Plan Commission, I think we have to start tracking that because we need to, I think we need to know if things are languishing and why they're languishing, you know, it doesn't do us any good if we're not monitoring that internally.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And this is a Village of Good Neighbors for fast permitting.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: Well, I mean, that is what we do at the department. I mean, it's essentially, just to be fair, that's what we are doing and --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I appreciate that, but --

MR. LYSICATOS: -- whoever the Director, but when it comes to documents, to Rachel's point, that are still in draft format; we are very careful about what we share.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: You don't have to share documents.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: It's just a draft. It's just saying, hey, this person you saw here in, you know, whenever, August, and here it is, you know, six months later and why, you know, Bruce is asking questions, there's other issues that have come up, and I think what we want to do is make sure that if things are getting hung up, then we have line of sight to it. You know, if we saw something eight months ago in Conceptual Review and we're wondering --

COMMISSIONER DROST: It's still there.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: It's still there, right.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DROST: Then what do we do?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Right.

MS. HITZEMANN: So, you want it --

MR. LYSICATOS: Well, to be fair, we also don't want any vetting issues with the Plan Commission before it's ready for a public hearing, but --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I don't think it's vetting issues --

MR. LYSICATOS: -- if we're giving you dynamics of why plans have stalled, there are specific issues like I don't want to talk about specific issues with the one on Ridge, because now we're vetting the application before the application is ready to be vetted with the Plan Commission.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, we can give you a status and that's completely fine.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes. Yes, I think that's fine.

MR. LYSICATOS: If you're looking for documents, looking for a response --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We're not looking for vetting, but if somebody is in the pipeline for like seven months, we need to know about it because that's completely inappropriate.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, sure, and some stuff just goes away. I mean, obviously, in some sort of stalls, have to refer to the petitioner, we've reminded them, we have no response.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I think --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Look, Michael, I guess what everyone is looking for is, like the property just west of Metropolis that building that was brought on, they came before us and it was approved. I'd just kind of like to know what the status of stuff like that is, or the huge piece of property on Arlington Heights Road just south of Golf. We had a proposal for a couple of high rises or whatnot and that's dead now, and the old International Shopping Center, that's huge. I mean, I just would like to know what's going on with that stuff, too.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes. So, I can tell you we are working with them on a petition.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And the Arlington Race Track?

MS. HITZEMANN: So, I'm understanding that you really want the updates to start from after they've come to CPRC, or at the relative --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, I would say starting with the Plan Commission actual application.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Right, right.

MS. HITZEMANN: But that's after CPRC, so --

MR. LYSICATOS: We can put something together when something comes to, when you've heard at Conceptual, to give you a sense of is the project still going or is it gone.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Exactly. Thank you.

MS. HITZEMANN: Okay.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, we can do that.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any other comment?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Are all the committees filled, Rachel?

MS. HITZEMANN: Not yet, no.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DROST: Do we need to do anything?
MS. HITZEMANN: We do. I've been trying to connect with Jay and we're
working on --
connect with me?
CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I didn't know that. How are you trying to
connect with me?
MS. HITZEMANN: I sent you a couple of e-mails, but maybe you haven't
gotten them yet.
CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Oh, okay.
MR. LYSICATOS: We'll work with you offline on that.
MS. HITZEMANN: We'll work on it, yes.
MR. LYSICATOS: We still have the committees; it's just a matter of re-
organizing and tweaking a couple of things.
CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, is there a motion to adjourn then pretty
much?
COMMISSIONER GREEN: Motion to adjourn.
COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I'll second it.
CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, all in favor?
(Chorus of ayes.)
CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, motion passes. We're adjourned.
(Whereupon, at 8:43 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