

APPROVED

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: 600 WEST UNIVERSITY DRIVE - TASTY BREADS - PC #25-018
AMENDMENT TO PUD ORDINANCE #01-057, AMENDMENT TO
LUV ORDINANCE #25-048, 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, 1st Floor Buechner Room, Arlington Heights,
Illinois on the 12th day of November, 2025 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

DANIEL OSOBA, Planner I
RACHEL HITZEMANN, Development Planner
DARKO BOJIN, Assistant Planner

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right. Okay, we'll call the meeting to order.
If we could stand, the flag is in the back, we'll recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you.

Can we do the 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.

(No response.)

MS. HITZEMANN: Petermann.

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MS. HITZEMANN: Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Here.

All right, good, we have a quorum. Thank you. We'll proceed to Item Number III on the agenda, Approval of Minutes, the minutes for 10/8/25.

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Second?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, the motion passes, minutes approved. We'll move on to Item IV, Public Hearings. The first public hearing on the agenda is 600 West University Drive for Tasty Breads.

Do we have representatives here for Tasty Breads?

MR. BUDZIK: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, excellent. You guys, whoever is going to talk, if you want to just step up here to the podium, please?

I'll ask Staff, have all public notices been given on this one?

MR. OSOBA: Yes, they have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you, sir. We'll ask you to raise your hand, please.

(Witness sworn.)

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, excellent, thank you. If you could give us your name and spell it, please for the record?

MR. BUDZIK: Sure. Thomas Budzik, it's spelled B-u-d-z-i-k.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, and if any of your colleagues would like to join during the public hearing or during the questions, they're welcome to come up and join at that point.

MR. BUDZIK: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: We'd just ask them to give their names then as well. There is a Staff report that goes along with your petition. Have you read that Staff report? And there are conditions listed in there, do you agree with those conditions?

MR. BUDZIK: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, excellent.

Just to say for the record, Commission Dawson is joining us.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Just got off the train.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

Okay, so what we'll do is we'll start out, and we don't usually, we used to have our screens in front of us in the other room, so we're just all going to be looking up at the same screen up there.

MR. BUDZIK: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, you're going to have to turn over whatever, hopefully you can manage that up there, but we'll let you go ahead and start your presentation, and then once you're done, we'll ask the Staff. So, please continue.

MR. BUDZIK: Okay, sounds good.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

MR. BUDZIK: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Thomas Budzik, I'm the architect on this project. I'm here presenting the project on behalf of the Petitioner, Tasty Breads. We're here to request an amendment to a land use variation, an amendment to a planned unit development, and a couple of related zoning variances in order to allow a freezer addition at this facility.

As the Commissioners may recall, we were here a few months back to request a land use variation for the Tasty Breads to allow for food manufacturing in the M-1 Zoning District. I'll just briefly go over what Tasty Breads does just to refresh everyone's memories, but the focus today really is just on the freezer warehouse addition.

So, again, in terms of the process, what Tasty Breads does, despite the name, they don't actually have baking involved in their facility. They take dough, or take water and flour, mix it together, form rolls, freeze it, package it, and then send it to their freezer warehouse. So, what we're really talking about today is that last component, the freezer warehouse.

In the previous iteration, there was a possibility to have a freezer warehouse within the facility. It's simply much more cost effective and makes more sense from a scheduling perspective to have a separate standalone freezer warehouse addition as opposed to trying to accommodate the freezer within the building itself.

You can see here the property. The freezer warehouse addition is going to be located on the east where you see that kind of green area to the east of the building.

On this image, you can see the proposed size of the addition. It's approximately 13,000 square feet. I would like to note that the shipping, receiving and building

APPROVED

entrances still remain the same. Essentially, the use of the building is fundamentally the same as what we had presented a couple of months back.

Going on to the floor plan, we're much further along in the process right now. We're essentially ready for building permits with this project, so the plan is much more developed. I would like to just briefly walk through the floor plan and how their process works.

At the far northwest corner of the building is where they have their receiving. It's primarily flour tankers and packing materials coming in through those, in that loading dock. The flour tankers, they come in next to the building. There's a manifold, they plug the tanker directly into the manifold, it gets piped directly into four internal flour silos that's located at the north, also at the northwest side of the building there, entirely self-contained, designed to minimize explosion risk or any other issues related to flour and dust particulate matter.

From there, the flour gets sent over to their mixers, mixed with Village tap water, and then goes into their process line. From the process lines, it goes into spiral freezers. From there, it goes into packaging lines, boxed, palletized, and then moved into the freezer warehouse addition.

Also at that far northwest corner is their internal trash room. The addition is displacing an external trash enclosure. Based on the type of waste that they produce in the building, they have to have an internal trash room. They can't leave raw dough out, so there's no trash corral here because it all has to be contained within the building, and that's specifically designed in that northwest corner as well.

The southeast corner is where they have their four existing loading docks. Again, this addition does not fundamentally change the amount of deliveries they're going to have or the amount of shipments they're going to have. The freezer addition is designed to accommodate the full capacity for the building. As you can see here, we have two process lines proposed right now. There is room for an additional two process lines directly to the north of there, so we have designed the freezer addition to accommodate their full future needs for this facility.

I would also like to point out here, there's, a lot of that cross-hatched area in the bottom left there, a lot of that is office space. There's also a second-floor space which a lot of that is office as well. Again, as we presented previously, Tasty Breads is using this primarily as a production facility. They may be using up to four private offices within the entire building. Their intention is to really keep their office staff at their two other locations in Northbrook and Franklin Park.

Here you can see the building elevations for the freezer warehouse. The freezer warehouse addition is approximately 40 feet, the existing building is approximately 26 feet as is shown.

This is a rather kind of unique construction system. The exterior wall panel is actually the cooler panel for the freezer. That's part of what makes this an economical solution and a preferred solution in this case.

Now, specifically with regards to the land use variation, I do want to point out that again we are not fundamentally changing anything about how the building is being used. It's consistent with what we described a couple of months ago. We have had extensive meetings with the Engineering Department and Fire Department to make sure that we've satisfied their concerns regarding stormwater detention and safe fire access to the building.

We have improved the drive aisle on the north and east sides of the property so that it complies with the Fire Department's requirements. We do have an aerial

APPROVED

access point located along the north of the addition. So, we've gone to great lengths to make sure that the Village is satisfied with this proposed addition.

With regards to the planned unit development, so this is a rather unique condition. This is part of the University Park's Planned Unit Development. This PUD consists of this property and the property directly to the east of it. That property is improved as a parking lot and, my understanding, is used as fleet storage for Arlington Heights Ford. As far as we can tell and as far as Staff has been able to figure out, we have no idea why the PUD was created. But the simple fact that we're creating an addition to a building within the PUD requires that we request a PUD amendment.

We have notified the neighboring property owners of our proposed project. They're aware of it and they have no objections to what we're proposing here.

Now, going on to the zoning variations, there's two zoning variations that we're requesting. The first is a reduction in parking from 134 spaces to 82 spaces, and the second is a reduction on the side yard setback from 50 feet to approximately 27 feet.

Now, firstly, with regards to the parking reduction, the way the Village calculates the parking demand is based on the number of employees for the production side of the building and then the raw square footage for the office side. So, in this particular case, if you are to look solely at the parking requirement for the production facility which in this case would be, they have 75 employees planned per shift that would translate to 38 required parking spaces. We have well in excess of the 38 spaces required.

We've also provided information about their parking usage at their other facilities which shows a comparable size facility with 80-some parking spaces that's about 60 percent utilized. We also have a parking analysis from KLOA where they have determined that, based on the production usage, that there is more than adequate parking even after the reduction in the number of parking spaces.

I do also want to point out that the reason we're reducing the parking spaces in part, they were partially displaced by the addition itself kind of creating that fire aerial apparatus access on the north side of the building. That has caused us to basically take out a lot of spaces that were striped there.

I do also want to point out in particular that based on the parking analysis from KLOA, in theory this site could support up to 7,000 square-foot of office space. That's not Tasty Breads' intention, but just to put it in perspective, all of Tasty Breads' offices between their two other facilities which they plan to maintain there are less than 4,000 square feet. So, even if they were to bring everyone over, they would have adequate parking at this facility.

Lastly, the other variation regarding the setback, so when we initially spoke to the Staff about this project, we had a question about the side yard setback. We were told it was 25 feet, it was always 25 feet, and then later on Staff had determined that in fact there's been, this interpretation has been interpreted a couple of different ways. Staff has determined that from now and forever going forward, they're going to interpret it this way so that it's 50-foot. So, we originally designed it as if there were a 25-foot side yard setback, our building is at 27 feet, hence, why we're now requesting a reduction in the side yard setback.

With that, that concludes my presentation. I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commissioners have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks. I think we'll have some questions for you, but you can take a rest now. We'll turn it over to Staff presentation.

APPROVED

MR. BUDZIK: Okay, sure.

MR. OSOBA: All right, good evening, Commissioners.

So, the subject property for this petition is located at 600 West University Drive which is also located in the University Subdivision Planned Unit Development, or PUD, along with that property immediately to the east. The Petitioner is Tasty Breads International who obtained approval of a land use variation in August 2025 for Bakery Products, Production, and Wholesale land use within in the M-1 District. The Petitioner wishes to expand this building by adding a 13,000 square-foot freezer addition on the eastern side of the building. Therefore, their requested action is to amend that University Subdivision PUD and previously approved land use for the freezer addition. This request includes two variations as was mentioned for the east side setback and for the reduction in parking.

This aerial shows the Tasty Breads site in red and the overall University Subdivision PUD in dashed blue. The three site access points from University Drive will remain unchanged with this proposal. The zoning within the University Drive Corridor is M-1 Research, Development, and Light Manufacturing District, and the nearest residentially zoned properties are approximately 350 feet to the south across University Drive.

This is the proposed site plan with the freezer addition highlighted in blue. The side setback is 27.14 feet from the eastern property line where 50 feet is required in the M-1 District, which is why we have a side setback variance. This request is to again fit the freezer adjacent to the building and minimize the loss of parking and landscaping. The SDC has reviewed this request and agrees with the Petitioner that it will not alter the character of the locality and that it is also internal to the overall PUD.

The drive aisle adjacent to the addition is proposed to be reconfigured to account for this addition and provide adequate site access for emergency vehicles and truck deliveries. This access drive is proposed to be widened on the north to account for the increased building height up to 40 feet on the addition. The remaining site improvements that are on the western parking lot were reviewed and approved under the previous land use variation application which remains in effect as a condition of approval.

These renderings were provided to Staff during review of the Design Commission application and the Plan Commission application review. The Design Commission reviewed this application in September and had no issues with the design and commented that the Petitioner did well to match the same stone design and color and architectural roof detail.

With the proposed addition and reconfigured drive aisle, many existing parking spaces are proposed to be removed. The blue highlighted area shows the addition and removal of the angled spaces on the eastern side of the site, and the red highlighted area shows parking removed to account for the drive aisle and emergency access widening. Overall, the site will have 82 parking stalls with this proposal where 134 is required.

The Petitioner provided a traffic and parking analysis that demonstrated the 82 spaces would be sufficient if the office space was not included in the calculation and just for the production planned use. The Petitioner contends that the main function of the space would be for dough production and storage, and offices would not be utilized as a typical office at this location. The SDC finds that the parking variation is acceptable with the condition that the floor plans are updated to change the second story office space to inactive storage, and that the second story may not be utilized as office space. This would reduce Staff's concern of future parking issues if business operations change or the space is utilized as a business or a professional office.

APPROVED

These are the criteria for approval for the variations which would apply for the land use variation amendment and the two variations for the side setback and for the parking. The Staff Development Committee reviewed the proposed planned unit development amendment for the 13,000 square-foot building addition and land use variation amendment to allow an expansion of an existing Bakery Products, Production, and Wholesale land use within the M-1 District along with the following variations--to reduce the side setback from 50 to 27.14 and to reduce the parking requirement from 134 spaces to 82 spaces. The SDC recommends approval of the application subject to the conditions in the Staff report and on the slide. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, sir.

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

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So moved.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: The motion passes; we'll include that. Thank you. Also, just to note it for the record, Commissioner Lorenzini is here and he arrived very shortly after our roll call vote so we've got everybody here.

We'll start with questions. Why don't we start down at Michael's end over there?

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No questions.

Kris?

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Joe?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Nothing.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Bruce?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'm good.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Ah, very interesting.

Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I have just a clarification on the parking. Is this, what you said in recommendation 4, talk to me again about how we're going to address the parking if there's a problem?

MR. OSOBA: So, Staff is recommending that the second story of the space, which is approximately 16,000 square feet and labeled as office space on the floor plans that were in the packet, cannot be used as office space and they'll reflect their floor plans on their building permit submittals so that it's inactive storage. Therefore, the parking requirement, if it's labeled as such, would actually be reduced, and I believe there was a table on the Staff report that kind of highlighted that change. If it does become a problem, then it becomes an enforcement issue where code enforcement would have to take a look and see what type of utilization of the office space is being done.

Based on what Staff has reviewed and the parking studies and the analysis that the Petitioner provided and the employee counts that the Petitioner has provided, Staff and the SDC don't believe that there would be a parking problem, but if it does occur, then it

APPROVED

would go through the normal route of code enforcement.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Sure, and I'm again, also not concerned that it's going to be an issue, but I want to make sure that if for some reason it did, because in honesty, plans today aren't plans 10 years from now, they just aren't, right? Things change. I don't feel there's any evil intent in the application, nothing like that, and I'm fully in favor of it. I just want to ensure that should something happen in the future, and as one does, we forget restrictions and we forget whatever and parking problems occur, that the Village has the ability to go back and say, hey, we need to talk. That's all.

So, Staff feels comfortable that this restriction allows us at a future time to have discussions should plans change and parking becomes an issue. Okay, that's good enough for me.

MR. OSOBA: And in general, if the plans do change and floor plans are changed, then building permits would have to be submitted. Staff would be able to review that, and as part of --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, we all know building permits aren't always filed when they're supposed to be.

MR. OSOBA: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And, again, no nefarious intent here, it just happens, right? Sometimes people just don't realize, right, that's all I'm saying. But, again, if Staff feels like if something were to occur, we have the ability to go back and say, wait a second, you didn't put it in the building permit, this wasn't supposed to be here, we need to have a dialogue.

MS. HITZEMANN: That's why we're inputting the condition.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Perfect, okay.

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I just want to make sure because that's a, to me when I see parking conditions, it's usually differently expressed than simply a restriction on floor plans, okay. So, I just want to make sure Staff is comfortable. Staff is telling me that you're comfortable, I trust Staff, so great. I'm all in favor of the project. I think it's a wonderful addition to Arlington Heights. Just want to make sure it's on the record that we had that discussion. That's it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Sue.
Commissioner Ennes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I also have a question and am concerned about the parking. This is the, I'm familiar with the history of the property. This is the second time there has been a major reduction in the parking. The lot to the east that's now owned by Arlington Heights Ford was a requirement for the parking for this facility. I believe it was the original developer but it was two occupants before that, and they were using the office space. I think they were an R&D operation; they were using that office space and they needed all that parking for the office space. So, this 16,000 square feet of second floor office space could require a lot of parking.

So, my concern is the same thing, that other managers don't come in and start using this space, the second-floor space for other things that requires a workforce, whether it's office or other that may affect this, because we are really cutting the parking I believe down to close to a minimum of what our code requires; is that correct?

MR. OSOBA: Our parking ordinance would require 130 parking spaces.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Correct.

MR. OSOBA: If the office --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: We're talking about, what, 89?

MR. OSOBA: 82, and if the office space per the condition of approval is removed from that calculus of 16,000, then we would get about 82 spaces. So, with that modification of the floor plan, the overall parking requirement would be in line with what they are proposing to have on their site.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, I would like to see something even a little bit more enforceable than what we have as item 4 in the conditions, that this space can't be, you know, this is going to be 16,000 square feet of office space that will be sitting just vacant?

MR. OSOBA: They've labeled it inactive storage or intend to label it inactive storage on their final plans.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, it could be storage, I don't have a problem with that, but I would hate to see in any situation where it gets out that it's utilized as office space.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Or any other space that requires parking.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Correct.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Which again just happens in the evolution of a business. Things change.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I want to make sure there is teeth, because we all know that it can be hard just to call back in the future, right? I agree with you, I'd like to see something a little stronger but again, yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: That's it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, I have a question. How many employees do you anticipate using this facility to manufacture?

MR. BUDZIK: So, at full capacity, they'll have 75 employees per shift, and they'll have two shifts.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Right now, you currently have two lines so you could double that?

MR. BUDZIK: No, I'm sorry, the 75 per shift is at full capacity.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Full capacity.

MR. BUDZIK: When they go at full capacity.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, so you have 75 employees and you have two shifts.

MR. BUDZIK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Is there a problem then if you have, let's say the first shift employees are still working and you've got personnel on the second shift arriving a little bit earlier than their time start and now you're overlapping and there would be a parking shortage?

MR. BUDZIK: Sure. So, the reality with these employees for these types of positions, it's not like it's one employee per car. A lot of them will carpool. They can actually take public transportation to the facility. So, there is not going to be 75 parking spaces needed for all their employees, and that's evidenced by their utilization at their other facilities. So, at Northbrook which is a very similar size, they're only utilizing 60 percent of the parking lot which has approximately 80 spaces.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, I was just concerned if there was an overlap of the employees leaving later and the second shift employees arriving earlier and they don't have parking. Okay, I have no other questions. I'm in favor of it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thanks, John.

George, anything?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes. What kind of work is conducted on the premises?

MR. BUDZIK: So, it's all part of the food production. So, moving the, you know, moving the dough from the mixers to the production lines, running the production lines, running the machinery for the packaging, forklifts.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So, it's basically, you're completing the entire process on that site?

MR. BUDZIK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Just for the record.

MR. BUDZIK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And what is, is this a private label concern? Will we recognize any of the manufactured goods?

MR. BUDZIK: We're sure you've had them before.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Is it public record as to what they are? Because that's a mystery.

MR. BUDZIK: Yes. I'll let Gus and Nancy speak to that; they're the owners at Tasty Breads. They can't disclose all of their clients, but --

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, but I mean, just from the standpoint of as an Arlington Heights resident, we're always proud of, you know, manufacturers that have an impact, and certainly the word international is something that's curious to me, too. Who is the --

MR. BUDZIK: That goes more to their roots for the starting of their company and sort of how they prepared their recipes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So, it's not going to be a data center, or it's not going to be --

MR. BUDZIK: No, no.

COMMISSIONER DROST: -- an addition to the White House.

MR. BUDZIK: No.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So, all right.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: They could tell us but they'd have to kill us also.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, of course, but if they want to explain parts of their business that they feel comfortable?

MR. BUDZIK: I think they have some samples here, so if the Commissioners would like to try them.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Oh, absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Just go pop it in your oven. All right, thank you.

So, I would just say at this moment, we're going to open, this is a public hearing so we have to officially open it for public comments.

Is there anybody in the audience from the public that would like to comment on this matter?

APPROVED

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Seeing nobody, we'll close the public comments.

Any final questions?

My only questions were, you know, I like the project, I'm good with it. I think I had a question about, you know, the safety protocol for the combustible dust and everything to make sure that we're following all of the requirements for the implementation of that.

MR. BUDZIK: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And then I would say the other issue is with the cold storage and everything, I'm sure there's a safety protocol for that as well for your employees.

MR. BUDZIK: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, the expectation is that the company would be implementing best practices for both of those potential danger items, right?

MR. BUDZIK: Yes, we have the means of egress required for a freezer warehouse, so that's incorporated into the plans. The system they have for the flour delivery is the same exact system they're using in Northbrook. So, it's a system they're familiar with. It's entirely self-contained specifically for those explosion concerns.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, and then the only other question I have is for Staff. If you could just provide a little bit of clarity, the Petitioner brought up the issue of a 25-foot setback versus the 50-foot setback, and we set on the 50-foot setback. What's the history or what's kind of the gray area there just so we understand what the issue is?

MR. OSOBA: Sure. So, the M-1 District indicates that the side yard setback has a total of 50 feet. So, the interpretation, and it has been interpreted both ways over the years where total could mean that both the, in this case, east and west setback total up to a 50-foot setback. So, therefore, you have a 25-foot and a 25-foot setback. Alternatively, that language also could be interpreted that it's a 50-foot setback on the east and the west side of the site. So, looking through it and looking forward and how we're approaching that code section, we've reached back out to the Petitioner and let them know that we're going to be interpreting this as 50 feet as the required setback as that's the direction that the Planning Department has interpreted, and that's where the variance request came from.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: And that will be consistently applied within the district, across the district.

MR. OSOBA: Correct, we have that interpretation going forward.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, thank you.

Yes, Joe? Did I totally skip over you before?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No, no.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No, okay. All right, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Some of the other Commissioners' concerns just raised a question in my mind. So, on a practical standpoint, if they were to just have more people than they should, where would they be able to park? On the street?

MR. OSOBA: There is no parking on the street. So, the site has 82 spaces and the code requirement, if it was just a production facility, would be 38 total vehicles. The office space is what really drives the majority of what the parking requirements per code are. If they're increasing the employee count, per code if it's just a production facility, you essentially get one increased parking space for every two employees.

APPROVED

So, there's certainly a limit and they would need to make sure that's not the case. They've indicated that their, I believe there was a five-year plan to kind of get to maximum capacity with both of the assemblies kind of going at the same time would be the 75 people. If that increases, this ordinance kind of has stopgaps to make sure that the parking is addressed if it does become an issue, and we have a planned unit development and a land use variation to kind of rely on and back up the Village if it does become a problem.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, I would say then my other final comment would just be, you've heard from the other Commissioners, the extra space upstairs is an issue. We are concerned about parking. So, I think it's very clear from everybody that, you know, there will be a, you said you agree to these conditions so there will be either this condition or if somebody makes a motion to modify it, I don't know, but I think it's very clear that, you know, the second floor space obviously is not going to be utilized for anything that would require parking space.

MR. BUDZIK: That's understandable.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: That's understood; that's the meaning. I think we're all on the same page; however, it passes. That's the concept.

MR. BUDZIK: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I think Staff did a nice job of finding a way to accommodate your need while, you know, anticipating those potential issues. So, unless anybody has any other questions, I don't know if there's a motion or anything?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'll make a motion. All right, I have my sheet of paper and I'll read it.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #25-018, an Amendment to the University Subdivision Planned Unit Development (Ordinance #01-057) for a 13,000 square-foot building addition; an Amendment to the previously approved Land Use Variation (Ordinance #25-048) to expand the Bakery Products, Production and Wholesale land use within the M-1 District; and the following variations:

1. A variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-15.3(B) to permit a side yard setback of 27.14 feet where 50 feet is required; and
2. A variation from Chapter 28, Section 10.4-3 to reduce the required parking from 134 spaces to 82 spaces.

This recommendation is subject to resolution of the following:

1. The conditions of approval as required by Ordinance #25-048 shall remain in effect.
2. The Petitioner shall provide screening for all rooftop mechanical equipment at the time of building permit application.
3. The Petitioner shall provide updated floor plans that accurately reflect the intended internal uses of the building prior to being heard by the Village Board.
4. The second floor may not be designated or utilized as office space and the Petitioner shall provide floor plans to reflect this condition of approval prior to being heard by the Village Board.
5. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations,

APPROVED

and policies.

please?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

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

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes.

Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, with comment.

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.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Chair Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, and the motion passes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I have a comment.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, there's going to be a comment, and the recommendation is that you're approved. We're not the final body but that will go to the Village Board. So, we're going to have a comment here and then you can talk to the Staff afterwards about when the final hearing is going to be.

Yes, Sue?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: My comment isn't necessarily about the Petitioner. I think it's a wonderful addition to Arlington Heights and I'm excited to have you come. My comment is more to the Village.

As a business owner myself, I've seen nothing but reduction in need of parking spaces associated with staff. I do not, as a business attorney and someone who represents businesses and their leasing needs, do not see this changing any time soon. Maybe it will, I don't know, but I think it's time to perhaps look at our zoning code and our parking needs because more and more we need fewer people in the seats to run businesses and the parking ordinance has become a burden to businesses trying to evolve in today's marketplace. That's it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Sue.

Was there another comment or was that it?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, as I said, recommendation of approval, congratulations. Welcome to Arlington Heights hopefully, we'll get that final vote from the Village Board, and Dan will usher you to the next step.

APPROVED

MR. BUDZIK: Great, thank you, everyone.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you all very much.

(Whereupon, at 8:03 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: 125 SOUTH WILKE ROAD - LINDEN AURA MASSAGE - PC #25-021
LAND USE VARIATION TO ALLOW MASSAGE ESTABLISHMENT IN B-1 DISTRICT

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 1st Floor Buechner Room, Arlington Heights,
Illinois on the 12th day of November, 2025 at the hour of 8:03 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

DANIEL OSOBA, Planner I
RACHEL HITZEMANN, Development Planner
DARKO BOJIN, Assistant Planner

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, so let's see. Our next matter is, let's see, 125 South Wilke Road, Linden Aura Massage, PC #25-021.

I'm going to ask the Staff, have all the notices been given on this one?

MR. BOJIN: Yes, they have.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Darko.

All right, if the Petitioner could raise your right hand, please?
(Witness sworn.)

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

MR. BRAUDE: Josh Braude, that's J-o-s-h, last name is B-r-a-u-d-e. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, thank you, sir. There's a Staff report that was submitted with your, for this public hearing. Did you read the Staff report? And did you see the conditions of approval and do you agree with those?

MR. BRAUDE: I did, and we do.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, excellent. We'll let you go ahead and proceed, and then we'll turn it over to Staff. Thank you.

MR. BRAUDE: Thank you. Good evening, my name is Josh Braude and I'm with Birchwood Law. I represent Julia Babinska who is applying for a land use variation to open a massage studio at 125 South Wilke Road, Unit 200J.

Julia is a highly qualified expert in massage therapy. She has been a licensed massage therapist for over 18 years, has been credentialed by the National Certification Board for Therapeutic Massage and Body Work which is a nationally recognized board certification in massage therapy. Over the last 18 years, she has been practicing at chiropractic offices and is applying to open her own studio.

Julia's therapeutic approach blends elements of Swedish massage and trigger point therapy which are combined with aroma therapy. The studio welcomes clients of all ages and genders with a particular focus on women's wellness. Julia plans on opening the practice as a solo practitioner with the opportunity to expand to one additional part-time therapist. All practitioners will be licensed and credentialed through IDFPR and comply with all applicable state and local laws.

The studio would be open six days a week, Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., and Saturday at 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. The studio will operate by appointment only which will be made either, appointments will be made either over the phone or online. Julia looks forward to becoming a part of the diverse Arlington Heights business sector and bring her therapies to the community.

With that, I'm happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, sir, thank you very much.

We'll turn this over to Staff. Darko?

MR. BOJIN: Sure, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Actually, yes, go ahead, Darko.

MR. BOJIN: Okay, thank you.

The subject property is 125 South Wilke Road, Unit 200J, which is located in the B-1 Business District. The Comprehensive Plan designates this property as appropriate for office uses only, and the Petitioner is requesting a land use variation to allow a

APPROVED

massage establishment in the B-1 District. Massage establishments are not permitted in any zoning district and, therefore, this land use variation is required for the Petitioner to operate her business.

This aerial image shows the subject property and the surrounding uses. The building is one of three in Wilke Office Park with shared parking and are under common ownership, but each building is on a separate parcel. Access to the site comes off of Wilke Road.

The subject property is surrounded on two sides with those other office buildings in the B-1 Business District. To the north is Westgate Shopping Center which is in the B-2 District. To the west across Illinois 53 are the residential neighborhoods in the City of Rolling Meadows. Then to the south and the east is a residential R-3 neighborhood.

As mentioned previously, the Petitioner will be the sole employee of the massage practice with a potential additional employee being hired at a later date. Clients will be seen on a one-to-one basis and will have to make these advanced appointments. Appointment and booking hours will be 9:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, and from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Saturdays.

The Petitioner is an IDFPR licensed massage therapist and will provide a range of therapeutic massage services to clients. The subject tenant space is about 730 square feet and includes a waiting room and two treatment rooms.

As for parking, like I mentioned previously, there are three buildings in this office park that share parking and are under common ownership but separate parcels. The site map on the screen shows the number of parking spaces divided amongst these parcels with the red one being the subject property. If you look at the subject property alone with 52 parking spaces, there is insufficient parking per code; however, across the office park, there is plenty of parking, there is sufficient parking. So, as one of the conditions of approval, Staff recommends that the property owner provide a cross-access agreement or a similar parking arrangement just to ensure there are no parking issues in the future should the ownership of the property has changed.

Additionally, the Petitioner provided a parking study for that subject property with the 52 spaces that showed sufficient parking over a three-day period. Staff reviewed this, the study, and concludes that there is adequate parking on site.

The Petitioner provided responses to the criteria of approval for variation requests listed on the screen. Since the Village Code does not permit massage establishments in any zoning district, this land use variation is required for the operation of the building, or the business rather. Staff reviewed these responses and found their responses to be sufficient.

Overall, the Staff Development Committee recommends approval of this application with the conditions listed on the slide and in the Staff report. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Darko. Nice job.

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

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll second it.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, motion passes. The presentation is included in the public record.

Do any of the Plan Commissioners, well, we'll start down at this end. First of all, you know what, public hearing, officially let's open the public hearing. Is there anybody from the public in this room that would like to comment on this? Are we hiding behind the podium? Okay.

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No? We'll close the public hearing.

Any questions for the Petitioner? Sue, we'll start with you.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: No.

Terry?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: George?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Pass.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: This is getting good, all right.

Michael?

COMMISSIONER PETERMANN: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Kris?

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Joe?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No questions.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Bruce?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: When do we eat?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: There you go. I know these --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It's tempting me.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: -- breads have been on your mind.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It's tempting.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I know. I guess the only question I would have, so Darko, if you could put up the thing with the three buildings up there?

MR. BOJIN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: They're all owned by Imperial, right? That's what you said?

MR. BOJIN: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: So, did Imperial give you any response about throwing a cross easement on this thing? Is there any resistance or anything to this?

MR. BRAUDE: We don't think there will be. As I said, we're completely fine with the condition. It's obviously owned right now and --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes, but to the Staff's point, they want to make sure that there's --

MR. BRAUDE: I know, yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: I mean, there's plenty of parking there but we don't want to get in a situation where Imperial peels off one building and then --

MR. BRAUDE: And I think that makes sense.

APPROVED

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay. All right, good. I don't have any other comments.

Is there any motion or anything?

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

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay, Bruce, go for it.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #25-021, a Land Use Variation to allow a massage establishment in the B-1 District.

This recommendation is subject to resolution of the following:

- 1. The Petitioner shall provide licensure by the Illinois Department of Professional Regulation as part of their initial business license renewal.**
- 2. Imperial Realty Company or current property owner shall provide Staff with proof of cross access and parking arrangements.**
- 3. This land use variation shall be limited to the Petitioners and cannot be transferred or assigned to any other user.**
- 4. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.**

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, that's the motion on the table.

Can we do a roll call vote for this?

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes.

Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, with comment.

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.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Schurtz.

COMMISSIONER SCHURTZ: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: Chairman Cherwin.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

So, congratulations, the motion passes for a recommendation of approval to the Village Board. Darko will help usher you to the next stage of this venture, and we have a comment from Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, I'm two for two tonight. Same thing, not

APPROVED

a comment to you, Petitioner. Welcome to Arlington Heights, or hopefully the Village Board will feel the same way.

My comment is towards the Village. I understand, being on this Commission for as long as I have, that there's problematic history with massage parlors. But I do not agree with treating them all as if they were criminals before they have even come to the Village. So, having to subject a small business to the expense and time that is associated with having to come before this Board I don't agree with, and I would like to hear the Village reassess that. Massage is a needed therapeutic medical part of people's lives.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Service.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Service, thank you for the word. So, yes, there's been problems in the past but we can't treat everyone as criminals before they walk into the Village. So, that's my comment. Thank you so much.

MS. HITZEMANN: I'll just note this is something that we're already looking into.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Thank you.

MS. HITZEMANN: And a process to, if it is, probably likely going to be a special use of some sort but expedited with Staff review of it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Exactly, right. Staff did a wonderful job reviewing this. Plan Commission review was really not needed in my opinion in this case.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Thank you, Sue.

Okay, so yes, you guys are all set. You may stick around if you want but you don't have to. Oh, yes, that's right, I know why you're sticking around. You guys can have a cookie, a celebratory cookie in honor of your victory. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Hands off the cookies, Bruce.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Hey, you opened it. You've got the --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: They smell so good. I want that on the record. They smell really good.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right, you guys.

So, Item Number V, Other Business, we don't have anything listed although I would just ask if we could, under this section for the Staff, so Commissioner Dawson brought up the parking issue before that we've all, it's been on all our minds. The recently passed People Over Parking Act, I don't know if the Commissioners are familiar with it, but it's going to affect, I would assume, what's going on in Downtown Arlington Heights and our projects and the parking requirements.

Did the Staff have any, has there been any deliberation or any thoughts about how we're addressing that or are they affecting any current projects?

MS. HITZEMANN: We're still reviewing; it's still under review. We realize that it will impact the projects downtown and ultimately the Arlington Park as well because there is a train station over here.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Yes.

MS. HITZEMANN: So, we're still in the process of reviewing that, kind of with our attorneys and things like that.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay.

MS. HITZEMANN: In terms of current projects, there are a couple in that vicinity. They were already applied for, so we're kind of going as normal, but it's under assessment and we haven't made any determinations at this point. But it is definitely under

APPROVED

review kind of from the Manager's Office now.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: But when does that go into effect?

MS. HITZEMANN: When the Governor signs it, and I believe he has not signed it yet. So, not as of right now.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Okay. All right, so just for the Commissioners, if you're not aware, there was at the state legislation that affects any like transit-oriented, so like Downtown Arlington Heights, the state is basically saying they're taking the parking governance out of the hands of the municipality and the state is preempting them and they're bringing the parking requirements down so that municipalities can't like hold up a project because of rigid adherence to parking. So, the municipalities aren't going to have a choice, so it's going to be, you know, kind of being forced on municipalities. Anyway, so as Rachel said, we'll hear more from the Staff, but that's the situation.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So, is that commentary related to potentially new neighbor in our community?

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Me, I'm just bringing it up generally, but yes, it could affect any potential neighbor in any community along the, you know, like Palatine and Mount Prospect and Arlington Heights. All right, so that's it. I just wanted to have your thought on that.

I'm going to open this up for public comment. We don't have any friends in the room it seems, so we're going to close public comment. That was Item Number V, I'm sorry, that's Item VI.

Then, Item VII is Update on Previous Plan Commission Cases. So, Staff has given us this list.

Are there any questions on this from anybody?

MS. HITZEMANN: We -- sorry, I cut you off.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: That's all right.

MS. HITZEMANN: We do have one comment. Dan, if you want to give them an update on your particular project?

MR. OSOBA: Sure. So, the Plan Commission reviewed a subdivision proposal earlier this year. It was in October for the Chestnut Woods Subdivision, and there were a couple of comments that were made as part of the motion, not specific but comments to Staff and to Village Board regarding public improvements and the timing of those public improvements.

Staff did work with Public Works to kind of figure out what that potentially could look like. We did bring it to Village Board, and Village Board ultimately decided to require that the Petitioner install those improvements with their final plat. So, even though the Plan Commission made that kind of recommendation to the Village Board through that motion, the Village Board decided to require that.

So, if you're seeing something in the future when they come back for the final plat, that's how that resolution --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: This is the 1920 North Chestnut?

MR. OSOBA: Correct, yes.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Remind me, what was the public improvement over there?

MR. OSOBA: So, they had sidewalk, curb gutter, and street widening on Chestnut and on Walnut. So, it was a four-lot subdivision and --

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Oh, yes.

APPROVED

MR. OSOBA: There's new residential homes and there's no sidewalks adjacent to the development, and so the Plan Commission had made a recommendation as part of their, or suggestion really as part of their motion to look at the timing and the triggers for those public improvements, and the Village Board has decided that they're going to move forward with the requiring of the public improvements with their final plat.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Sounds about right, okay.

Any other?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, just are there any stirrings on the 425 block? No?

MS. HITZEMANN: No, not that I've heard.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: That's right. It would really be affected by this.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Correct. So, we're connecting that now.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Oh, interesting.

MS. HITZEMANN: Yes, we haven't heard anything from that property in a while.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Nothing? All right.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Anyway, all right, thanks.

Anything else, any other questions, folks?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All right. Okay, we're getting a lot of demand for cookies out there; we can't hold off much longer. George is kind of grabbing my leg.

All right, so I guess is there a motion for adjournment?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CHERWIN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

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

(Whereupon, at 8:20 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.

APPROVED

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