

APPROVED

PLAN

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

COMMISSION

RE: 703-723 WEST ALGONQUIN ROAD - PC#17-013  
PUD, PRELIMINARY PLAT OF SUBDIVISION

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of  
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village  
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,  
Illinois on the 24th day of January, 2018 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

TERRY ENNES, Chairman  
LYNN JENSEN  
JOE LORENZINI  
BRUCE GREEN  
GEORGE DROST  
SUSAN DAWSON  
JOHN SIGALOS  
JAY CHERWIN

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Village Planner

## APPROVED

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I'm calling this meeting of the Arlington Heights Plan Commission to order. Could I ask you to all please stand and join us in the pledge of allegiance?

(Pledge of allegiance recited.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Sam, would you take the roll please?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Here. Sam, were all the public notices sent out for the hearing this evening?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, they were.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We have the minutes from our last public meeting, from the Chapter 28 Text Amendment and the Annual Review of Comprehensive Plan. Could I have a motion to approve those minutes if you were here?

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

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I just want to mention I wasn't at that meeting, so I abstain.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Neither was I, I'll abstain.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay. Is our Petitioner here for Algonquin Road?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, they are.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Then I would ask the Petitioner to please come forward and anybody who is going to speak before the Plan Commission this evening and we'll swear you all in. Please raise your hand.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Please proceed. If the Petitioner can give us a recap of your project?

Sam, in case you didn't notice, Commissioner Dawson joined us.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you.

## APPROVED

MR. WAUTERLEK: My name is Mike Wauterlek, and I'm with Hamilton Partners. Our proposed redevelopment is a light distribution building. If approved --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Spell your name for the reporter.

MR. WAUTERLEK: Sure. It's W-a-u-t-e-r-l-e-k. So, our proposed redevelopment is a light distribution building. If approved, it would be the fourth such project we've undertaken locally over the past three years. Our intention would be to begin construction of phase one of the projects this spring, and to complete phase one of the project at the end of this year. The first phase is approximately 140,000 square feet, and it has the ability to accommodate two or more tenants. At a later date, it's our intention to expand the building to a total of approximately 330,000 square feet. The second phase also has the ability to accommodate two or more tenants. The interior of the building itself is 32-foot clear and it's state of the art in every way.

For some details on the construction of the building, I'm going to ask that Julie with Ware Malcomb, our architect comes in and fills you in.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Julie, would you please state your name and spell it for the reporter also?

MS. DALGA: Sure. My name is Julie Dalga, D-a-l-g-a. I'm with Ware Malcomb Architects. Can you go to the next slide?

So, this is just an image of one of the corner offices for our building. It's going to be predominantly precast with the three-tone gray paints to help break up the building and accentuate some of the corners in the office areas. So, there will be reveals kind of dividing up these different painted areas and precast, and then form liner on some of these darker gray panels near the entry to help emphasize that area. Then we have the true grain composite wood siding to help highlight the four potential office corners or office areas at the building and help guide guests and visitors to these areas and enhance the look of the office space.

MR. LEDER: Good evening. My name is Paul Leder, that's spelled L-e-d-e-r. I'm with RWG Engineering. We're involved in the civil, site civil aspects to this project. I was going to take just a couple of minutes and review the drainage characteristics of the property.

The site currently is comprised of two office warehouse buildings. The drainage for the site is split. The office building to the north drains to the north and connects to a storm sewer in Algonquin Road. The existing building to the south drains to the south and connects, well, actually it discharges to the Illinois Tollway along the south property line.

Our proposal for drainage will contain those existing drainage areas. Basically, phase one is consistent with the north parcel which will drain to the north. The phase two area will drain to the south. So, the drainage divide works very well with the phasing of the parcel.

For the proposed stormwater management characteristics, the existing condition is composed, for the north of stormwater management, in those two small basins that you can see along Meijer Drive, plus surface storage in the existing parking area. The storage for the phase two area is all in the, excuse me, all in the existing parking area. Our proposal is to use for the north those two basins along Meijer Drive. The one smaller one more to the north would be left in its existing condition. The second one, the little larger one, would be modified slightly. So, we will be using those basins, plus we would be providing them an

## APPROVED

underground vault or storage area. In a worst case condition, there will be some storage, excuse me, within the truck dock areas. That's the worst case condition.

For the south or the phase two, again there will be some storage in the dock area, worst case condition, an underground storage vault, and a new basin constructed between the parking area and the tollway, basically containing the existing drainage and actually reducing the amount of, reducing the release rate of water to the existing systems, both to the north and to the south.

MR. HUBBARD: That concludes the Petitioner's presentation this evening.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can I ask the Petitioner, do you know that Staff had recommended a continuance on this hearing? You're aware of that?

MR. WAUTERLEK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: The 11 conditions on the application. Have you seen those, are you familiar with those?

MR. WAUTERLEK: I am.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And are you acceptable?

MR. WAUTERLEK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Sam, would you give the Staff report?

MR. HUBBARD: Sure. So, the property in question is in the M-2 Zoning District which is the Limited Heavy Manufacturing Zoning District. Warehouse and distribution facilities are permitted uses within that district, so relative to zoning, the proposal is compliant. The Petitioner is requesting two approvals this evening, and that would be planned unit development which is required for any M-2 property greater than four acres in size. As the overall property is a little over 15 acres, a planned unit development is required.

Additionally, Petitioner is requesting a plat of subdivision to consolidate the lots into one which is also required. At this point in this hearing, only preliminary plat of subdivision is requested, which means that a future appearance before the Plan Commission would be required for final plat of subdivision approval. In addition, there are no variations proposed within this development.

The Comprehensive Plan designates the subject property as suitable for Research & Development, Manufacturing & Warehousing uses. So, the proposed distribution warehousing facility is compliant with the Comprehensive Plan designation.

There are two actions to date relative to this project. On March 22nd, the Petitioner met with what was at that time called the Plat & Subdivision Committee but what we now know and call today the Conceptual Plan Review Committee. I would say there was some discussion on the amount of truck traffic, but overall I would characterize that meeting as positive and the Plat & Subdivision Committee encouraged the Petitioner to move forward.

On November 28th, the Petitioner went before the Design Commission that resulted in a positive recommendation of approval. There was one requirement by the Design Commission, and that was to add additional greenscape, greenspace and foundation plantings at the northeast corner of the building. Petitioner has since incorporated that into their plans, and the plans that were sent to the Plan Commission do reflect the required changes by the Design Commission.

So, here is an aerial of the property. You can see the subject property is outlined in red. To the west, you see Weber Packaging Solutions, and well farther west of that is Meijer which is actually in the Village of Rolling Meadows. To the north is an

## APPROVED

industrial office development. To the east is a self storage warehouse facility and two industrial buildings. To the south of the subject property is the Illinois Tollway, and across from that is a forest preserve.

So, as you can see, the site is currently occupied by two, I would characterize them as industrial office flex buildings, the northern building being currently vacant which would be the site of phase one of the development. Phase two development, as I understand, would commence once all of the leases on the southern building have terminated and, therefore, is vacant in all of them before redevelopment.

As you can see from the aerial, the site currently has access from Meijer Drive. It's got a right-in and right-out on Meijer Drive located right here. Then there is also a full access intersection and a driveway with Algonquin Road. Finally, there is the shared private access drive along here. So, it currently has three points of access. Additionally, the site can access Golf Road west of Meijer Drive. I will mention that Golf Road and Meijer Drive is a right-in/right-out intersection, so cars using that intersection can only enter it traveling eastbound on Golf Road and can only leave eastbound on Golf Road.

So, the view here is a little flipped just to make it fit the whole site plan into the slide. Weber Packaging Solutions is on the north, and on the right-hand side of the screen is actually north, Weber Packaging Solutions is on the top of the screen. As I mentioned, with the site, there are no required variations. As you've heard, they are modifying the detention pond located right here, and they are going to be keeping the detention pond that's right here as it currently stands today.

I will mention that this is an outlot, this is not currently part of the subject site, and to our knowledge is not owned by the subject property. There are some easements in the area and I'll get into those later. But I also point out the southern detention area here and then there is a large underground detention vault proposed I believe right here.

They are proposing to keep the same access points as currently provided on the site. So, that's going to be the existing full access point here, as well as the right-in/right-out on Meijer Drive, and most notably they're going to keep that shared access drive as a private means of access to the trucking portion of the site.

So, I want to get into the easements a little bit because there are multiple easements that are part of this property. Some of the pretty significant easements are right here and that's the stormwater detention easement on this outlot parcel that is not owned by the Petitioner. The Petitioner has proposed some paving in that area as you can see right here in the orange. This area, as I mentioned, is a stormwater easement, and so we're not entirely certain that the provisions of the easement allow for its paving. That's one thing that we would like a little further correspondence on.

Additionally, there is a large reciprocal shared access easement, as you can see here in green. Half of that roughly falls on the subject property and the other half on the Weber Packaging Solutions property to the west. Since we received this application, we did receive a call from individuals at Weber Packaging Solutions. They did have a little bit of concern relative to this easement and whether or not it provided the rights for the use with all the truck traffic proposed in conjunction with this development. The ability to use that easement is critical to the viability of the site as proposed. So, we would like to see a little bit of coordination between the current property owner and the property owner of Weber to resolve any outstanding issues over the use of this private shared access drive.

## APPROVED

There is, as I mentioned, easements that do outline which parties have what rights to the easement. But I think maintenance is somewhat of a concern given the number of trucks that are going to be traveling as a result of this development. Again, without the ability to use that easement, the site as proposed is probably not viable.

Finally, there is another easement located at the very south of the site. It's a 30-foot easement for a sewer main. There is also a water main in that location. As you can see, some of the parking area is proposed on that easement, and part of the grading for that detention area also falls a little bit into the easement. So, we just are awaiting further communications from our Public Works Department to make sure that the parking and the grading of that detention area overlapping with the easement won't interfere with any future maintenance of the storm sewer main and water main.

Back in 2002 before the Meijer was developed and in the process of developing the Meijer, the Village entered into an intergovernmental agreement with the City of Rolling Meadows. I'd like to discuss that a little bit. Back in, well, first, I've got something to show you here. This blue line represents the boundary between Arlington Heights and the City of Rolling Meadows.

So, back in 2002, Weber Packaging Solutions was all one property as you can see outlined in the yellow line. In order to get Meijer to be developed, I believe that Meijer also wanted access to Algonquin Road, and so Meijer Drive had to be constructed to facilitate that connection. In order for Meijer Drive to be constructed, the Weber Packaging Solutions site had to be subdivided, and it was approximately subdivided as shown into three lots. There was actually a fourth lot but relatively small, but these were the three primary lots. On the north side you see the green lot which is currently vacant, on the south is the yellow lot which is the current lot for Weber, and then that orange lot on the side which is the detention facility previously mentioned.

In the intergovernmental agreement, in order to facilitate this road connection to the Village of Arlington Heights, the City of Rolling Meadows agreed to take jurisdiction and maintenance responsibilities for that portion of Meijer Drive that falls in the Village which is outlined in red on the PowerPoint presentation. As part of the review process, we did notify the City of Rolling Meadows that this application is pursuing forward, and they did provide the Village with some preliminary review comments which were included in the packets to the Plan Commission. They had some concerns about potential truck traffic on Meijer Drive and they asked the Village if we would be willing to accept jurisdiction control and maintenance of that portion of Meijer Drive which is in the Village currently maintained by the City of Rolling Meadows.

Per the intergovernmental agreement, jurisdiction and maintenance responsibility of that portion of Meijer Drive isn't triggered until that vacant lot on the north right here is developed. So, that's really what would trigger it, but as a result of this pretty significant redevelopment that would bring a fair amount of truck traffic on Meijer Drive, I think the village of Rolling Meadows is interested in asking Arlington Heights if we would be willing to consider taking that jurisdiction as a result of this development.

So, Staff has had some internal conversations about this and we've got some research that we need to do in order to analyze if this is something that would be viable. But we haven't had the opportunity to sit down with Rolling Meadows and discuss this. So, we would like that opportunity prior to moving forward with this development.

## APPROVED

Relative to parking, the site conforms to all parking requirements. Basically, it's divided up between the warehouse uses and the office uses. Because the building is to be built on spec, there are no signed-on tenants and there are no floor plans outlining what the exact size of the office area and number of employees would be, which is what our parking requirements are based on. So, the Petitioner has provided us with their best guess of what they anticipate these to be. Based on these estimates, we've calculated the parking requirement to be 169 spaces; a total of 309 spaces would be within the development on the completion of both phases, so that represents 140-space surplus. We don't believe that parking is going to be a problem here. However, I would note that if the number of employees or the size of the office spaces for the actual uses that are located in this building are different, that's going to change the parking requirements.

Relative to the traffic, the Petitioner submitted a traffic analysis in conjunction with their application. The study found that the development would have a fairly low impact on the surrounding roadway network. Specifically, there's kind of three major intersections that were analyzed. First one is the intersection of Golf Road and Meijer Road which, as I mentioned previously, is a right-in/right-out on the intersection. During the morning a.m. peak, the traffic study estimated that the development would create 26 inbound cars, and six inbound cars during the p.m. peak.

At the current full access driveway intersection, the northeast corner of the site which intersects with Algonquin Road, the traffic study estimated that there would be 75 inbound cars during the morning peak, and I want to note that 60 percent of those 75 cars would be traveling westbound on Algonquin Road and would have to take a left into the site and cross outgoing traffic on Algonquin Road. The traffic study also estimated 20 inbound cars during the p.m. peak, eight outbound cars during the a.m. peak and 27 outbound during the p.m. peak.

Finally, probably the most heavily used intersection would be the intersection of Meijer Drive and Algonquin Road. The traffic study estimated 18 outbound cars during the a.m. peak and 15 outbound cars during the p.m. peak. So, the number of trips that would be generated by the proposed development relative to automobiles are apparently low. It would actually probably be higher if the site was used as office space as it's currently built out. So, relative to automobile traffic, Staff doesn't see this to be a big issue with the proposed development.

Relative to truck traffic, there were only two intersections that are going to be primary footers for this truck traffic. The first intersection is again the intersection of Golf Road and Meijer Drive. The traffic study estimated that about 25 percent of inbound truck traffic will use this intersection. That correlates to seven inbound trucks during the a.m. peak, and one inbound truck during the p.m. peak. The other intersection analyzed was the intersection of Meijer and Algonquin Road, and all outbound truck traffic will utilize this intersection which will result in 18 trucks during the a.m. peak, inbound trucks, and five inbound trucks during the p.m. peak. Again, as I mentioned before, all trucks will use this site to exit.

The traffic study found that the Meijer Drive and Algonquin Road intersection had the capacity to handle the peak exiting truck traffic. However, they did recommend that a change to the timing on the signal here be approved by IDOT which would add I think three additional seconds to exiting traffic from Meijer Drive onto Algonquin Road. Additionally, the traffic study analyzed the Algonquin Road and Golf Road intersections, and the

## APPROVED

Algonquin Road and Arlington Heights Road intersections, and found that they had the capacity to handle the increase in truck traffic associated with this development.

So, IDOT did review this development and they've provided a preliminary review letter to the Petitioner which was provided to Staff as well. They did have some issues. They didn't really quite say if they supported the change in signal timing, they didn't, you know, categorically deny it, but I think they asked for additional modifications to the traffic study in order to analyze that. They also asked for some improvements to the right of way to bring the sidewalks up to current ADA standards. Most notably, they requested that the, or required that the full access driveway on Algonquin Road be changed to a right-in/right-out only access point. So, as I previously mentioned, 60 percent of inbound car traffic uses that intersection, and once it's changed to a right-in/right-out, it's not going to be able to accommodate for that traffic. So, the traffic study staff would request that the traffic study be revised to reflect that change that IDOT is requesting so that we can have a chance to analyze that.

Finally, the Staff Development Committee recommends that this project be continued until the February 28th Plan Commission meeting. We're certainly supportive of the concept and we believe that the subject property is suitable for the proposed use. But there are three primary issues that we think should be addressed before this project is brought again before the Plan Commission. They relate to the easement between Weber and the subject property, the changes required by IDOT and then the corresponding changes to the traffic study, and the issues raised by Rolling Meadows about truck traffic on Meijer Drive and its impact to the street and the jurisdiction and maintenance of that street.

So, that concludes the Staff presentation.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Sam. Do we have a motion to accept the Staff report?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So moved.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Second. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I see we have a couple of people in the audience this evening. Just to give you an idea of how we're going to proceed, the Commissioners will ask the Petitioner and Staff any questions that they may have. After they have gone through that, anybody in the audience that would be interested in making comments about this application can come forward and make those comments. Following that, the Commissioners will close the public portion of the meeting and the Commissioners will get to ask any additional questions and make their deliberations. So, that's the way we're going to proceed.

So, Commissioner Cherwin, if you would like to start with questions?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Sure, thanks. I saw this earlier last year in the Conceptual Committee which was then I think the Plat & Subcommittee. So, I'm familiar with the project. You know, I think it's a good overall use. I like it, but I think one of the concerns I had then was some of those screening and landscaping plan along Algonquin Road just given the size of the structure and all.

I looked at the landscaping notes in here. I think you said that there



## APPROVED

were some enhancements made, Sam. But I'd just like to ask you, I didn't see in the plan necessarily a visual of how it fits the elevation. I mean I get that the Staff is satisfied on the Algonquin Road frontage, that there is sufficient plantings. Just next to the building or I mean the parking, along the right of way? Where are those?

MR. HUBBARD: They have both. They have plantings within the parking lot along Algonquin. They have foundation plantings right in front of the building. I believe they also have some plantings in between the parking lot and the right of way to screen it.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: You know, I think for the most part, you know, given what I saw in the project earlier, I'm comfortable with it. I think that, you know, you raised good issues. The issues with, you know, Rolling Meadows, we certainly want to make sure that we come to an agreement that is reasonable with Rolling Meadows. Has there been any talk of potentially, you know, if Arlington Heights was going to be on the hook for Meijer Drive once the development in that outlot took place? Has there been any discussion with the proposed owner with Arlington Heights accepting that obligation but having some sort of cost sharing from the owner until the development of that site? Or how would you envision, you know, and maybe you guys haven't talked enough about it yet to know, but I'm just wondering if there's a way to get the owner to somehow accommodate the Village?

MR. HUBBARD: I don't know if the owner of that vacant would be --

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: No, I mean the owner of this project in order to facilitate the sort of temporary --

MR. HUBBARD: You know, it's something that the Village could ask for. I don't think we very often do it, I think it's really rare. You know, we have kicked around the idea, it was something that Rolling Meadows also raised in their review comments. But you know, I mean we're still realizing all options here.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay, and the rest of the issues, I'll just defer them and see how those turn out. But I would agree with them having to resolve obviously the IDOT issues and the Weber Packaging Solutions, but thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Jay. Commissioner Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I have a question of the developer. Is this building being built almost like a speculation since you don't have a tenant signed up for phase one?

MR. WAUTERLEK: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I saw your schedule there of construction. You're hoping to start in May and be completed at this fall. Will phase two start immediately or would that start only after phase one is leased and occupied?

MR. WAUTERLEK: It would be at a later date. The second building, as Sam had referenced, is currently occupied.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Right.

MR. WAUTERLEK: So, once that building is vacated, our intention would then be to expand the building.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Irregardless of phase one being fully occupied?

MR. WAUTERLEK: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: The other question, I was out at this site earlier today, that shared access drive between Weber and your property currently seems to be

## APPROVED

in a pretty sad condition. Is there some kind of agreement as far as the maintenance of that access drive with your truck traffic and their traffic?

MR. WAUTERLEK: There is an agreement currently. We're planning on discussing that agreement with the owner next week, so I think it would be premature to speak as to what the outcome of that discussion will be. But we are planning on having a discussion. We are planning on owning that property for many, many years and we do want a harmonious relationship with our neighbor. So, we're very hopeful we'll be able to figure something out.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, and I would think that would be important to you to come to some agreement for the maintenance of that road. That's all I have right now. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I have a question for you. Why are you pushing forward, why not continue?

MR. WAUTERLEK: So, we had this meeting originally scheduled, and these issues came up recently. So, from our perspective, it made sense to keep this meeting on the books, sort out what we could, and address the rest of the items later since they did pop up fairly recently. I guess we could have done it the other way but that's what we decided to do.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, what items are you hoping to address tonight and sort out?

MR. WAUTERLEK: I guess if any items were to come up today, it would give us more time in theory to sort those items out prior to construction season. So, it's really just the benefit of having more time to address any sort of concerns that the Village might have.

MR. HUBBARD: To clarify, I don't know if the Petitioner is strongly pushing to move forward tonight. I certainly think they would love to move forward tonight, but I think they are also agreeable to a continuance in order to resolve some of these issues.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, I was just going to restate, it seems almost as if you're asking for a second conceptual plan with the full board to make sure there aren't any other issues that are going to come out.

MR. WAUTERLEK: Correct, yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, all right. I understand that, why you're here tonight. The property, are they currently, they're not vacant, the second building is occupied, what about the first building?

MR. WAUTERLEK: The first building is completely vacant. The second building is 50 percent occupied.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: How long has the first building been vacant?

MR. WAUTERLEK: Many, many years, I'm not sure exactly. So, the prior owner owned the building, as I understand it, for five or six years. I don't know that he's ever had more occupancy than what is currently there, unfortunately. You know, and we're one of the best real estate markets that I think anyone has maybe seen in quite a while or maybe will for a while. So, I don't know that there's really much potential for future leasing in the current property as it is.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: The use seems very appropriate for where the market is going right now. I don't have any issues with the use. There's just so many open issues, I don't even know where to begin with my questions tonight, but I'm very supportive of the concept as long as you can work it out. That's all.

## APPROVED

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I concur with Commissioner Dawson.

Looking at the items three, four, nine and 10, those are, again they need to be clarified or condensed and put into some sort of packet. But you know, it sounds like a good project but there's just too many moving parts here to really, you know, give you an approval right now. We could say, all right, go to the Board of Trustees, let them work it out when you get more information, but it seems like you've had some time from when you were at Conceptual Review which was in March of last year. What went on with all those --

MR. WAUTERLEK: Some of these issues are quite new, to be honest with you. You know, so the IDOT issue, we made our submittals to IDOT, as I understand it, based upon the Village engineers, and it takes so long for IDOT to respond. Once we did receive that feedback, you know, we've responded to IDOT in kind and we've tried to address their issues.

As it pertains to the easements with Weber, legally we reviewed the current easements and we felt very comfortable with the one that's been reported. We still feel that way today. You know, I think there's been concerns, and justly so, they have been raised by people at the Village and at Weber, and those concerns were raised fairly recently which is why we haven't had a chance to address those issues. But we do have a meeting set up next week with our neighbor, and hopefully we'll have a positive outcome.

But to answer your questions, because these are new issues.

COMMISSIONER DROST: New in the sense, you knew Weber was there, you knew the easements were there, you knew that IDOT is still running Algonquin Road, it just mystifies me.

MR. WAUTERLEK: For what it's worth, we had met with an individual at Weber about two months ago just to familiarize them with the project and then, you know, get his blessing and his feedback was very positive.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Again, the project sounds really good, but there's just I think too many moving parts here that are unanswered. I'm going to defer to the rest of the Commission who may have some opinion, and there might be some folks in the audience that may shed some more light on this rather than kind of --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thanks, George. Commissioner Jensen?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes. I was in the Conceptual Plan Review meetings as well, and it seems to me that some of the issues we raised there around traffic and the use of the road and so forth haven't been well addressed here either. I share the view of Commissioners Drost and Dawson. In fact, I need to ask Sam, you mentioned a couple of things that may have even called into question the viability of this project around the easement issues. Did I hear you correctly?

MR. HUBBARD: The viability as currently proposed, if for some reason, you know, the shared private drive is not viable for the truck traffic as proposed, then they'd have to find some other way to fit that to the site.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, it seems to me, and then there is one question with the Village and as with I guess Rolling Meadows, which is how are you going to handle the maintenance upkeep and so forth on that piece of Meijer Drive that's in Arlington Heights but has been under the jurisdiction of Rolling Meadows? Isn't that really a decision for the Village? And the financing of that is something you're either going to have to assume or you're going to have to work out something with the Petitioner. So, that's something that's kind

## APPROVED

of left open as well.

MR. HUBBARD: Right.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, to me these are just too many large issues that are open for us to even further deliberate on in my opinion because you need to get the best answers you can to these various questions on what IDOT is expecting you to do, what's going to happen between the two villages' intergovernmental agreement, and with your neighbor, because all of those are just essential to this project going forward.

Having said that though, I strongly support this project as I did in the Conceptual Plan Review. I think it's a great use of the property. I think it will be a great addition to Arlington Heights. I'd love to see it come back when you've worked out all those details so we can have a short meeting and give it a stamp of approval.

MR. WAUTERLEK: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Could the civil engineer come up please? Could you pull up the area plan, Sam? So, the sewer that's going to drain at the north end goes to the Algonquin Road, that's all in order?

MR. LEDER: Well, actually it's an IDOT storm sewer that would be in the Algonquin Road.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: And you're okay with that?

MR. LEDER: Yes, sir, that's where it goes now.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Then you drain to the south into an underground detention basin which is going to mitigate -- will flow on to the south. But where is it going on to, the tollway property?

MR. LEDER: Yes. It drains now to an open ditch on the north side of the tollway.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, you're basically just continuing that?

MR. LEDER: We are continuing that, yes, it is an existing condition. What we are doing is putting a restrictor in the existing manhole to slow the rate of release down.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: This underground detention vault, is there a life expectancy on these? Because I would think it has to --

MR. LEDER: Well, they do need maintenance. But if they're maintained properly, they don't need a lot of maintenance, but if they are maintained, they don't silt up and it's like any underground storm sewer system. There's a pretty long-term life expectancy to them.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. Could the Petitioner, the other gentleman come back up please? So, the north building is going to where, on that vacant, where is the north building going to go? Well, in relation to those existing buildings.

MR. WAUTERLEK: So, the first phase of the project is over the currently vacant northern building.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: All right, so it's in the vacant lot, okay.

MR. WAUTERLEK: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Then the south is going to go, I believe the Staff report says the south is going to when the other buildings are vacated. Is there a timing for that?

MR. WAUTERLEK: There is not a time for that. So, there are lease expirations and there are options for existing tenants to renew potentially.

## APPROVED

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay. All right, then going on to the intergovernmental agreement section, Staff has reviewed the IGA and believes that the proposed development would be in substantial compliance; however, Staff believes that the issues raised by Rolling Meadows warrant further consideration. Are you talking about the maintenance of the road --

MR. HUBBARD: Maintenance and jurisdiction of the road, yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, right now, Rolling Meadows is responsible for that road until that other parcel is developed which isn't happening now. So, I mean legally it's still their responsibility now?

MR. HUBBARD: Correct.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Then we've got the IDOT review comment. So, I agree with what our Commissioners have said. There's a lot of outstanding issues here. But I think we all agree that this is a good project and we want it to go forward. So, even though there are lot of issues here with the board, with Sam and the Planning Department, et cetera, with the Petitioner, you know, for their satisfaction, I don't know that it needs to be continued. But it's certainly up to everybody's opinion on it. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thanks, Joe. Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: My question for the Petitioner here is if we were to push this thing forward, these three main outstanding issues would have to be answered before you could move on from our recommendation. Do you see a time situation that would keep you from not starting in May as you would like to, the time required to answer these three questions?

MR. WAUTERLEK: It's a difficult question to answer because some of those issues are potentially legal issues. You know, so depending on how different individuals who have the ability to make decisions in the process responded to things, then --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: But you see my question is that you can't move forward until these questions are answered. So, if you get approval here tonight, you still have to answer these three main issues.

MR. WAUTERLEK: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Does tonight's approval in any way help you or hurt you as far as getting these three main areas --

MR. WAUTERLEK: I believe it would help us. At that point, we at least know what the outstanding items are. If we're able to resolve those items, then we're certainly closer to being able to move forward on construction season, so I believe it would be a large positive for us.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Because I agree with Commissioner Lorenzini, I think that no matter what, these issues have to be addressed to the satisfaction of the Village and the Staff. But if it will help move the project forward, you know, I don't think I would be against doing that tonight. I guess that's my, I'll wait to see what the public comment might be.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I was not at the Plat & Sub, and I have some concern with this Meijer Drive. Sam, do you know anything about the history of the development of the Meijer Drive? Was that basically for them so that the Meijer development could move into Rolling Meadows?

MR. HUBBARD: That's my understanding, yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, this was done and it was a big plus for Rolling

## APPROVED

Meadows, which is probably why they picked up the liability for the drive. They wanted this to go in there. What were you saying, if something triggered, that would make us responsible for the maintenance of the part of Meijer Drive that's in Arlington Heights?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes. So, when the green lot shown there is developed which is currently vacant, then we would take over the jurisdiction and maintenance responsibilities for all of Meijer Drive that is to the right of that blue dash line in the Village of Arlington Heights.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I don't know if you can answer this. But this Meijer Drive was put into the industrial area, is it in fairly good shape?

MR. HUBBARD: It is, yes. It's in fairly good shape. It's about 15 or so years old, and it may need some maintenance in the next maybe five to 10 years. But that's one of the items that we are trying to further analyze in order to have a discussion with Rolling Meadows about that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there any reason for us to believe that that road wasn't improved to carry heavy truck traffic? It's in an industrial zone there.

MR. HUBBARD: It was built to commercial standards, so that would be specifically to allow it to support trucks.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, why would we want to pick up this on the Village, I mean the road was built for this, until that use of land is developed, I don't see the incentive for why Arlington Heights would want to pick it up if that's the way the agreement was originally drafted?

MR. HUBBARD: I mean I think at the time that the agreement was drafted, it was probably anticipated that that outlot portion in green which is fronting on Algonquin Road would probably develop fairly quickly. I don't know if we anticipated that we weren't going to hold on to it for this many years.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: How long had it been --

MR. HUBBARD: 2003-2004 maybe.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay. So, before the recession.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Because there still would have been, had the subject property been fully developed, 50 percent of the actual -- there still would have been a lot of traffic --

MR. HUBBARD: If it was fully developed and used as office uses that it's built to you mean?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Well, for whatever it was built for.

MR. HUBBARD: Right, there would be substantial car traffic.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay. That's all I have on that. I'm going to open the meeting to any public comment. Is there anybody in the audience that would like to make a statement? Let's start over here on the right in the front. If you would please come up, state your name. If you are with a taxing body, then let us know that, and you may proceed.

## **QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE**

MR. WEBER: Good evening. I'm Doug Weber, part owner of Weber Packaging, W-e-b-e-r.

LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES  
Chicago & Roselle, Illinois - Miami & Orlando, Florida  
(630) 894-9389 - (800) 219-1212

## APPROVED

MR. WINKLER: Tom Winkler, attorney with the Winkler Group in Schaumburg, here on behalf of Weber Packaging Solutions and the Joseph A. Weber Union Trust.

Weber Packaging Systems, as you can see, owns the property directly west and contiguous to the, I've referred to it as the subject parcel many times which is the parcel in question tonight. The Weber property is located at 711 West Algonquin Road, of course in Arlington Heights. Weber Packaging Solutions was built about 50 years ago, has a worldwide employee count of about 900 individuals. Its worldwide headquarters is in Arlington Heights in that building, employs about 150 individuals in Arlington Heights, making it one of the largest employers in the Village of Arlington Heights.

Just for a clarification note, the public notices that I've seen identified the subject property as 703 to 723 West Algonquin Road. Our address is in that range, but we're certainly not part of the PUD request or the plat of subdivision request.

The Weber Trust owns the, what's been noted the vacant land north of Weber Packaging, and it is about a four-acre parcel just to the south of Algonquin Road. I guess where Meijer Drive is, there north of Meijer Drive and west of Meijer Drive.

Doug Weber who is here is the president of Weber Marketing Systems. Joseph Weber, Jr. is the principal shareholder, controlling shareholder at this time. Both Doug and Joe have lived most of their adult lives here in Arlington Heights.

Weber Packaging Solutions is a very, very important asset to the Weber family and its employees, vendors, contractors, customers, truck drivers, and affiliates. The business was started by Joseph Weber, Sr., and is now in its third generation of Weber ownership and management. The family has a vested critical interest in being involved in the subject property and make certain that it doesn't unreasonably impact Weber Packaging Solutions in a material and significant manner.

A little bit of history is relevant. The Weber Trust owned the 22-acre site which is now improved with the Weber property and Meijer property. This property was sold to Meijer and it was closed in 2002. I was the attorney at that time representing the Weber Trust and Weber Packaging Solutions in that transaction. I accept the criticism or the credit for the many access or drainage easements affecting the subject property, the Weber property, the Meijer property, or the Weber Trust property. I was the principal drafter of all those documents. Furthermore, the Weber Trust built about 50 years ago the Weber Atrium building which is the south building on the subject property and is a subject of this hearing.

The Meijer building project was about a two-year-plus project which began around 1999 or 2000, involving in part, I can't remember all the parties, the Village of Arlington Heights, the City of Rolling Meadows, Oakpoint which is the north building, Meijer of course, Paddock Shopping Center, Continental Towers, the Arby's Restaurant, Pearl Vision, Mike's Muffler, IDOT, all the utility providers, and former Pappadeaux's Restaurant owners. The coordination required among all those interested parties was absolutely enormous. For a time, there were monthly meetings held at the City of Rolling Meadows village hall, and there was probably no fewer than 25 people involved in each of those meetings. The three primary issues involved in that project, which coincidentally are the issues mentioned in the Staff Development report, were as follows: (1) traffic concerns; (2) access concerns; (3) stormwater management and detention.

Our clients, Weber Packaging Solutions which is the pseudonym of

## APPROVED

Weber Marketing Systems, and the Weber Trust, do not appear at this meeting necessarily to be opposed to the project. However, because of the lack of information, due diligence, and discussion of the project, neither Weber Packaging Solutions nor the Weber Trust is in the position to support the project either. We are here to voice our concerns on the project and ask that more due diligence be conducted.

Our client did not get notice of the meeting. Joe Weber called me after the sign was erected on the subject property, and that was about two weeks ago. He called me on a Thursday, I met with him on a Friday. Joe did not express either opposition or support for the project; he just had concerns.

I will briefly discuss the three primary issues, although my comments shouldn't be interpreted as being exhaustive of all the issues on the project. First and foremost is access. The legal access to the subject property is from Meijer Drive via an easement agreement. I was the principal drafter of that easement agreement back in 2002. This easement agreement is often referred to in the context of public documents as the shared drive. The initial access as you see from Meijer Drive, what we often called the stub parcel, is completely on Weber Packaging Solutions property. There is a cross easement allowing access to the subject property. The cross easement is actually 22 feet running from north to south on the western boundary of the subject parcel, 22 feet on each parcel.

The easement is referenced in the traffic report which is in the public records prepared by KLOA. However, very importantly, it fails to reference the fact that Weber Packaging Solutions is solely responsible, solely responsible for the repair and maintenance of the shared drive. Accordingly, any changes or modifications to the road including changes to the existing curb cuts need to be approved and are the financial responsibility of our client. Furthermore, and importantly, the language in the easement agreement states that the use of the easement by any party "shall not unreasonably interfere with any of the parties' uses thereof." Weber has not been provided sufficient information to make a determination whether any of these proposed uses unreasonably interferes with its use. The financial responsibility imposed upon the Weber Packaging Solutions for the maintenance and repair of the road is also significant since the use being proposed is substantially different than the current use.

The road itself, the shared drive which also refer to as Weber Drive, was initially constructed about 50 years ago. Someone referred to it as being a little bit in rough condition. There are no reports that I have seen discussing any of the construction characteristics of that road, i.e., can withstand the semi-trailer traffic that's being proposed. It does, however, appear, and a couple of you have mentioned this tonight, that this very issue was raised at the Plat and Subdivision Committee meeting back on March 22nd. But the concern seemed to have been dismissed.

The following are just short quotes from that meeting. One of the Commissioners said that the traffic study should assess the ability of the shared drive, Meijer Drive, and the intersection of Algonquin Road and Meijer Drive, to determine their ability to accommodate the traffic that could be generated by the developer. He asked if access to the site could come from Algonquin Road. Later, another Commissioner, I'm sorry, that same Commissioner said that he was "a little concerned about the number of trucks and the condition of the roads." Then finally, near the end of the meeting, another Commissioner responded that he believes the roads were built to accommodate heavy truck traffic.

The foregoing reflects the concerns which we have. The



## APPROVED

Commissioners were asking the right questions, I don't think the correct answers were yet obtained because of the analysis not being complete. We suggest the characteristics of the existing road is a significant issue which requires some analysis since our client is financially responsible for those costs.

Issue number two, water management detention. The proposed project, the Weber Packaging Solutions parcel, the Weber Trust parcel, and the Meijer parcel all suffer, all of them, from significant long-term water management detention issues. The result of the water management studies performed over the Meijer parcel was approved and ultimately resulted in the construction of two water detention ponds, a water drainage pipe permitting water discharge into the pond in front of the Weber Packaging Solutions' main entrance near the tollway, a stormwater detention agreement between Meijer and Weber Trust, and a drainage easement between Weber Packaging Solutions and Meijer. All of the foregoing were done with the approval and mutual cooperation of the Village of Arlington Heights and the City of Rolling Meadows.

During the past week, Weber Packaging Solutions retained Christopher Burke Engineering to consult in connection with the water management and detention issues. A preliminary review was made of the RWG report. Christopher Burke issued a letter with 12 separate points just in connection with the RWG report. I won't read this report into the report but simply say it raises some very significant water retention and management issues on the parcel.

Issue number three, the traffic impact study. The traffic impact study was finalized on December 15th of 2017 and is in the record. The study referenced the access agreement but does not discuss any of the terms of the easement agreement. It also fails to mention the approval needed from Weber Packaging Solutions to construct and change the shared drive in any manner.

On page eight of the report, a section is captioned Existing Roadway System Characteristics, and the Weber Packaging Solutions plant is not even mentioned. In a letter to the Village of Arlington Heights from the City of Rolling Meadows Division of Public Works and Community Development, which was just sent on January 17th, the letter notes the following comment, it's comment number four: "Why is the existing Weber Marketing Systems traffic never mentioned in the traffic impact study? It is as if the facility is not even there."

The response from Morgan/Harbor which is the general contractor dated January 18th, 2018 simply states, "It's included." Well, I've reviewed the traffic impact study more than a few times and was unable to find any reference at all to Weber Marketing Systems' operation. The report fails to even consider basic questions such as how many available shifts are now operating at the company, how many employees are employed in Arlington Heights, how many automobiles use the easement, or how many trucks go in and out on a daily basis to the Weber facility.

The traffic impact statements of the Petitioner's other projects which are similar to this would also be extremely helpful for us to look at and review in connection with this project. We just heard this tonight, that the proposal I guess includes a right-in/right-out at, if I heard it right, at Meijer Road and Algonquin Road. That would very, very significantly -- let me back up a little bit. That may significantly impact access in and out of the Weber facility. Our client has not retained a traffic consultant, but in the event the traffic report does not more accurately reflect the impact upon the entire traffic system in a very, very busy area, it will

## APPROVED

probably need to retain somebody to take a look at that report, to conduct more of their own analysis.

In conclusion, our client is not anti-development. Our client is not here to stop this development. Our client, however, does not have enough information to provide any support for this project. It's important that the process of proving a project as proposed be deliberative and that the due diligence be exhaustive, complete, and thorough. At minimum, the three issues discussed, being access, traffic, and water management detention, have to be more fully analyzed and properly vetted in connection with the project. We encourage the Plan Commission to require a more thorough, deep dive analysis into those issues. Our client being a 50-year corporate partner with Arlington Heights and the surrounding community welcomes the opportunity to be a participant in that process. Thank you.

MR. WEBER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I can sure appreciate your concerns, and thank you for your statement. I suspect you haven't seen the conditions, the 11 conditions that were placed on this application if we were to vote for approval tonight. But let me just read one of the conditions because obviously the issue that you were raising is something that the Village is concerned about. That condition is the Petitioner shall work with Weber Packaging Solutions' property owner to ensure that the easements governing the shared access drive are suitable to accommodate the proposed development on the subject property.

So, they need to come to an agreement with you. I think a lot of what you have stated here today is really the business that needs to be addressed between you and the Petitioner and come to a resolution. If, you know, I don't know, I'd have to defer to the developers and/or architects on the Commission, but if that access drive can't be accommodated and the developer still wants to go ahead, they might need to move their building and put a driveway in. But this is something that I believe should be worked out between you.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and I think the evening is pretty short as far as working that out. It sounds like you're going to start fresh on those items, and there's more to this as you unpack it. I don't think we're ready.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Could I just, Terry, could I ask for a clarification to something Mr. Winkler just said. I just want to make sure for the record and everything we're talking about the same thing. I think the last statement you mentioned about the right-in/right-out potentially for IDOT, I think we're talking not about the, I think you might have mentioned the Meijer intersection which I agree would be pretty prohibitive. But I think we're talking about where Sam is pointing which would be direct access into the site. Is that -- okay, I just wanted to clarify.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: You also expressed a drainage concern? What brought that up?

MR. WEBER: In the 20 years, it floods in the two properties. It's always flooding.

MR. WINKLER: The Oakpoint Shopping Center, the building to the north, was, you know, flooded very, very often. I mean lots and lots of water. I think, as we mentioned, they owned the Weber Atrium building for 50 years, there was always significant flooding problems on that property. When you're driving down the tollway, you can just take a look at how the property crests, canalized by the Meijer, and it is a significant issue. The drainage pond to the north which is just on the, as I'm looking at the map there, just on the Rolling Meadows

## APPROVED

side of the Old Elk Grove Road, was required to be installed.

The other drainage is on what you call the Outlot A right here, it is what is required to be installed. Then the drainage pipe I was referring to goes into the front pond, it's right off the tollway in the front of the Weber building. There is a drainage pipe that goes through the Meijer property to the west into that pond. These were all very significant issues.

At that time, it was actually Christopher Burke that was involved in that because they did work for the City of Rolling Meadows. Not on our behalf but on Rolling Meadows' behalf.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Are you saying that these measures did not fully or satisfactorily resolve the water issues?

MR. WINKLER: You know, I think that they have. I think that to a great extent they have. I don't know about, I think they've taken care of the Meijer property there.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, flooding right now is not a problem with the properties outside of the subject property?

MR. WINKLER: But again, Doug, you could answer the issues that continue at the Atrium down there.

MR. WEBER: There's a lot of standing water.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is the Atrium the building on the subject that's 50 percent occupied?

MR. WEBER: Yes.

MR. WINKLER: The issues that, honestly, the engineer at Christopher Burke mentioned, if I read them I wouldn't understand them anyway. But again, it just raises issues that I think should be addressed in connection with it, and they have not looked at this for more than a week at this point.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can you provide a copy of that engineering report to the Planning Department?

MR. WINKLER: Absolutely. Absolutely, this is a copy, Sam, you can have it.

MR. WEBER: Like many of you, this came up real quick and, you know, we were contacted but we didn't see any of these plans until really late in the game, up until about two weeks ago. There's a lot of issues as Tom alludes to, the easements, traffic, and water.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

MR. WINKLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there anybody else in the audience that would like to make a comment? Would you please come forward and state your name and spell it for the reporter?

MR. VOGT: Good evening. My name is Fred Vogt, spelled V-o-g-t. I'm the Director of Public Works and Community Development from the City of Rolling Meadows. I appreciate being here. In regards to some of our concerns, Mr. Hubbard certainly expressed a lot of those. Mr. Winkler added on to that.

Just for the record, our concerns are primarily that of Meijer Drive in regards to the maintenance of it. As Mr. Hubbard indicated, about 15 years ago, when Meijer Drive was built for primary access to the Meijer store, the City of Rolling Meadows agreed to maintain the road within the corporate limits of Arlington Heights all the way out to and inclusive

## APPROVED

of maintaining the traffic signal at Algonquin and Meijer Drive. We're perfectly good with that continuing understanding that the intergovernmental agreement that was executed made reference to the four acres to the north and west of Meijer Drive in terms of development. We talked a little bit back then, because I was here at that time, about curb cuts and it was agreed on all sides that that was in the best interest at that time when it would be developed, to turn the road over to Arlington Heights.

Certainly in the spirit of back in 2002, with the Oakpoint and the Weber Atrium land uses being as they were, there wasn't a lot of truck traffic if any. It's significant to note that parcel which is the subject parcel you're considering tonight was certainly from Weber Packaging which was Weber Marketing at the time, but the proposal that you have certainly makes a significant increase into the traffic or the impact on the Meijer Drive with regards to the trucks and the, as we all know, one truck whether loaded or unloaded is significant compared to several other cars.

We're certainly not opposed to the site as proposed for redevelopment. But certainly we'd appreciate having the opportunity to discuss with the Village of Arlington Heights Staff about what we can agree to or get together with regards to the future maintenance of Meijer Drive given this increase with the heavy truck traffic that's proposed, whether or not the Village of Arlington Heights would be willing at this time upon this redevelopment to take over the maintenance of all of Meijer Drive or a portion of it that's impacted by this proposed development, or at least develop some sort of a cost sharing that would be in fairness to both the Village and the to the City of Rolling Meadows.

We, too, only received the information regarding this proposal a couple of weeks ago. So, we did act in some haste to have our traffic engineer review the proposed site traffic analysis. They do have some concerns I won't go into tonight with regards to potential for looking at lane modifications and the operation of the intersection of Meijer Drive and Algonquin Road. I'd certainly be happy to get into that further discussion in the future with the Village of Arlington Heights Staff.

So, we appreciate the concern; we just wanted to make sure that you know of our concerns. If there's any questions regarding the City of Rolling Meadows' position, I'll be happy to take them.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Mr. Vogt.

MR. VOGT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there anybody else who would like to make a comment? Then we'll close the public portion of the meeting and go back to the Commissioners for any additional questions or deliberations.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'd like to actually ask the Petitioner a couple of questions. If I understand this project correctly, you're going to ultimately raze all the structures that are there now?

MR. WAUTERLEK: Just the northern structure.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And the southern one you're never going to raze, you're going to basically just repurpose it?

MR. WAUTERLEK: We will eventually demolish that building as well.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: That's what I've said.

MR. WAUTERLEK: Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Ultimately, you will be razing all of the

## APPROVED

structures there?

MR. WAUTERLEK: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: If you're going to do that, why would you not consider having a better access to the east rather than trying to have a longer access coming through these existing roads which, you know, there are some substantial issues with that, things that need to be worked through? Why would you not think about running your own access road where you're not having to use a shared road and have all of these other issues that encumber that?

MR. WAUTERLEK: To do that, it would just trigger various governmental agencies and incur further cost that would then make the project unfeasible from both the timing and I guess just financial standpoint.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, you've already triggered the interest of a couple of governmental agencies, the Village of Arlington Heights, Rolling Meadows, and also the Weber family and their various holdings. So, I mean you've got a big set of issues already. I don't know what it would do to costs but what I've heard just causes me a lot of concern trying to basically squeeze more uses into these roads that really haven't been vetted and haven't worked out well.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and I would think, I'm going to sort of divide this up a little bit. This is a kind of a petition that I think probably deserves a continuance because I don't think we can push it up to the Board of Trustees at this point, because there's just too many --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I agree completely.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Too many items that are loose ends. Rather than trying to grab the individual issues, and the points were all well made that we want to concentrate on these three principal issues that Attorney Winkler had set forth, and I think that kind of brings the issue for Hamilton Partners here in the condition and basically to get to work and come back on February 28th.

MR. WAUTERLEK: Right.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I agree with that, I agree.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Shall we make a motion on that?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I can make the motion but I want to defer to the --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: There's just one other thing, one other thing. Lynn made a good point about having a brand new road, but I mean if you're going to go for the expensive building a brand new road, why not just rework an existing one --

To the Weber team, as far as drainage goes, any development to come before us requires a drainage study. We don't just take their word for it, the Engineering Department also looks at it. So, I can say with fairly good confidence that what they're putting in is probably going to make it better. It probably won't solve every flood that ever happens, but it certainly would probably make it better than what is there now.

COMMISSIONER DROST: **Then I'll make the motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees the continuance of PC#17-013, a Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Plat of Subdivision to consolidate all lots into one lot for the property, and we'll get these addresses again to the issue that Attorney Winkler had raised, 703-723 West Algonquin Road until the February 28th Plan Commission meeting.**

## APPROVED

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Do we have a voice vote, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: No, roll call.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Roll call, yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, with comment.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: My comment to Sam is that we're continuing this specifically to the February 28th Plan Commission hearing. Are we, can we be sure that these issues would be addressed by that time? That's only four weeks away.

MR. WAUTERLEK: I'm not looking to waste the Village's time and go through the process if you don't believe the issues have been resolved to the Village's satisfaction. So, if that's the case, prior to the meeting, we'll certainly notify you and keep working at it. But we're hopeful that we will resolve those items by then.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: That's the point I was making, not to come back on February 28th if you're in the same position you are tonight.

MR. WAUTERLEK: Right.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Technically, we've got a meeting on the 28th anyway.

MR. HUBBARD: We do, yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So, if there are delays, those can be addressed at that meeting.

MR. HUBBARD: Right, if for some reason --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Raise them at that time. But you have to get to work. It sounds like you have to get going.

MR. WAUTERLEK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, good luck.

COMMISSIONER DROST: But good project.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Do we have any other business?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We have a motion, do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

## APPROVED

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We're adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above-petition was adjourned  
at 8:53 p.m.)