

APPROVED

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: 1920 NORTH CHESTNUT AVENUE - CHESTNUT WOODS SUBDIVISION - PC #24-018
PRELIMINARY PLAT OF SUBDIVISION, VARIATIONS

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,
Illinois on the 24th day of September, 2025 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director, Community Development
DANIEL OSOBA, Planner I
RACHEL HITZEMANN, Development Planner

APPROVED

(Gavel pounded.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We'll call the meeting to order.

If we could stand and do the Pledge of Allegiance, please?

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you again, everybody, for your patience. We usually start this on time, but we had a meeting go long next door and because of the Public Meeting Act, we had to extend some of the comment period for a meeting in the Conceptual Review Committee. So, thank you again for your patience, and I apologize that we're running just a little bit behind, but we'll try to catch up here.

If I could have roll call, please?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes.

Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Here.

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: Petermann.

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Here.

Thank you.

We have a quorum, so we'll continue with the meeting. Item III on the agenda is approval of minutes from August 27th.

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Second.

All in favor of approving the minutes?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, motion passes; minutes are approved. We're going to move on to our next section which is public hearings.

The first one we have is 1920 North Chestnut, Chestnut Woods Subdivision. So, I guess I'll ask the Petitioner group, whoever is going to speak, if you can come

APPROVED

to the podium here.

I'll ask, have all notices been served on this?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, they have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you, Dan.

So, whoever is going to speak on behalf of this one, if you can just come and, if anybody else is going to speak, you don't have to speak right now but if you're going to speak later at all, I just need you to take a swearing in.

All right, so I'm going to ask you to raise your hand.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, thank you.

All right, so if you want to go one at a time or however you want to, you know, start out, that's fine. I would just ask you to state your name before you speak and spell your last name for our court reporter. I'd ask you first before you get started, there is a Staff report that's in the record, have you read the Staff report? And there are certain conditions on there, do you agree with the conditions that were set forth in the report?

MR. NIERMAN: We've read the Staff report.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, and did you read the conditions that are --

MR. NIERMAN: The six conditions, yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, and are you in agreement with those?

MR. NIERMAN: Vitalie, yes? Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, if you could please state your name, spell your last name, and you can go ahead and present your petition, please.

MR. NIERMAN: Well, my name is Scott, S-c-o-t-t, Nierman, N-i-e-r-m-a-n. I'm a Consultant for Clim Development. Vitalie Clim is here, he's the owner. Also, Sabin Olteanu is the Civil Engineer; he is prepared to answer any questions as well.

The first thing I'd like to do is to thank the Staff for their cooperation and guidance and, of course, your consideration tonight.

The proposed subdivision is a three-plus-one subdivision; three residential lots plus a smaller lot to provide for detention for the subdivision. There's one residential lot that faces Chestnut Street that would be 13,320 square feet with a frontage of 90 feet and side yards that conform to an R-2 zoning. However, the setbacks, the front setback, a variation was required because of the formula that's stated in the applicable chapter of the Code. There is no established setback yard per a survey along the west side of Chestnut Street.

The detention pond is a small pond that we need, I mean, is a small parcel that a variance is required because the size of the parcel and the width of the parcel do not conform to R-2 zoning. The reason for the detention is that the subject parcel cannot take advantage of the Ladd detention facility a couple of blocks north; due to the topography of the site, it sits lower. So, the subdivision needs to provide its own detention.

There are two residential lots on Walnut Street, both of which are 11,100 square feet, and they conform to the R-2 zoning requirements. The proposed houses on all the lots would conform to the R-2 FAR and bulk coverage regulations, but we're here tonight on the petition to request a variance of the required setback, a 40-foot setback on Chestnut Street, and the size and the width of the smaller detention pond.

That's all I have to say for now. We'll rely on the Staff report, and

APPROVED

we'll be available for any comments or questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Great, thank you. Thank you for your presentation and we'll probably get back to you with some questions.

So, I'll turn it over to Dan.

MR. NIERMAN: Thank you.

MR. OSOBA: Good evening, Chair and Commissioners.

The 1.14-acre subject property is located at 1920 North Chestnut Avenue, approximately 150 feet south of the intersection of LaSalle Street and Chestnut Avenue. The existing zoning is R-2 One Family Dwelling District, and the Comprehensive Plan designates the property as appropriate for "Single-Family Detached Estate 2" types of development.

The Petitioner, Clim Development, LLC, proposes to subdivide the property into four total lots; three lots for single-family residential homes, and one lot dedicated for on-site stormwater detention. Based on this request, the Petitioner has applied for approval of a preliminary plat of subdivision along with three variations to reduce the required front setback for one of the lots facing Chestnut, and reduce the minimum lot width and lot size for the detention lot.

This aerial shows the subject property highlighted in red. It is within a single-family residential neighborhood that contains predominantly standard-sized lots for the underlying zone district; however, there are several larger lots in the surrounding vicinity. Palatine Road is the nearest arterial roadway, while Rand Road is farther to the northeast.

The surrounding R-2 zoning makes up much of the surrounding single-family residential development context. North of LaSalle Street, there are pockets of R-3 and R-5, however, the majority of the surrounding zoning is R-2 One Family Dwelling District.

This is the proposed preliminary plat of subdivision shown with two residential lots which are Lots 3 and 4 facing Walnut on the west side, and one residential lot facing Chestnut which is labeled as Lot 1. The on-site detention lot is labeled Lot 2 at the southeastern corner of the site. The three proposed variances are highlighted in red and green on the slide.

So, first, for lot width and lot size, Lot 2, the detention lot, is proposed at 60 feet wide and 8,800 square feet where 75 feet and 10,000 square feet are required. The Staff Development Committee, or SDC, reviewed these variation requests and agrees with the Petitioner's assertion that the substandard lot size and width will not alter the character of the locality because it functions only as a detention lot and a home will not be placed on the lot. The Petitioner is providing additional landscaping around the detention basin to be more compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

For the front setback variance, the front setback for Lot 1 which faces Chestnut requires a variation to reduce the front setback from 40 feet to 25 feet. The front setback is established by an average if more than 40 percent of the lot frontage between two intersecting streets are developed with a front setback greater than 15 feet. Code requires, Code does also state that in no case shall a front yard setback requirement exceed 40 feet. For this project, the west side of Chestnut between LaSalle and Palatine Road contains more than 40 percent of lots with a 15-foot setback. Therefore, an average setback establishes the Lot 1 setback requirement. The average front setback for the lots that face Chestnut Avenue is 80 feet; however, that maximum of 40 feet is the code-required front setback in this case.

The Petitioner is requesting a variance to reduce that setback from 40

APPROVED

feet to 25 feet to be consistent with the front setbacks in the surrounding neighborhood. 25 feet is the general setback for the surrounding vicinity; 25 feet is also the code minimum for the R-2 District. The SDC reviewed this request and agrees with the Petitioner that this variance will not alter the existing character of the neighborhood due to the similar setbacks in the surrounding vicinity.

This conceptual plan was provided by the Petitioner and shows where new homes could be constructed on the newly subdivided lots. These homes would all require Design Commission approval and would need building permit review to ensure compliance with lot coverage, setbacks and building height. The conceptual plan is overlaid on an aerial image to illustrate the size of the lots in comparison with the surrounding neighborhood. The existing lots on Walnut to the west and the lots on the east on Chestnut are generally similar in size and setbacks with similar building footprints. While there are two larger unplatted lots to the north and south of the subject site, the SDC finds that the Petitioner's proposed lot layout and variance requests are acceptable.

As is required with any subdivision, the Petitioner is required to complete right-of-way improvements adjacent to their property. On Chestnut, the Petitioner is required to resurface Chestnut to the full width, provide curb and gutter, parkway landscaping, and a new sidewalk. On Walnut, the street will be widened to the full width, parkway landscaping will be provided along with a sidewalk.

The Petitioner also provided a landscape plan showing new trees within the parkway and on-site trees. Additionally, the proposed landscaping around the detention basin is shown on the bottom of the slide.

The Staff Development Committee reviewed the proposed preliminary plat of subdivision with variations from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-2.3(a) to permit a front yard setback of 25 feet where 40 feet is required; from Section 5.1-2.2 to permit a lot width of 60 feet and a lot area of 8,800 square feet where 75 feet in width and 10,000 square feet in area is required; and from Chapter 29, Section 307(b)(2) to permit a subdivision with a residential lot width of 60 feet and 8,800 square feet where 75 feet in width and 10,000 square feet are required and recommends approval subject to the conditions listed on the slide and in the Staff report.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks, Dan. Nice job.

MR. OSOBA: Welcome.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, is there a motion to include the Staff report?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

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

We'll start with just initial questions before we get into any public, this is a public hearing so you'll have a chance to speak on this, but before we do that, let's start with our questions from Plan Commissioners.

Commissioner Dawson?

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'd like to wait for public commentary.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, I have no questions at this point.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Terry?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll wait for public comment also.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Also.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, down on this end, Mr. Petermann?

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: I'll wait.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, Commissioner Schurtz?

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Same.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Joe?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Dan, one question. Could you explain why on the, pertaining to the detention pond, there's a fee-in-lieu-of required?

MR. OSOBA: Yes. So, there is a specific requirement from the Engineering Department for required on-site stormwater detention. The basin covers some of the stormwater requirement, it's actually a majority of it. There is a little bit of it that is not accounted for, and the Petitioner and the Village Staff have agreed that the fee in lieu for the remainder is acceptable.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: And I assume that it would not affect any of these other properties?

MR. OSOBA: No, the preliminary engineering that has been provided by the Petitioner has been reviewed by Staff and the detention basin is acceptable per our standards.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you, Dan.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks, Joe.

Bruce?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll wait.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you.

So, we'll turn it over to the public at this point and open up public comments. So, is there anybody on this side of the room that would like to speak as to this matter? No, okay.

Anybody on this side in the front row who would like to speak on this matter? First row, nobody. Second row? Yes, sir, in the brown, if you could come up first? Then we'll make our way over to the next gentleman. If you can please state your name and spell your last name for the record, and if you'd like you can share with us where you reside.

PUBLIC COMMENTARY FOR PC #24-018

MR. SINCLAIR: Okay, my name is Dan Sinclair, S-i-n-c-l-a-i-r. I live at 1916 North Chestnut. My property borders the south property line of this property. I don't suppose you can bring up that drawing where it shows that overlay? Right there.

So, my biggest concern about this is, you know, our setbacks when you do the average per the Village website, I understand there's a 40-foot maximum but actually I did the same thing and it came out to 80 feet is what the average is for the whole block. This, if you look at this, if you take it from the front of that house to our house, it's 75 feet forward from our houses. If you look at this picture right here, you can see my house right here, I'm in the middle of two lots that you're showing here.

APPROVED

So, basically, when the person in this house comes out of his house, 40 feet of his backyard is in my front yard. So, you know, he's going to be, and so with my neighbor on the north side. So, you basically have a house that's floating out in the front of Chestnut all by itself and all the other houses are set back quite a bit behind it.

Then, my other concern is, then you go and you spend a million dollars and some on this house, and then he gets tired of going to his backyard and drinking his coffee and looking at my driveway with my car on it, the next guy, and he then petitions for a privacy fence. Now, I've got a house and a privacy fence on my whole entire north border of my property, so it blocks off my entire street view of this property.

So, I mean, I guess that's my main concern. I've looked at his landscaping drawings and all that stuff. I mean, that looks really good, I can appreciate that. I'm in a better situation than my neighbor that's on the north side because I have a retention pond on my property or next to my property, but it's still, I mean, this is just right on top of Chestnut Avenue and this block is not like that.

There's been a lot of building in Arlington Heights, I've lived here for 35 years, and if you go over in the Ivy Hill neighborhood, they've built a lot of big houses. You go in the Patton neighborhood and they all have a common setback. Even in your pictures when you blow that up, all these streets, all of the houses have kind of a common setback. This would be a total one-off, floating out in the middle of nowhere.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Mr. Sinclair.

Dan, could I ask, do you have, just so the Plan Commissioners can see, the larger, zoomed-out picture of this site so we can take a look at the setbacks?

Is there another member of the public that would like to speak in this row? Sir, I think you had your hand up? If you could come -- yes, go ahead.

MR. OBERMAN: Richard Oberman, O-b-e-r-m-a-n. Address is 1917 North Walnut.

I'd also, it does look kind of odd having one home up so far. I think somebody was saying that the average distance back was, I don't know what they said, 60 or 70 feet? I take it back, I know I got it mixed up, but there is nothing that ends up close. I think it's closer to 60 or 70 rather than the 40 feet that you stated.

There was going to be a sidewalk put in I guess on Walnut? Where would the sidewalk go? It would just be in front of those two homes or would it go further? Would it go all the way down to LaSalle?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: What we'll do is you go ahead and make your comments to the Board and we'll kind of take note and let the Petitioner --

MR. OBERMAN: Okay. Also, what was the name of this subdivision? What did you guys call it?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Chestnut.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Chestnut Woods.

MR. OBERMAN: Chestnut Woods, right. I noticed on the plat on our survey it was called Walnut Woods. Wouldn't it be something if all the trees were cut down to do that when it's specifically called the Woods. I hope if you do anything that some of the trees that are nice-looking trees that are not where the homes are going to go, those trees are left there. You know, you put on the television, they're talking about let's go green and all of that, let's not cut

APPROVED

down all of those trees. Let's make it look good.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, sir.

Anybody else in the second row who would like to speak? I'm going to go to the next row. This gentleman with the hat -- sure, come on up.

MR. SARGENT: Hello.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Hi.

MR. SARGENT: Mike Sargent, S-a-r-g-e-n-t. I live at 1912 North Chestnut. Much like, you know, Dan had stated, I'm trying to search for a precedent that had been set in Arlington Heights where there's a house that's so far in advance of other houses within the row. You know, I get, you know, the code is 40 feet versus the requested 25, but at the 80 feet, we're almost 70 percent in the difference there.

Then, much like the previous statement, on the Chestnut side, there isn't a sidewalk that goes past any house north of me, it ends at my house. So, I'm curious how that ends up, you know, looking within the context of it because I see it was stated that the essential character of the locality won't be compromised, but I kind of disagree with that as far as the renders that I've seen.

Then, you know, I'm a stickler for the rules, so if there is a code in place that states we should follow that and then there's a big sized variance that's coming in that's kind of setting a precedent for future things, so if that's the case, then I would just suggest maybe updating the code. So, that's all I got.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Anybody in the same row? No? Then, we have I think one last row. Is there anybody back there in the final row who would like to speak?

Yes, ma'am.

MS. MULEK: Hi, my name is Catrina Mulek. I'm actually 2000 North Chestnut which is north of the property, so I do have concerns, but I first want to start off saying that I agree a 100 percent with Mr. Sinclair. We are the two neighboring houses, and putting the new house that close to Chestnut really makes it out of place because looking at all these houses, I feel this block is very unique where we have larger lots and all of them are in a row. So, it's going to look very out of place where you have everyone here, here, here, and all of a sudden you have a house here, and then my house again.

Not only that, but what will I be looking at? Somebody's backyard? Somebody's deck? I mean, if you look at every single other block, they're all in a row. Maybe slightly a little bit here but, you know, but not drastically like that. So, I have concerns.

I'm also saying what happens with the remainder of the sidewalk? Will it stop drastically at my property? Does it continue? What happens with that? So, yes, lots of questions and definitely agree and it doesn't look good, doesn't fit in with the character of the neighborhood of this particular block and what it looks like. It's going to be out of place.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

MS. WOLEK: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, I believe that's it. Anybody else that didn't speak that would like to speak on this? Otherwise, we will close the public hearing.

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you for your comments. We're going to go to the Plan Commissioners, but I guess I'm just going to ask the Staff here to just

APPROVED

Speak to a couple of things here.

There was a comment about the trees. There's going to be, there's a tree ordinance in place. Can you just speak a little bit to that, Dan?

MR. OSOBA: I can, yes. So, the Petitioner did provide a landscaping plan and a tree preservation plan. There are quite a few trees on the site. They did an evaluation of those trees to find out what the condition is. The tree preservation plan has shown that they're going to be keeping one of the trees, citing that there is going to be quite a bit of grading that's being done on the site additionally with the detention pond. A lot of those trees next to it would have to come out.

The requirement for code is basically that they're putting those trees back on site, so that landscaping plan that was provided shows the new trees being put in above code requirements. So, in the net, positive towards the trees; they have equal the amount of trees that they're removing.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, thank you. There was a question brought up as to the sidewalk. Can you speak a little bit to that as far as what's being required and what's being proposed?

MR. OSOBA: Yes. So, for any new subdivision, the petitioners will be required to complete improvements adjacent to their development; in this case, those two frontages on Chestnut and Walnut. The Petitioner will be required to put in a sidewalk in this case from the north end of their property to the south end of their property, and it would just stop on the north end and stop on the south end as that sidewalk doesn't exist on either of those two sides for Walnut or Chestnut.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, that's an issue that has come up before where we're a little concerned about, you know, when we talk about not changing the character of the neighborhood, when we have a sidewalk that kind of goes to nowhere. I understand the Village wants to eventually have sidewalks potentially there, but to kind of do it, you know, I wouldn't say randomly, but I mean, it's a new project that's coming along. Was there any consideration given to maybe some kind of deposit so that if a sidewalk was created in the future that, you know, in a time where it kind of made sense instead of being, you know, in my opinion, when we do this, it's kind of out of place, out of character and not really practical. I mean, was there any consideration given to saying, hey, let's take a deposit and, you know, a sidewalk maybe at a future date where it makes sense?

MR. OSOBA: That has been a consideration on other projects and it's generally done on a case-by-case basis based on the review of the project, based on Public Works' review. I don't believe that was done in this case, but it's certainly something we could take a look at.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, and would you mind putting back up on the screen, Dan, the zoomed-out map that you had as we look at the setback issue? So, I think the setback issues, it seems to me you did a calculation that was, you know, like if we look across the street, Walnut Avenue and Chestnut Avenue, it doesn't really seem like what's being proposed is out of place with that. That's kind of where the average comes. It looks to be in character to me when you look across the street. Where it maybe gets skewed is you have a lot to the north and you have a lot to the south where it's off, but otherwise, it seems to be in line.

Is that kind of your perception, too, where you draw these calculations and that's what it looks like?

APPROVED

MR. OSOBA: So, the calculations, and I'll go to a different slide here, the calculations by code are basically on one side of the block between two intersecting streets. So, there's five homes with frontage on Chestnut, on the west side of Chestnut, and that's where that average actually comes in. But looking at the character of the neighborhood, the remaining surrounding lots, the setback in average or in general is about 20 to 25 feet for the existing development in the surrounding vicinity, but this block in particular does have an average of 80.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, just to be clear for everybody, we're not, there's no zoning change in terms of the lots. The lots are all, you know, these lots are essentially conforming with the zoning with these setbacks. So, the difference really is this, it's like a, they could put a 40, you know, if these folks are at 80 feet, the Petitioner by right could come in and do 40 feet. So, all we're really talking about is the incremental 15-foot request of relief, right?

MR. OSOBA: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, that wouldn't, you know, because I'm trying to think, if the Petitioner just went in by right and built something, there'll still be this I guess concern perhaps. I mean, you wouldn't be able to do anything about it because it's done by right, but we're talking about 15 feet essentially, I mean, is that --

MR. OSOBA: Essentially, yes. The average is 80, code requirement is 40, the Petitioner is requesting 25.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: 25 extra, okay. All right, I appreciate the clarification. I'm going to be quiet now. I'm going to go back on this end to Commissioner Petermann to see if he has any questions for Staff or the Petitioner.

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: I do not.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No? Commissioner Schurtz?

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Those are the two largest properties, correct, the two ones we were talking about, the people that were here?

MR. OBERMAN: We're on either side.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Okay.

MR. OBERMAN: The house next to me to the south is as deep. It covers the whole lot, to the back lot. So, there's four of them.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Okay. No, I don't have any other questions right now.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Commissioner Lorenzini, of the Staff or the Petitioner, any questions?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No. Nothing from me.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I have a question for Staff. Is there an Estate zoning overlay on this by chance?

MR. OSOBA: There is not. The underlying zone district of R-2 is the standards. The Comprehensive Plan does designate this as a "Single Family Residential Estate 2" which generally in the Comprehensive Plan just means that the lots are a little bit bigger just in context, but not necessarily in the underlying zone district.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, it is an Estate 2.

MR. OSOBA: In the Comprehensive Plan it's designated as such.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: For this area?

MR. OSOBA: For the entirety of the neighborhood, correct.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, because it's an overlay thing.

APPROVED

MR. OSOBA: Well, it's not an overlay district; it's just designated as such in the Comprehensive Plan. So, the standards for the lots in the area are established by the R-2 District.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: But there are additional restrictions with the Estate zoning?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: It's not zoned Estate.

COMMISSIONER DROST: There are not.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Overlay, the overlay.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: There's not an overlay. It's just the Comprehensive Plan which of course gets, you know, it's not a binding consideration.

MS. HITZEMANN: It's more like a future land use guide.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, but you know what I'm talking about, the Estate Overlay in certain areas, that's my point.

MR. OSOBA: Yes. There is a zone district for the R-E which is an Estate Zone District. This is not in that district, so it is not in an overlay one.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, that's what I want to know. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Anything else, sir?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, I'm good; I'm good.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Mr. George, or Commissioner Drost I should say?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, what's the history in this area? Was it unincorporated for a while and now, you know? We've had these issues in the past, and sort of bringing a little bit of a historical perspective is that you can't change what had already existed and now you're trying to do some remediation of what zoning should have been like. That's kind of the ouch, you know, in this process, you know. It's sort of unexpected. So, maybe you can shed a little light on it and add it to the record?

MR. OSOBA: Sure. Yes, this area is predominantly, was unincorporated and annexed as a whole and has been piecemeal developed over the years. So, development of new homes from larger lots into smaller lots being subdivided into the current zone standards or the standards of the time has happened over the past 40-50 years. But these are the remnant lots that have not been subdivided and are the larger lots that were annexed into the Village as is, and are now being subdivided into lots that are consistent with, generally consistent with the surrounding lot size.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and this is a desirable location and the idea is to try to bring some balance to what was done in the past and how you can deal with the current and future issues to bring a little bit more harmony into the neighborhood. Okay, thanks.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, sir.

Commissioner Ennes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I do have a question in regard to the neighbor-to-the-north's concern about how his, I believe it's his backdoor, his backyard is going to have the neighbor's backyard. Was anything considered with that as far as some type of a landscape buffer?

MR. OSOBA: There is nothing in code that would require a landscape buffer or anything that would be any type of screening between someone's kind of back property and the front of the property, but the Petitioner has provided what complies with code.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DROST: And sort of to your question, too, about any restrictions on privacy fences or, you know, some future blocking off of views, any comment on that particular point?

MR. OSOBA: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I thought it was consistent with what you were asking.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Sure. So, privacy fences are permitted in the side and rear yards of any residential property up to six feet. So, in theory, the property in Lot 2 would be able to erect a six-foot tall privacy fence on either side of --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: That's what I'd like to address to the Petitioner. Is that something that you would consider?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Please come up to the podium.

MR. NIEMAN: A landscape buffer? Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Is something that you would consider?

MR. NIEMAN: We would discuss that, yes. Yes, we would talk about that.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is that it, Commissioner Ennes?

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

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Commissioner Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I have no questions at this point, no.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Can you clarify the sidewalk comment that was made?

MR. OSOBA: What about the sidewalk comment?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I wasn't sure I followed. Is there going to be a partial sidewalk?

MR. OSOBA: Essentially, the sidewalk is going to be required from the north end of their property to the south end of their property on both Chestnut and Walnut. That's required based on the improvements required in Chapter 29. So, based on the --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, show me the, so there's no sidewalk anywhere else?

MR. OSOBA: No.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, so we've been down this road before, so I'm not in favor of a random sidewalk in the middle of nowhere.

Can I understand, so it seems to me the main concern is the setback, not the other requirements regarding the reduction in size for the lot. Why can't we put 40-foot setbacks here?

MR. OSOBA: I would defer to the Petitioner.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Petitioner?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Could someone from the Petitioner come up and answer that question?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Why can't -- can you come up to the speaker please?

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We're asking why the 40-foot --

MR. NIERMAN: Oh, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I don't think it's been addressed. The main concern seems to be, I mean, there's other concerns but the main concern that I'm hearing is you're not doing the 40-foot setback. Why are you not doing the 40-foot setback?

MR. NIERMAN: It's a matter of the size of the house and the placement of the house I think and the backyard, because when you move the, if you were to establish a 40-foot setback, then the backyard is going to be truncated by that same amount of feet, in this case 15.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Sure.

MR. NIERMAN: So, you would have a 34-foot --

(Comments from the audience.)

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, there's no public commentary right now.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No public comments right now, please.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But to what they're saying, why is that the neighborhood's problem if the setback requirement is 40 feet? So, there's going to be a smaller backyard. You purchased this property to develop knowing the restrictions of the property. Why should I allow such, I mean, I get that a 40-foot setback, there's nothing I can do about it, but if we've got a neighborhood filled with 80-foot setbacks and these are going to be 15, that does to me change the essential character of the neighborhood. I don't see why you're not doing the 40-foot setback.

MR. NIERMAN: Well, again, the balance of the neighborhood, the front yard setbacks are between 20 and 28 feet.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: That's not what it showed on the picture.

MR. NIERMAN: No, along the east side of Chestnut Street and the west side of Walnut Street.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Dan, could you bring up that picture?

MR. NIERMAN: The front yard setbacks are between 21 and 28 feet.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, where?

MR. NIERMAN: With the majority being about 25 feet. That's why we were looking at a 25-foot setback.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, Dan, can you show me? I mean, where are we talking? They're saying 80-foot, everything is 80, what are our setbacks around here?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, so I'll explain kind of the two pieces to it. So, the setback requirement, the average of 80 feet is between LaSalle Street which is one property to the north, and then --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: You have your magic thing; just show me where you're talking about.

MR. OSOBA: Unfortunately, I can't show you on this.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, where is LaSalle Street? Magic clicker, there you are, yay.

MR. OSOBA: So, LaSalle Street is right here. So, the property is in between this street and Palatine Road on the west side of Chestnut.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Oh, just those have the --

MR. OSOBA: These five are the ones that established the required

APPROVED

average. The Petitioner is, I'm assuming the Petitioner is talking about the properties in the surrounding area on Walnut and Chestnut that have a 21 to 28-foot setback.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Those would be directly across the street from this property?

MR. OSOBA: Correct, yes, from the one that's being requested.

MR. NIERMAN: Yes. Those lots were platted and subdivided with the established front yards being nominally 25 feet.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay.

MR. NIERMAN: As Mr. Osoba pointed out, these are legacy lots. They've never been subdivided. So, it meets the bounds description and they're just --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, I understand. I understand now. Okay, thank you. No more questions.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, my --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: You can ask him.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, I'm just curious. The one just across the street there are the ones that are 25-foot setbacks?

MR. OSOBA: Correct, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Those would conform with those directly across the street.

MR. OSOBA: This would be consistent with the ones directly across the street, but the ones that are on the same side of the street, on the west side of Chestnut, that's where the average setback is established at 80 feet, and a maximum of 40 feet is required by code.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Got it.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I have a follow-up question on that, Dan. The code states that you should be sharing the average of the setback on your side of the street. So, in no place in the code does it say it has to match across the street. It says on the street that you live.

MR. OSOBA: Correct.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, technically, in my estimation, I know where you're coming from. They have a bigger lot; they push the houses into the middle so they didn't have to deal with any street. So, there's an argument to be made that the bigger the setback, the better it would be.

I have a quick question. Has the developer thought of selling two bigger lots and putting on even bigger homes instead of three, so it is a lot and lot? I'm just asking, I mean, because --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: You can talk amongst yourselves for a minute here before you come up.

(Slight pause.)

MR. NIERMAN: Frankly, I don't think so. I think it's a matter of economics. It's not cost-effective to build the two homes on, as you said, two huge homes on the lot.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is there any -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, no, go ahead, go ahead.

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Commissioner Dawson brought up the question of the setbacks. So, if you were to push these back and take away some of the backyard, we'd almost have no reason to be here because you'd be able to do that without our approval. Is there any consideration given to, or ability to appease some of the concerns of the neighbors by pushing those houses even partially back? Even if it, I mean, it's 15 feet we're talking about by code. So, are you able to push those back? If you push them back 10 feet, now we're talking about an increment of five feet which doesn't seem to be a big deal to me.

MR. NIERMAN: Well, I would need to confirm with my client, but --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I'm just asking the question. If you want to go ahead, take the time to do that.

Dan, cue the Jeopardy music.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: While they're talking, Dan, is that correct, what Commissioner Green said that the code is specific, because I saw some talking going on over here as well.

MR. OSOBA: Yes. So, the code specifically states that the average between the two blocks is what establishes the average setback. So, the setback between LaSalle and Palatine on the west side of Chestnut, those five homes on the slide that have the red line on it which establishes what those front yard setbacks are.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: On the same block? You can't --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: On the same side of the street is the --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: The code does not consider the other side of the street, okay.

MR. OSOBA: The code does not consider that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And what type of precedent do we have for disregarding that?

MR. OSOBA: It's not necessarily that we're disregarding that. The Petitioner is using that as justification for their request.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, no, I understand, but do we have other examples of similar situations?

MR. OSOBA: Of similar situations, yes, where we have existing larger lots that either require a 40-foot maximum or somewhere in between and the general surrounding context has --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Been taken into account.

MR. OSOBA: -- been taken into account based on a variance request, yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay.

Sir?

MR. NIERMAN: To answer, we'd look at a landscape buffer but we're going to stand pat on the request for the 25-foot setback. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, any other questions of the Petitioner or the Staff from our Commissioners? Anybody over here?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Well, I want to discuss the sidewalk issue before a motion is proposed.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Sure. Go ahead, Sue.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I just would love for a motion to include a waiver on the requirement of the sidewalk so we don't have a floating sidewalk.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I think that would be included in the ultimate, I don't know if it's a separate motion I don't think. I think that --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, if we're going to make a motion, isn't that one of the requirements?

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, and to just kind of touch on that just for a moment, if we're adding a variance, so since the public hearing notice did not notice for an additional variation, it will require another public hearing. We do; we would --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We've done this before though.

MR. LYSICATOS: Adding variations or more variations?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We've done this before where the petition required a floating sidewalk in the middle of nowhere and we've said take out the floating sidewalk and that was in the motion.

MR. LYSICATOS: Well, we could, well, I think some of the things we've done in the past is look at an agreement for when that sidewalk would be built or contributions to that, so there could be a condition where it's not removing the requirement for it, but it's conditioning how the sidewalk would be built. I think we've had several of those over the last, since the time I've been here.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right, right.

MR. LYSICATOS: You know, we used to do estoppel agreements but we've moved to more, to just agreements with the landowners.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right, if the sidewalk, I think that is what we did last time. If the sidewalk is required in the future --

MR. LYSICATOS: There would be an estoppel agreement.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, when it comes to the sidewalk, if more building happens and there's a sidewalk, then the owner of that property would have to contribute to the building of the sidewalk.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, I think what we do is we have a condition that the property owner enter into an agreement on the conditions of how that sidewalk would be constructed.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right.

MR. LYSICATOS: It would be something along the lines of that, where it would remove the requirement and, therefore, not create a new variation.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, do you have an objection to our motion adding that tonight? Otherwise, I can simply put it in my commentary for Staff consideration as it moves forward to the Village.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I think that's up to you, Sue.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, I meant I would rather it be in the motion, but --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: -- if your belief is that that causes legal issues relative to the motion, then I'll just put it in my commentary.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I think if the motion -- oh, go ahead, Michael.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, I think part of that is we also discuss it with

APPROVED

Engineering because they most of the time will provide the mechanism for that, how it's done. They lay out the requirements for any pre-engineering, cost estimates, things of that nature. So, I think maybe it's more appropriate to have it as a note. That's something that we'd discuss with them before it comes to the Village Board.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Happy to put it in the comment, sure.

MR. LYSICATOS: That way we have a chance to discuss with the rest of the Village Staff on how that mechanism needs to work.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: If that's the appropriate procedure in your opinion, then that's what I'll do.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes. Thank you for the consideration and bringing it up.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: A reserve? Some type of a reserve?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'll just put it in my comment, yes, an estoppel or some other, I will say something in my comment that you guys will know what I mean because it's all on the record and we'll sort it out later.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, so any questions then?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, the only other question on the privacy fence, even though it is legal under our current ordinance, is there something that can provide notice triggering or some other alternative to a privacy fence where there could be mutual screening to create that woodsy look?

MR. OSOBA: From a zoning code perspective, no, but if the Plan Commission wishes to make some modified version of a condition of approval to that effect, they may, but as from a zoning code perspective, they would be able to do that fence by right.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Any comment here? Anybody want to move with that --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, I think that if you want to make a motion --

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make a comment on the privacy fence, that there, you know, be considered, or should the proposal be approved, that we can let that be handled by the Village Counsel.

MR. LYSICATOS: Just to provide a planning clarification, the detention pond will be Village property. That will become a Village facility, so the Petitioner, well, we, we're the property owner, we would not put up a privacy fence there.

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, and I --

MR. LYSICATOS: We are the northerly side of the property that the consideration for the privacy fence --

COMMISSIONER DROST: The detention really adds to a lot of view or visibility. I mean, it's a nice green space.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, and that's our property, we likely would not put up a, I mean I don't know what we're going to do there from a safety construction standpoint, but that would not be on the property owner.

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, it's just allaying some of the concerns because I'd have that, too, if I was, you know, if that was my new neighbor.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you, George.

Are there any motions? Does anybody want to make a motion on this?

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: I have one last question.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, Michael.

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: The size of these homes. We talk about the consistency and the setback but, Dan, I may have missed this, but the actual size of these homes, is that consistent? I get the homes to the north and south are rather large, but if we're going to make comparisons to the homes on the east and west, how do these homes compare in that size?

MR. OSOBA: Sure. So, the homes that are provided by the Petitioner are these ones on the slide here. These are conceptual, so tonight we're only looking at the plat of subdivision and the variances associated with it. So, we're not looking at the approval of these specific homes. The Petitioner has provided this along with floor area ratio calculations, building lot coverage and impervious coverage, along with setbacks for side and rear yards. Generally, based on the conceptual layout, they're consistent with the size of the surrounding area. Basically, the zoning code regulates for all of these lots in the same way, so as long as they're complying with code in all of those different development standards, they're going to be relatively consistent with the surrounding context of the homes.

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: Okay, so we don't have like an estimate, because just as I look at this drawing, the home to, that would be the west, is probably 3,000 square feet, the one right there next to the retaining, like that, that looks like it could be huge.

MR. OSOBA: That one would allow a larger lot, or a larger house because it is a larger lot. I would let the Petitioner speak, too, if they have an idea on what the size of their potential homes would be, but --

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: Yes.

MR. OSOBA: -- again, it's going to be reviewed as part of the Design Commission and further building permit application.

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: I get that. I just think even more reason why we should honor the setback a little bit. I get the concerns from the public there of there's going to be a very large home right in front. I tend to think if I was next door, I wouldn't be a huge fan of that either unless we were to adjust the setback in some way.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Michael.

Anyone else have a comment or a motion?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, I'll make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #24-018, Preliminary Plat of Subdivision to create three residential lots and one dedicated on-site stormwater detention lot, and the following Variations:

- 1. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-2.3(a) to permit a front yard setback of 25 feet where 40 feet is required;**
- 2. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-2.2 to permit a lot width of 60 feet and a lot area of 8,800 square feet where 75 feet in width and 10,000 square feet in area is required; and**
- 3. Variation from Chapter 29, Section 307(b)(2) to permit a subdivision with a residential lot 60 feet in width and 8,800 square feet in area where 75 feet in width and 10,000 square feet in area is required.**

APPROVED

This recommendation is subject to resolution of the following:

- 1. Final Plat of Subdivision approval shall be required.**
- 2. The Petitioner must provide all required fees in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 29 of the Village Code.**
- 3. The Petitioner shall locate aboveground utilities, transformers, or other similar utility company mechanical equipment in such a way that they are screened from public rights-of-way to be reviewed with the submission of building permits.**
- 4. A Design Commission application shall be required prior to the teardown of the existing home and prior to the issuance of any building permits for construction of new homes.**
- 5. Prior to issuance a site development permit for the required improvements, the Petitioner shall provide a fee-in-lieu for the deficient volume required by the Village for the on-site detention basin.**
- 6. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations and policies.**

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, a motion is on the table for a vote.

We'll do a voice vote.

MS. HITZEMANN: Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, with comment.

MS. HITZEMANN: Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, with comment.

MS. HITZEMANN: Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, with comment.

MS. HITZEMANN: Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes, with comment.

MS. HITZEMANN: Petermann.

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: No.

MS. HITZEMANN: Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: No.

MS. HITZEMANN: Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No.

MS. HITZEMANN: Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Anyone do the math on that?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We have a few comments that we want to add to the -- well, can you give me the count on that? I didn't, is it five?

MR. OSOBA: Five to four.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: In favor?

APPROVED

MR. OSOBA: Five to four in favor, yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, we have, so the motion passes. We have some comments for the record.

Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: My comment is specific to the sidewalk. As we discussed previously, I would like there to be some sort of provision that holds on the requirement to implement the sidewalk at this time and instead an estoppel or some other agreement to be revisited at a future date with the new homeowner having responsibility for adding in a sidewalk.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Another comment, George?

COMMISSIONER DROST: My comment relates to the fencing or potential fencing, that there be some triggering event, not necessarily a code approval but that the neighbor, whoever is the owner of the neighboring site have notice that there would be a privacy fence, and better yet, that there be a natural type screening so that the aesthetics of the lot and the development of the subdivision are consistent or more consistent to what exists today.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks, George.

Okay, so --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Wait, more comment. One more.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I agree with Commissioner Dawson. We should do something about not putting the sidewalks in now and fall back on an estoppel agreement somewhere in the future.

I do sympathize with the owners just north and south of this project. It is going to certainly change your view that you have now. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: My comment is that I sympathize with the homeowners to the north and south, and I voted no. It should be at least 40 feet.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, those are the comments. This is just a recommendation. Ultimately, this decision is being made by the Board, so they'll have more facts and they may have more questions, and they may ask for more from the Petitioners in the interim.

So, we have the recommendation to move forward. Thank you for your time, Petitioners and members of the public. You're free to go on. We do have a second public hearing. You're all free to stay here as well.

(Whereupon, at 8:22 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)

APPROVED

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: QARGO COFFEE - 4 WEST RAND ROAD - PC #24-023
PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, 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 24th day of September, 2025 at the hour of 8:22 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director, Community Development
DANIEL OSOBA, Planner I
RACHEL HITZEMANN, Development Planner

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, we'll move on to the next petition on the agenda, and that is Qargo Coffee at Rand Road.

Is there anybody from Qargo Coffee in the house? Oh, we do have the Petitioner with us.

Take your time. We've got a member that had to take a break real quick. Give me just a minute; thank you.

(Long pause.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, I think we can start our second petition. If the Petitioner from Qargo could come up to the podium, that'd be great.

Staff, have all public notices been given on Qargo Coffee?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, they have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Excellent.

Sir, if you could raise your hand?

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you. If you could please state your name and spell your last name for the record?

MR. SASSILA: Sure. I'm Amer Sassila, first name A-m-e-r, last name Sassila, S-a-s-s-i-l-a.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you. I was going to ask you; have you read the Staff report on this matter? And you'll see some conditions that the Staff has put on there recommended, do you agree with those recommendations?

MR. SASSILA: Yes, I agree.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay. All right. well, you know, I'll ask you to just go ahead and proceed with your presentation. Everything you can see up there we've got on our screens. Take it away.

MR. SASSILA: Sure, awesome. The clicker, I can just right-left, right?

I'm with the HOH Group here, the project architect on behalf of Qargo Coffee. The agenda, just a quick run-through of what Qargo is a little bit about, project information, you know, the need for a coffee shop. Much of this is already in the report but just kind of reiterating and emphasizing it.

I'm showing of course the site demolition plan and the proposed plan, parking plan, et cetera, all the turns, and the landscape plan, the proposed floor plan for reference of the inside, and then just some visualizations of what to expect.

So, description of work. I mean, the essence of all this is renovating the interior, reusing this existing building which was previously used as an Olson Rug store, rug shop, to turn that into a coffee shop, Qargo Coffee specifically. We're looking to be one of the franchisees. It's about 4,100 square feet, only one story, and really the whole push here is serving really fine quality coffee along with pastries and other refreshments as well.

You can see in the written description about the specific operating hours, from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., kind of a typical coffee shop, eight to 10 employees. Then, garbage pickup just would be before hours.

So, the need for a coffee shop. One, who doesn't like coffee, right? A big part of that is it's a space to bring the community together. Of course, with the Starbucks to the south but then having another coffee shop, especially when that gets concentrated, having another option as well along Rand Road, and as everybody knows, a place where one can work.

APPROVED

Also, what's unique about this, we'll get into the floor plan of Qargo Coffee. This one is not just a big open dining area but there is also a unique feature with it as well with having a rentable space for meeting rooms, conference rooms, community gathering, et cetera. So, this coffee shop brings that to the table here for the community.

Then the need for the drive-through, of course it alleviates some congestion. You have, instead of having all these cars parked in front and especially in the morning where everybody has got to get up, walk in, et cetera, everyone has got the convenience of, you know, staying in their vehicles, getting their coffee, and then keep moving on with their day. Not only that, since the site is limited in size, having the one way around alleviates, the drive-through actually allows for circulation just having that one way around the building. So, even more so it's a push for that.

Of course, you know, such a case will not under any circumstances be detrimental to the health, safety, morals or general welfare of persons residing or working within the vicinity, and we'll comply with any regulations as mentioned.

Then, just the site demolition plan. Really, it's, although you see a lot of notes on the plans, in general it's really minor. A lot of that is just to enable that one-way circulation around from the south up north, back in the easement, and off to Rand Road.

Then, the proposed parking. Of course, this is a big shared plaza space. We just use the multiplier from, in coordination with the Planning Commission, just to make that we've got adequate parking within that shared space, which we do. Not to mention just seeing what the worst-case scenario would be for the queuing which will be okay, and as well as just the speed of, because it's going to be similar to Starbucks, Dunkin Donuts, we don't envision long wait times for orders as well.

The proposed drive-through signage, it's showing where, just like a typical site drive-through for a lot of the other franchises, just showing just how the circulation works, the entry sign, where to order, and then of course just the exit with, you know, the thank you sign.

I'm showing all the turns, just confirming that's really no concern here in the event of an emergency, God forbid. Then, garbage truck turns which a lot of this is not going to be during the time of operation anyways, but just to confirm that no issues here.

So, our proposed landscape. So, coordinated with the Landscape Department here with the Village of Arlington Heights. So, we just added some colorful shades where needed, especially at the islands, and then put some shrubs for screening of the equipment, and along Rand Road as well.

Just to reference for the interior, there's three, here, it's the red light, right, for the --

MR. OSOBA: Yes.

MR. SASSILA: Thank you for the laser. Nonetheless, in the plan itself, you can see three like conference rooms in-between for flex space, a unique feature for Qargo Coffee, for this location specifically. Again, with the dining area in the middle in between, and then of course the serving area, washrooms, et cetera, and all the other utilities or the back of house spaces if you will.

Just some visualizations of what to expect from the Olson. I know that building has been abandoned for a while, but this has given some life back in that specific building, so what this will eventually look like. The interior, very decorative, it gives a lot of life

APPROVED

back and as well as gives some excitement to the building itself.

That's my presentation.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, very nice. We'll ask you -- you can go ahead and take a seat. We're going to have ask you maybe a couple of questions, but we're going to switch over to the Staff presentation.

MR. SASSILA: Sure. Hopefully, I wasn't too long.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: You're fine, thank you. Nice job.

MR. OSOBA: All right, the subject property for this Petitioner is located at 4 West Rand Road within the Arlington Plaza Shopping Center. The Petitioner, Qargo Coffee, is proposing to renovate the interior of the building and add a drive-through lane for a coffee/restaurant. Based on this request, an amendment to the Arlington Plaza Planned Unit Development to add a drive-through lane and a special use permit for a restaurant with a drive-through lane is required. One variation is requested to reduce the required off-street parking within the entirety of the center from 1,154 spaces to 1,139 spaces, and I will detail that one a little later on.

This aerial shows the existing building up front at the Arlington Plaza Shopping Center facing Rand Road. There is a signalized entrance to the shopping center adjacent to the site to the southeast, and another signalized entrance further up Rand Road to the northwest.

The subject site is zoned B-2 General Business District along with the remainder of the Arlington Plaza Shopping Center and the surrounding commercial corridor. The nearest residentially zoned property is on the east side of Arlington Heights Road.

The Petitioner provided a traffic impact study with this application that provided analysis of the proposed site, level of service for site access, and trip generation. Based on the study and review from the Staff Development Committee, the Petitioner is proposing to reconfigure the existing site circulation as was stated from a two-way configuration with 90-degree parking to a one-way configuration with 45-degree angled parking spaces. This does accommodate the new drive-through lane that's highlighted in yellow on the plan while still providing efficient site access for customer vehicles and for emergency service vehicles.

Additionally, the SDC worked with the Petitioner to provide landscaping in the parking lot, on the parking lot islands, screening for the mechanical equipment that exists, and a row of shrubs along Rand Road, all of which are highlighted in green on the slide. All of these proposed modifications are compliant with Village codes.

This is again just a rendering that was provided by the Petitioner. This was reviewed and approved by the Design Commission about nine months ago.

The SDC worked with the Petitioner to provide a parking study to analyze the drive-through queuing and parking demand for the proposed use. The overall parking requirement for the Arlington Plaza Shopping Center is shown on the table on the slide with the proposed Qargo Coffee restaurant requiring 44 spaces which yields a net deficit of 15 spaces for the entirety of the center. The parking analysis did find that the overall property did have adequate parking for all of the uses within the shopping center, and the majority of the parking will be utilized closer to the actual storefronts within the center. If overflow parking is needed for this specific petition that's off the leased area of the subject site, there would be adequate parking in the surrounding parking fields to accommodate the projected trip generation that was identified in the traffic study. The SDC has reviewed the parking analysis and variation

APPROVED

request and found both acceptable.

These are the criteria for approval for a special use, and these are the criteria for approval for a variation. The Staff Development Committee reviewed the proposed planned unit development amendment to add a drive-through to the property and a special use permit for a restaurant with a drive-through with a variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.4-2 to reduce the parking requirement from 1,154 spaces to 1,139 spaces, and recommends approval subject to the conditions listed on the slide and in the Staff report.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, sir. Nice job, Dan.

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

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So moved.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

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

Before we go to the Plan Commissioners, I'd like to open this to the public given the potential concern I see out there. Is there any member of the public that would like to speak on behalf?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No? Seeing no hands, and nobody in this room except the Petitioner, we will now close the public hearing and make our way to the Plan Commissioners.

Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No comment.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Commissioner Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I just question the size of the building. It seems to be a very large size. I saw the interior floor plan there with a lot of seating and so forth. It seems like so many coffee shops are even eliminating interior seating and just drive-through facilities. So, I don't understand, is this similar to other coffee shops that you have?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: If the Petitioner could come up to the podium, please and answer the question?

MR. SASSILA: It won't be an issue if I just stand here, right?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No, you're welcome to.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, you just passed up the photo there. It seems like awfully large compared to other coffee shops. I mean, Starbucks is getting away with a lot of the interior seating.

MR. SASSILA: Yes, and that's a good question. For this Qargo Coffee specifically, I know that it's trying to introduce something a little bit more than just kind of get your coffee and go. It's more like a, kind of setting a tone as well for, you know, another alternative place for one to gather, you know, whether it's with friends, family, where it could be just a different vibe from the interior, just to give that, just to stand out from the typical like Starbucks and the Dunkin Donuts gives coffee.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Are there other Qargo Coffee shops? I'm not

APPROVED

familiar with them at all.

MR. SASSILA: They are relatively new to the area. For now, I know there's a couple that opened in Bolingbrook. They're actually originally, their office is based in Miami, Florida. They saw some opportunity here where they can make an impact and, yes, so basically make an impact with the alternative coffee as well.

So, they are new, and they want to use this also was a place for training staff from other locations as well. So, they're trying to make this also kind of their, I wouldn't say regional headquarters but it stops short of that, like a place where they can train and kind of set the example of what they'd want to see for the Qargo Coffees.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: All right, thank you. I have no other questions.

MR. SASSILA: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Commissioner Terry?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I have no questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Commissioner Drost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, it looks like an effort to, in a post-Covid, of bringing people out in. I think there's some, within your neighbors, that there's really going to be some synergism, too, to kind of pull and draw off of some of those businesses that you have. It looks like entertainment; it looks very inviting. It looks like a nice alternative to other coffee shops.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Bruce?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I have no questions, but I think it's a great project.

MR. SASSILA: We're excited for it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Joe?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: The locations in Bolingbrook, are they as big as this?

MR. SASSILA: No. So, the ones in Bolingbrook, they're actually in a Meijer. So, they're really small, but they're meant to be like samples of kind of the, you know, it's kind of to give a sample of what they can expect from a Qargo Coffee actual size, like the one here that's being proposed.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, and are you going to do any roasting of coffee here?

MR. SASSILA: Not to my knowledge like coffee roasters, no, but it would be nice if they did.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: The pastries will be brought in, too?

MR. SASSILA: They'll be brought in, yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, that's all I have. Thank you.

MR. SASSILA: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Kris?

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: It is definitely not Dunkin Donuts. It's beautiful. No questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Michael?

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: Love that we're repurposing a vacant

APPROVED

building. Is this related to the Qargo Coffee in Madison, Wisconsin? There's a couple of Qargo Coffees there.

MR. SASSILA: I believe so, yes. So, it is similar.

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: It's a pretty cool hangout place. Was there outdoor seating?

MR. SASSILA: There was not, just because it's, I guess it's limited. I think the amount of pavement that's available is only for, like the minimum for walking. So, unfortunately, as much as it would be nice to do, but also it will take away from the drive-through aspect. So, it's kind of a, you know, kind of pick the best economic decision. It'd be nice to have an outdoor one though.

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion if that's in order.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #24-023, an Amendment to the Arlington Plaza Planned Unit Development (PUD) to add a drive-through lane to the property, a Special Use Permit for a restaurant with a drive-through, and the following Variation:

- 1. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.4-2 to reduce the required off-street parking from 1,154 spaces to 1,139 spaces.**

This recommendation is subject to resolution of the following:

- 1. The site improvements, landscaping, and interior renovation shall be substantially consistent with the site development plans drawn by the HOH Group, Inc. with a last revision date of August 15, 2025.**
- 2. The Petitioner must comply with all of the requirements set forth in the December 10, 2024 motion of the Village's Design Commission concerning the approval of the facade improvements.**
- 3. IDOT approval shall be required for any work proposed within the West Rand Road right-of-way.**
- 4. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.**

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll second that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, a motion is on the table. Why don't we do a roll call?

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Commissioner Lorenzini.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Petermann.

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Chair Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Motion passes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Congratulations! Motion passes, and that is a positive recommendation to the Village Board which is the final arbiter in this matter. If you could keep in touch with the Staff, they will let you know the next step and when that may occur, but thank you for presenting and thank you for coming to Arlington Heights to conduct your business.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and bring some coffee to the Village meeting.

MR. SASSILA: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Good luck.

MR. SASSILA: Thank you, everyone.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, good luck.

(Whereupon, at 8:42 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)

APPROVED

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: 1821 NORTH VERDE SUBDIVISION - PC #21-007

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 24th day of September, 2025 at the hour of 8:42 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director, Community Development
DANIEL OSOBA, Planner I
RACHEL HITZEMANN, Development Planner

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, so that is the last of the public hearings; however, we do have other business under matter V, and that is the 1821 North Verde Subdivision-Plat Extension.

Staff, if you want to present that?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes.

So, on April 15, 2024, the Village Board approved Resolution #24-011, which granted a preliminary plat of subdivision approval and a lot width variation for a two-lot subdivision for the property located at 1821 Verde Avenue. As required by the Municipal Code, the preliminary plat of subdivision approval is valid for 12 months. That would have expired in April; however, the Petitioner did request an extension of six months from the Village Board and that was granted on April 9th.

Per our code, a second requested variation needs to go through the Plan Commission, and so here we are. The Petitioner has requested another six-month extension to the preliminary plat of subdivision approval and has noted that the extension is necessary due to the fact that they have not secured a buyer and are still pursuing a buyer or a joint venture partner.

Staff has reviewed the request and is recommending approval of the extension; however, we do not recommend any future extensions of this request.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Rachel.

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #21-007, a request for a six-month extension to the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for 1821 North Verde Avenue.

This recommendation is subject to the following:

- 1. There are no additional extensions past April 21, 2026.**

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Why don't we do a roll call vote?

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Petermann.

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: Yes.

APPROVED

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Chair Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

Thank you. The motion passes, extended and confirmed.

All right, so we will open it for public comment. Let the record show there's absolutely no one in the room, so we'll close the public comment.

I will ask really quick -- oh, I guess we'll do an update.

Are there any? You want to give us -- I saw an update on the matters shown here on the form. Is there anything you want to --

MS. HITZEMANN: Nothing I want to highlight, just that we have updated the table to include our new list of applications that we've received in September.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay. All right, thank you. I just ask the Commissioners to take a look at that and we'll meet again. If you have any questions on that, please ask the Staff.

Before we adjourn, I'd just like to say hello to, Emily is in the house. I don't know if everybody has met Emily, but Emily, do you want to just do a quick introduction?

MS. RODMAN: Sure, thank you. Let me start by apologizing that it's taken me so long to introduce myself in person to the Commission, but I am fortunate that you're all here this evening and I know it's been a long night for you, so I won't belabor this.

My name is Emily Rodman; I am the Director in the department as you all know. I started with the Village this past December. You see a lot of what our department produces, we have a lot on our plate, but we've got a great staff as you see in here that continue to move these projects forward.

I did want to share that Michael and I did meet with Chairman Cherwin last week and he did share some context with us for the Commission over the years. I just wanted to mention that should the Commission have any concerns about the items that are coming before them, how they're being presented to you, suggestions about provisions in the code that you find challenging or bewildering or perhaps no longer relevant. I have seen some of the commentary in the minutes, I do read the minutes of all the meetings, but would encourage you to reach out to me, reach out to Michael, let us know what those are.

We'd like to work proactively with this group. We want to know what your concerns are. You've been dealing with this code, many of you, much longer than the four of us have, and you're in many ways experts in the room on this. So, we want to hear what those concerns are and want to try to work collectively with you, and then obviously ultimately the Village Board.

So, please feel free to reach out any time. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks, Emily, and welcome. We're happy to have you. Of course, we all showed up tonight because we knew you were going to be here.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Well, yes. Your rib prize from the chamber event in January.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: There you go.

MS. RODMAN: Yes, that's correct.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER DROST: So, you've emerged which is good and you're going to keep moving.

MS. RODMAN: I've come up for air, yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, so welcome.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Well, I'm sure if Lynn Jensen were here, he'd say something about bike racks, but let's --

COMMISSIONER DROST: We can talk about the economics. I'll make a motion to adjourn.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Is there a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: I move to adjourn.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, that motion is seconded?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Anyone opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, motion passes. Meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

(Gavel pounded.)

(Whereupon, at 9:01 p.m., the 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