

# APPROVED

PLAN

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

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

COMMISSION

RE: ARLINGTON DOWNS - 3400 WEST EUCLID AVENUE - PC#18-010  
PUD AMENDMENT, PLAT OF SUBDIVISION, AMENDMENT TO SUP,  
LAND USE VARIATION, VARIATIONS

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of  
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village  
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,  
Illinois on the 25th day of July, 2018 at the hour of 7:54 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

TERRY ENNES, Chairman  
LYNN JENSEN  
MARY JO WARSKOW  
BRUCE GREEN  
GEORGE DROST  
JOHN SIGALOS

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Community Development Planner

## APPROVED

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Moving on to our next petition, 18-010, Arlington Downs. Is the Petitioner here? Will anybody else be testifying with you and speaking?

MR. KLUEMPER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can we all come up and I'll swear you all in at the same time?

MR. KLUEMPER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Raise your hand.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: As you come up, if you would just state your name and spell it, okay? But let's start with the Petitioner, thank you.

MR. KLUEMPER: Thank you, Commission members. My name is Mark Kluemper, last name is spelled K-l-u-e-m-p-e-r. I'm with OKW Architects representing the Petitioner, Arlington Devco, LLC, regarding revisions to a previously approved PUD at Arlington Downs.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

MR. KLUEMPER: So, really I wanted to outline briefly the history and the rationale for presenting this before you. It really in large part is due to market conditions that, since the original PUD approved in 2012 and then subsequent revisions in 2015, there have been further developments in the marketability of the site. So, the amendments that are proposed before you to be considered tonight are an extension of that. They really drive the demand that exists with residential, the lack of demand that exists within the retail environment, further dynamics to the typical hotel that's approved for the site, as well as the existing shuttered water park. So, collectively, those changes are incorporated into a series of amendments that modify several parcels in the site and the associated variations that are requested.

So, Staff has done a really excellent job. It's a pretty detailed and complicated series of steps that we'll talk about tonight. So, I'll try to keep this part brief and I imagine you've read and enjoyed your materials that we'd welcome your questions.

So, going into the original PUD, again several lots that was primarily retail-oriented with residential on two ends of it, there is a Phase I residential which is complete now, and what we're going to talk about is producing Phase II residential along with some of the retail that was always envisioned at the corner. So, our current PUD master plan envisions a continuation of the retail quadrant which is Lot 4A at the corner of Euclid and Rohlwing. Within the ring road, approximately 28,500 square feet of retail space is envisioned within several buildings. Also within that retail quadrant, the proposed hotel which was formerly in Lot 16 at the intersection of Salt Creek Lane and Rohlwing, it is proposed to move that hotel within Lot 4A along Rohlwing Road and Stonegate Boulevard.

Then the residential component that was envisioned on Lot C is now being proposed in a reconfigured fashion between Zones C and E, Lots 3 and 5. There was originally 12,000 square feet of retail space envisioned along Lot 5, and that subsequently had been eliminated in that portion of the site. This is going to be an exclusively residential zone, housing 263 dwelling units and associated parking.

Then lastly, there's two future phase portions which are to be developed, and our understanding is that when those would become projects that the developer would pursue, they would come before this Commission again as well as the Board, seeking specific approval of those particular sites. So, one is being called ADR-III which is in Lot 3 of

## APPROVED

approximately 180 dwelling units, and then the ADR-IV which is between Lot 16 and Lot 2B of approximately 360 dwelling units.

The summary of our requests are basically that the petition has been revised consistent with the essential character of the previous approval. There are simply these different elements being relocated to different portions of the total property that require these amendments. We're trying to focus the retail and restaurant usage more in the southwest quadrant than the residential building along Lot C and 3, reconfigured with the hotel being moved in the future phase residential. That's basically the summary of our requests.

So, in terms of the character that we have, we're working from the previous approved PUD, have carried through into this version as well. The corner of Euclid and Rohlwing, we have a development sign that has a Welcome to Arlington Heights component to it, that's something that's going to be initiated in this next phase. Then the walkability factor has been maintained throughout this quadrant and the extension across Stonegate in the future phases as well. So, this is definitely a 360-degree development. There's no, we're trying to be sensitive to the fronts and backs of all the buildings and allow it to be a very walkable environment and connected to the various components.

There is a series of minor revisions that we are working through at the Staff level. Let me just point those out now, the first of which is a fire lane along Stonegate Boulevard to address the fire safety of the residential building ADR-II. So, along Stonegate is being proposed to widen the eastern portion of northbound lanes to 26 feet minimum width curb to curb, and have the building sited so it's within 30 feet of that curb line. So, we think we might have refinements and we'll be revisiting that at the Staff level to ensure that that's in compliance and approved.

The second condition, along Euclid Avenue, to better screen the Retail Buildings A and B, we're accepting of additional landscaping that's been shown in this diagram, I think it's 12 evergreen trees that front that and further screen that. The associated refuse enclosures that are exterior to the building will be oriented so that they do not face Euclid, so we'll be repositioning that and engaging it into each of those buildings. Then the additional screening of loading and associated utilities along ADR-II as well as the hotel structure along Rohlwing, we agree to all those minor Staff comments and their conditions of this approval.

So, I have a few other slides, but basically they're for reference. Just the ADR-II building itself is one of several that are being proposed, but we have already been through the Design Commission and have received a positive recommendation from them for the residential building. So, there's just a few slides that I could show the general character of what that exterior looks like. Subsequent retail buildings as well as future phase residential will again be developed at the point they proceed forward and they'll come to this Board in a similar manner.

With that said, I want to turn this over to Pat Dimmer of Eriksson Engineering, and he can go through some of the nuances of utilities and infrastructure.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Mark. Welcome.

MR. DIMMER: Hi. Again, Pat Dimmer with Eriksson Engineering, last name is D-i-m-m-e-r. Really just to touch on some of the changes that are being presented here from an overall site, really the access points are, the existing access points are all still there but you'll see the access point up to the north to Salt Creek Lane and no new access points over on the west side to Rohlwing. Then also, I know we've got the existing drive on the east side of the

## APPROVED

site and then adding, making this passage to the south of that prior building more of an actual fire lane throughway that somebody could use seeing as that parking garage for ADR-III has an access point out the back side down here on the southeast corner. So, residents could use that rear lane to access the signals at Salt Creek Lane as opposed to exiting the west side of that structure.

Then as Mark had mentioned, too, the only big change to this that would be coming was the addition of expanding for that fire lane on the west side of ADR-II. But overall, traffic and parking-wise, the site is actually a lot better in terms of there's, because of the residential towers and the parking associated with that, the more residential development, it kind of cuts back quite a bit on the shared parking that's been done in the past and analyzed for by our traffic engineers. The numbers are all better than they used to be; there's still some shared parking, but everything is still in compliance with the shared parking studies showing excess parking throughout the development based on that shared parking analysis, consistent with prior PUDs.

So, on the site, site utilities are probably the biggest changes from a site standpoint, and a lot of that is because of the reconfiguration of ADR-II. Currently, there is a water main that runs east underneath where the building is going and that turns north. That section of the water main is going to be removed and relocated around that northwest corner of that facility. The project would then connect the two, similar to what was done, planned in the past, we are connecting the water mains between the two branches internal to the site. These are private water mains. They are all metered and at the property lines, so these are all private, not public mains. Then the biggest change with the water main on the east side is that it previously ran, it was intended to run straight down this lane, this existing access road. Because of Fire Department connections to the building, we're rerouting that between the buildings and down this back side to provide better fire protection around that east side of the parking garages.

Sanitary-wise, not much has changed. The biggest change is going to be again on the east side. Instead of routing again down that access drive, we're using that rear access drive as sort of the main utility corridor through there. Stormwater-wise, we are still going to be working with Village Engineering as done in the past. We have the existing regional facility way up in the part to the northeast and it continuous a little farther east along Salt Creek Lane. That basin is providing the vast majority of the stormwater management. Onsite storage will be provided for sort of that incremental historic increase that the Village would require for their new requirements as opposed to what was done in the past.

In conjunction with that, the Sanitary District MWRD has new infiltration requirements. So, you can see all these little orange squares throughout the site; those are all intended to be, under parking lots, storage and infiltration of water into the ground. Then we would add new storage sewers connecting all those to the main infrastructure that was installed back in Phase I. There is an existing 60-inch storm sewer that runs through the site; those are sort of the bold green lines through here on site.

I just want to point out that the branch that is currently where that building is going is intended to remain there. It's a large diameter pipe, it is very deep. I want to say it's approximately about 14 feet down, so relocating that would be rather costly. Seeing as the structure itself does not have a basement in this portion, we can span that with the foundation walls and design accordingly to bridge that. Any future maintenance of that, because it is a five-foot diameter pipe, you can actually get somebody in that pipe to perform

## APPROVED

maintenance down the road that you can't do if it were a 12-inch pipe or an 18-inch pipe. So, because of the size, it kind of lends itself to being underneath that structure because you can access that and make repairs if you need to.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes, 14 feet down.

MR. DIMMER: That's about all I have from the site standpoint.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you.

MR. KLUEMPER: That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: That's all you have, okay. Is a principal here? Or Mark, can you accept the conditions 1 through 12? Have you read those, you're agreeable to those?

MR. KLUEMPER: Yes. Yes, the Petitioner is agreeable. The Applicant is agreeable to that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you. We'll move on to Staff report.

Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you. So, the property is located at the intersection of Euclid and Rohlwing Road, kind of on the western side of the Village, towards the center. The property is zoned B-2 which is a General Business District. It also has an overlay zoning district on top of it as well that's designated as mixed use on the Comprehensive Plan.

The Petitioner is proposing amendments to the previously granted PUD as well as a land use variation to allow residential uses as a principal use in the B-2 district. Traditionally, the B-2 district is for commercial uses and would have residential on upper stories. But because it's a B-2 district and it's going to be a principal use as residential on ADR-II, ADR-III and ADR-IV, they need a land use variation. The land use variation would only apply at this time to ADR-II.

Additionally, they're applying for preliminary plat of subdivision approval to reconfigure Lots 3 and 5 to accommodate for the ADR-II and ADR-III residential buildings. That means that they will have to come back before the Plan Commission for final plat of subdivision approval at a future date. Also, they're amending the previously granted special use permit for a hotel to reduce the room count from 161 to 116 keys, then relocate that hotel from Zone D, I'm sorry, to Zone D from Zone B, and allow construction of ADR-II prior to construction of the hotel. One of the previous conditions of approval from the original PUD was that the hotel had to be constructed before any of the other phases begin after the One Arlington-Sheraton redevelopment was complete. Now, they are asking to waive that condition and allow construction of other phases of development to occur prior to constructing the foundation of the hotel, and Staff is supportive of that.

Additionally, they're requesting three variations: one for parking, one for dwelling units on the first floor of ADR-II, and to waive the requirement for loading spaces on the retail and restaurant uses in Zone D.

So, the Petitioner has appeared at several commissions and committees prior to this evening. On February 28th of 2018, they appeared in front of the Conceptual Plan Review Committee and would characterize the Conceptual Plan Review Committee as enthusiastic to get this moving forward and they understood that as the market changed, so, too, could the development and they were sympathetic to that. Additionally, this appeared in front of the Design Commission on two instances, on May 22nd for the hotel and twice concluding on June 12th for ADR-II, the residential building.

## APPROVED

The Design Commission worked extensively with the Petitioner, particularly on the ADR-II residential building to work on some of the finishes and materials and exterior aesthetic. It did take two appearances for them to get approval of ADR-II, and they did end up changing some colors and materials and upgrading the garage significantly which, you know, was originally proposed without much detailing. Ultimately, both the hotel and ADR-II were approved by the Design Commission; the retail buildings, and certainly ADR-III and ADR-IV when those come forward will have to get Design Commission approval.

On June 12th, they appeared before the Housing Commission due to the introduction of some new residential areas in the development. They agreed to conform to the current Affordable Housing policy for ADR-II which requires 15 percent or 39 of the 263 units to be designated as affordable, or a fee in lieu of can be paid. They did agree to a \$25,000 fee in lieu of affordable units which is consistent with what we've gotten for similar projects. However, the Housing Commission did make a strong recommendation that the Petitioner include some of those units in the development as opposed to paying a fee in lieu of for all the affordable units.

Additionally, when the Hickory/Kensington apartment project appeared before the Village Board recently, the Village Board also made it known that they strongly prefer to see, at least to a certain extent, some of the affordable units within the development. So, Staff has recommended a condition of approval to require the developer to include some affordable units in the ADR-II building. The condition leaves that negotiation open between the Village and the developer, but we would like to see that as a recommendation from the Plan Commission and a condition of approval as well.

So, here's the aerial of the site, it's bounded in red here. You can see a lot of the areas on the property are semi-improved. They have a lot of deteriorated parking areas here to the southwest, additionally to the northwest as well. I just want to point out, one of the conditions of approval recommended by Staff was that if these areas haven't commenced development in the next 12 months, then we would ask the Petitioner to remove the deteriorated pavement and any improvements, and reinstall some landscaping in these areas. This is actually an original approval condition from 2012, they required that within five years the developer kind of green these areas with landscaping and remove any deteriorating improvements. That five years expired in 2017, so I think the Village has had a little bit of leniency with the developer and hoping to see some movement here. But again, we're going to be, we're recommending reinstating this condition that within 12 months, these areas be removed of their deteriorated parking areas and landscaped if there's no development commencing.

Additionally, I want to touch on another condition of approval that Staff recommended. We wanted to see a landscaped median in Euclid Avenue. Euclid Avenue is under the jurisdiction of the City of Rolling Meadows and the Cook County Department of Transportation, so any such landscaped median would need to be reviewed by both parties. We think it makes sense and we'd like the Petitioner to include that in their final engineering plans which will be due at time of final plat of subdivision approval. It would require obviously approval from Cook County Department of Transportation, and we would ask and require that the Petitioner be the one to maintain that landscaped median. Otherwise, since it is within the jurisdiction of the City of Rolling Meadows, it would be up to them to landscape that. We think it makes a lot of sense for the Petitioner to be responsible for that landscaping.

## APPROVED

Here you can see the previously approved plans. So, up here you'll see where the hotel was originally proposed to be. Down here were some marginal areas of retail, and then right here as well. Then this was going to be a smaller retail building, and then originally this was to be another kind of dual residential tower with about 440 units. As I transition the slides slowly, you'll see the new proposed site plan fade in here.

So, most notable areas of change are here with the new ADR-II, 263 rental residential building. The hotel of course moves down to Zone D from where it was previously approved up here. Then of course the developer is proposing future phases of residential for ADR-III and ADR-IV here as well.

One of the conditions of approval recommended by Staff was that the Petitioner revise the declaration of easements, covenants, and restrictions, because they are kind of changing up the uses here and switching some of the lots. We believe that the easements and conditions and restrictions need to be amended to accommodate for this. We want to ensure that cross access, cross parking, maintenance of all common elements are addressed satisfactorily in the declaration of easements, covenants, and restrictions. So, we're asking that that be recorded to the satisfaction of the Village, to require and plan for those elements prior to building permit approval.

So, the big issue here is parking. As you've heard, the parking has actually improved in this latest iteration of the plans. Technically, a variation is still required. The property operates on a shared parking model. While there may be a deficit relative to code requirements on certain portions of the development, on peak times that's accommodated with a surplus in other areas of the development. Relative to the latest amendment from 2015, you can see 2,526 parking spaces were required by code. Currently, under the new plan, 2,768 parking spaces are required by code, but the supply increases over what was originally amended in 2015. So, actually the deficit decreases from about 500 spaces to about 435 spaces from a code standpoint.

Relative to peak parking demand, based on the shared parking analysis, the maximum number of spaces will be used at any one time to be 2,106 spaces. Based on the supply, the actual peak parking demand surplus has increased to 227 spaces from 170 before. So, from all looks of things, parking has further improved in this most recent version of the plans.

When you look at it from a zone to zone basis, each zone while it may have a technical deficit relative to code requirements, the parking provided is always above the anticipated demand. You can see in ADR-II and III and IV, a lot of the parking demand from a code standpoint is created from these residential developments. When you consider ADR-III and ADR-IV, these are really just placeholders. I mean we don't have any proposal for these sites at this time, so it's, you know, this is just kind of our best guess of what parking demand requirements would be. But they're both parked at an estimated 1.5 spaces per unit.

I would note that ADR-II, the 263-unit rental residential building is parked at a ratio of approximately 1.5 spaces per unit. This property was originally slated for the dual residential high rise in this area and had been previously granted a variation for parking at 1.45 spaces per unit, with the condition of approval that when that development would actually move forward, the Petitioner would survey the parking at One Arlington to see if the parking ratio there was sufficient to accommodate for a 1.45 space parking ratio in the future residential areas. The Petitioner has provided that parking analysis of One Arlington; it's actually parked at

## APPROVED

closer to 1.32 spaces per unit. So, it confirms that the 1.45 previously granted variation is still applicable, and furthermore, the Petitioner has proposed parking at 1.5 spaces per unit. So, we are confident that the residential areas will not create a parking problem, and again the shared parking still conforms to expected anticipated demand and we're supportive of the parking variation.

There are a few land use variations required, one for as I mentioned principal use of residential in the B-2 district, and then one to allow residential uses on the first floor in the B-2 district. We are supportive of these variations as well. We believe that they've met the criteria for approval. The site is very unique. It's a former hotel and water park and it requires a creative approach towards redevelopment.

Additionally, the property has been vacant since 2012 relative to when the previous PUD was originally approved. This has been a hot time for the residential rental market, so the fact that these residential uses couldn't move forward during the last five years is evidence that, you know, a variation may be warranted. Furthermore, we do believe it's in compliance with the spirit and intent of the code. One of the intents of the code is to protect the character and stability of residential, business, and manufacturing areas. The Staff Development Committee believes that the proposed variations to allow ADR-II to move forward will help stabilize this area and bring on the redevelopment that I think the Village has hoped to see for the last five years, and it's not a threat to the character of the Village. So, we are supportive of both variations.

The Petitioner has also asked for a variation to waive the loading requirement. This is just for the retail and restaurant uses in Zone D, so it's these retail buildings here. They've justified it by outlining that deliveries will take place during off peak times. There are limited spaces in front of the dumpster enclosures for certain of the buildings that would allow for parking of a small delivery truck. Additionally, there is a large kind of layby lane here that could allow for a larger delivery truck, or they could park on the side of these buildings here when delivering to Retail Building A and B. We believe that this complies with the standards of approval and we're comfortable with this variation being granted and recommending approval of that as well.

So, we are supportive of the application. We are recommending approval subject to 10 conditions, I'm sorry, 12 conditions. Again, I'm happy to go through these conditions if you'd like, but otherwise, that concludes my presentation.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Sam. Can I have a motion to approve the Staff report?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And a second?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Second. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you. Lynn, you want to start on your end and the questions that you have?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes. I've been involved in all of the different iterations of this and just have some general questions. So, from 2012 to now, we've gone



## APPROVED

through a number of iterations where we've had, you know, different configurations of retail, different configurations of rental units. The theme park has changed its nature several times. I guess I'm interested in knowing what is the level of interest and commitment from other partners, companies, entities in what you're proposing now. What I'm really asking is are you trying to just divine what's happening in the market, or do you have concrete interest expressed and concrete commitments for any of this?

MR. KLUEMPER: Yes. So, speaking to the concrete interest, the main rationale for pursuing the amendments at this time is that really ADR-II, that development is anticipated to proceed forward into documentation and permit approval, upon approval of the PUD amendments. Likewise, there is interest in the hotel. If you recall, it was originally pursued with a different operator. The Vibe Hotel, which again went through the Design Commission approval process, is the operator that are interested in moving forward as soon as the approval of this amendment takes place. Thirdly, some amount of retail interest in that southwest quadrant is also anticipated to proceed, not all of the buildings are anticipated, but I think at least one would proceed into development upon approval.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, we should assume that probably with approval by the Board, you should be able to move forward and we would see some of this realized with what you're proposing now?

MR. KLUEMPER: Exactly, yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I mean this Commission and the Board have been very enthusiastically supportive of this project and we all think it's a great project. It's just gone through so many iterations, you know, we're wondering are these, you know, concrete expressions of commitment, and you've answered that and I'm pleased to hear that.

MR. KLUEMPER: Appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Another question. You have, for future developments, you have a restricted senior housing development plan proposed as I see it. You're not going to do it at this phase, it's going to be a subsequent phase if I understand it correctly?

MR. KLUEMPER: Yes, a subsequent phase.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I had, in the Conceptual Plan Review, I had some questions about really is that a sensible thing to plop down in the middle of this multi-use thing with a lot of kids and all kinds of things going on and a restricted senior housing. Is it viable? I will say that you've taken my recommendation or you may have been planning on doing it all along, you have a very good market study. So, I think you've done your due diligence and I don't have the problems that I initially had with it. There's still a nagging concern if trying to plop down a senior housing that's age-restricted in the middle of this complex is going to be successful, but you've done enough due diligence and I'm happy with what you've done. So, you know, that's for a later stage.

My last question is for Staff actually. What was the rationale for the original affordable housing where it was five percent of the housing stock and the fee in lieu was going to be \$100,000 per unit? Now we've reverted to the more standard one that, you know, that the Village required. Why did we propose the first one?

MR. HUBBARD: That's a good question. I don't have a direct answer for you. From what I understand, our Affordable Housing policy has kind of evolved over time. I think when this was originally proposed, it was right after the great recession and things were just

## APPROVED

starting to kind of turn around. So, there may have been a little bit more leniency in what was required there. Our policy has kind of evolved as we try and understand what demand is and what the market is able to accommodate relative to affordable housing.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, you were lenient once and so you didn't require 15 percent, only five percent. But the total that they'd have to pay was a lot higher than what they will under this current configuration.

MR. HUBBARD: Correct.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I do share where the Housing Commission and where the Board tends to go, I think it would be nice to see some of these things actually built out as affordable housing rather than just collecting money. So, I'm very encouraged by that. I'm very enthusiastic about the project and I think that I'm looking forward to it going forward. I don't have anything else.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Lynn. Mary Jo?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes. I, too, am supportive of the project and I will second what Commissioner Jensen has said about the affordable housing. I've seen enough projects now collecting money, I would like to actually see some affordable housing units.

My only question is related to the hotel in the fact that there is now this family entertainment center, well, there used to be one there so I guess there's always been a family entertainment component to it. Who is the primary market target of the Vibe Hotel? What would be the demographics of that? Is that a family, is that younger, is that business?

MR. KLUEMPER: Well, I can't speak to who actually will use it, but the Vibe as a brand, my understanding is it's targeted to younger occupants. So, millennials are one of the younger demographic groups that I know the Vibe has tried to brand themselves around.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Okay, my only concern, and I have a hard time seeing it specifically on the plans, is if there were families as guests of the hotel, making it to the Funtopia. I want to make sure that, you talk about walkability, I want to make sure it's truly walkable and we don't have young children going through parking lots in order to get there. Is there a sidewalk along that roadway that takes them right from the hotel to the front of One Arlington?

MR. HUBBARD: There are sidewalks, they have crosswalks.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Okay, that is my only question. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I, too, have a question about the Housing Commission. My question is if we have the ordinance that gives you the option to pay money or to build the units, are we throwing them a curve ball by changing our mind in the middle of the project? I mean is it written as an ordinance one way or the other?

MR. HUBBARD: It's our policy to accept one or the other.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, at this point, we're verbally changing our requirement? Is that something we've done before as a Village?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, I think we're pushing for a more inclusive model. So, I don't know if we've had this much push for that to date, but it is kind of a change of what we'd like to see moving forward.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Should we change the ordinance if that's what

## APPROVED

the push is? Instead of encouraging them, strongly encouraging them, you know, are we strong-arming them into this? In other words, an ordinance is something you can read and you can follow, but --

MR. HUBBARD: I think that's a great point. I think, you know, it's worth revisiting. You know, maybe there is language that could go in there that specifies, you know, maybe it's five percent of the 15 have to be included, you know, within the --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'm not trying to renegotiate. I'm just wondering, it's a little bit of an oddity the way it is worded here, that it's something we haven't done but we would like to see it. Yet we have an ordinance that says you have this option or this option. So, I just think, you know, there's a negotiation built into this condition here. Are we stating that it has to be a built-out unit or are they just negotiating the strong encouragement by Staff?

MR. HUBBARD: I think we'd like to see actual units within the ADR-II being designated as affordable, and I think how many units is what we're trying to figure out.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Can you do that legally if there is no ordinance written that says that you should do that or you want to do that?

MR. HUBBARD: I believe we can and that's why it's a condition of approval.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: We shall see. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Commissioner Drost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I echo the same sentiments as the Commissioners have previously stated, and I've only got one comment. This is sort of one of these plan to the market on longer term plans. In future, is there a way that we can handle this administratively rather than having to go through the Commission process? If an, you know, an original approval of the plan doesn't make it economically feasible or because market conditions changed, that the smaller changes to a plan can be handled administratively as opposed to having to come before the Plan Commission?

MR. HUBBARD: Sure, the Village could approve kind of an envelope of what's allowed in the general development parameters. It hasn't been done in this case, but that's something we can certainly look into.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I mean from the standpoint of moving things along, this is a larger project, it's important to the Village and there may be some efficiencies here that can be incorporated in a larger PUD. Again, looking at longer term ones, when you start in 2012 and we were here when that all came in, you know, some of the bloom is off the rose a little bit and, you know, you're coming into market reality, that there is something that can be done to kind of expedite the process for the developer.

MR. HUBBARD: I think these were some pretty major changes, I don't know if --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, they're major, but I'm just talking in terms of, again longer term phases of projects and there are forces that make the developer rethink what is economically feasible and that it's in keeping with the spirit of the original project and is not detrimental to the spirit and to the actual realization of the developer's plan.

MR. HUBBARD: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DROST: That's it. That's just a broader comment.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. John?

## APPROVED

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I really don't have too many questions that haven't already been raised. Again, I've been part of the Comprehensive Plan Review and, or I'm sorry, the Conceptual Plan Review Committee and previous Plan Commission hearings. What would be your timeframe, assuming this is all approved and that Village Board approves it, as far as moving forward on this? Because I've seen so many of these coming but I haven't seen much action here other than the initial conversion of the Sheraton Hotel to the residential units.

MR. KLUEMPER: Sure. Well, as I had previously stated, the ADR-II project as well as the Vibe Hotel would start immediately after approval into development of documentation that would be submitted for permit. So, it's more --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Do you have the documents prepared or you haven't started the development of the documents?

MR. KLUEMPER: The documents are in development. The majority of the work has been done basically, but we would complete that documentation and submit it for permitting.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, we would see this starting maybe later this year?

MR. KLUEMPER: Activity later this year.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: This year.

MR. KLUEMPER: Is what we would probably anticipate.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: My only last comment, I'd like to just go on the record again with this affordable housing that again I've seen so many projects come before us and the developers paying a fee in lieu of and none of the affordable housing being built. I'd sure like to see that pursued more not only for this project, but for other projects. I know this last one we had, the Hickory/Kensington, that didn't have, again there was a fee in lieu of, and I just want to go on the record that I'd like to see more affordable housing units become available in our community. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Mr. Kluemper, I'm not sure that you're the person to answer this, but I have a question that's kind of market related. That is, is it fair to say that these changes illustrate a reduction in the economic intensity of the original proposal? I mean we're going smaller, right, on the residential stuff and we're eliminating some of the retail?

MR. KLUEMPER: Yes, there's a minor reduction in the retail floor area.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, because I thought the courtyard was going to be, you know, the corner along Euclid, that that was going to be pretty much all retail and restaurants. Now we're moving hotels down into that?

MR. KLUEMPER: Collectively, the hotel --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Or I shouldn't say hotel, it's residential.

MR. KLUEMPER: The hotel is moved into that quadrant and further reduces some amount of retail spaces. Apologies, I don't have the numbers in front of me, but it's relatively minor. I think there was maybe a total of 60,000 square-foot of retail space originally throughout the site. With the hotel and the active retail and restaurant activities, it's collectively in the 32,000 square-foot range. There's also an additional retail presence for the co-working space that's currently in the first floor of ADR-I. So, there's likely an increase overall if you factor in the ADR-III and IV in terms of residential intensity.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Now, that co-working space, that's primarily office,

## APPROVED

right?

MR. KLUEMPER: It is, yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes. Does the residential development have to get to a certain level to act as the catalyst to get retail to commit? Am I saying that right?

MR. KLUEMPER: I'm purely speculating, but I would imagine there is a critical mass of residents locally that would be an automatic attractor for the retail.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Irrespective of how much of the residential you develop and you complete?

MR. KLUEMPER: Well, considering that the residential, there's a demand for residential which is why ADR-II would commence construction shortly after approval, that there would naturally be an increase in demand for retail in the area based on the number of residents.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, but we haven't seen any of the retail take off yet.

MR. KLUEMPER: Well, mainly it would come after the second phase residential development.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, that's all I have. Is there anyone in the audience that has any questions or comments? If we can ask this gentleman to come up? Please state your name.

### **QUESTIONS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

MR. CAVENAUGH: Sure. My name is Rick Cavanaugh, I'm president of Stoneleigh Companies. I haven't been sworn in. Do I need to --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Shame on you.

MR. CAVENAUGH: I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Well, then let me quickly do that.

(Witness sworn.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you.

MR. CAVENAUGH: Stoneleigh Companies is the managing partner of One Arlington. We are also the current managing partner of the land that is ADR-III that is being contemplated here. We are also the sole owner of Lot 5 within the development, and we are also the managing partner of the Esplanade Shopping Center next door.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

MR. CAVENAUGH: So, we have been here since we started construction in June of 2013 on One Arlington. Your question about the residential-retail interaction I think is an important one to consider. We've been very successful with One Arlington. Today it's 98 percent leased.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Congratulations.

MR. CAVENAUGH: The Esplanade Shopping Center when we bought it in 2012 had two tenants, and they're now 100 percent leased, thank goodness. I think what we have observed over the last five years since we built the Tower, renovated it, and considered what was going to happen with the residential parcel which was to the east which is now Lot 3 and Lot 5, and in conjunction with the developer, we don't own the retail or the water park land, the Petitioner here does, but obviously we have a vested interest in seeing them successful and

## APPROVED

getting rid of some of the parking lots they're building out there.

It's been an interesting relationship between those. We built the apartments, they leased up fairly quickly, then we saw the demand come in for the co-working space. We're also the owner of the co-working at 25 North which was done very well and we've expanded the entire retail within the building and filled up all of that office space on the first floor. In my opinion, you know, operating and managing the Tower and dealing with the residents in that, I do think you need a little bit more of a critical mass of residential there to help support the retail. Retail users in the area, having bought the center next door that was primarily vacant and had Dr. Hicks build his, you know, the dental building there, and see how that evolved over time, part of that was driven by the addition of the residences of One Arlington. So, the need for restaurants, the need for inlying retail I think is driven in part by the fact that you have users that will occupy and live and walk within the community.

The original concept for our building was to create a mixed use community here that had a critical mass that operated and thrived on itself, not just having the Tower by itself standing there.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Right.

MR. CAVENAUGH: In working with Devco over the years and seeing the demand and the potential tenants come and go for the retail uses, and looking at what is required just in the sheer investment that has to happen with the site, the stormwater and MWRD, all the utilities, ComEd and everything else we've had to deal with at the site, it's expensive to build stand-alone retail for six, eight, 15,000-foot buildings without having the rest of the site work and the land development happening. So, that investment has probably prohibited the retail from thriving sooner which is part of the reason why we rethought and kind of reconceived the residential use on Lot 3 and Lot 5 and reconfigured it. The original two high rises that were there, you know, there was perception in today's market given rents and construction costs, it's not feasible to build 19-story buildings on that space with all the structured parking. So, the opportunity to do a five-story building with a structured parking deck is much more in keeping of what you've seen happen in multifamily around the country in relatively suburban-urban areas.

So, I think the plan that's being presented tonight is a much more sellable, financeable, and economically justifiable plan than what we had before from 2012. In 2012, it was a difficult time to imagine how you could have a \$300 million development survive and, you know, you throw things and you see how it works. So, I think the revised plan with the reduction of the retail, the increase of the residential, and the solution of some of the site work and the simplification of the off-site work that has to happen with this is important in order to drive that and get more going. You know, as the owners of the Tower, we are certainly interested in seeing additional work happen in there, and we want to see more activity, we want more people, we want more traffic. We want it to be more of a, you know, regional collection center, not just a Tower standing there by itself.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Right.

MR. CAVENAUGH: So, we are supportive of the amendment that Devco has presented here, and we, too, want to see something happen and get some activity and some additional interest. I think we've done very well with what we've had so far. We want to see more of it, and it will help the economics of our building, it will help the economics of the center next door, and it will certainly justify the economics for them to take the risk and develop

## APPROVED

and finance the remainder of the project.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thanks for that perspective.

MR. CAVENAUGH: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Appreciate it. Is there anyone else that has a comment? Questions? Would you please come forward? Tell us your name and spell it please.

MS. PAYNE: Good evening. My name is Elizabeth Payne, P-a-y-n-e.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Hi, Elizabeth.

MS. PAYNE: Hi.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I don't have to swear you in.

MS. PAYNE: Thank you. I'm here this evening on behalf of the City of Rolling Meadows. Here, we're not opposed to the project but we would like to have our comments on the record as well.

Firstly, probably most straightforwardly with regards to building a landscaped median along Euclid, we have no objection provided that it is the Petitioner that has the maintenance of it as Mr. Hubbard did indicate would be the intent. Secondly, in our review of the documents that were provided on the website with regards to this petition, the traffic study did call for a southbound right turn lane to be provided at Rohlwing Road. However, the traffic study did not provide and we cannot locate in the documents timing with regards to the development of that particular improvement.

It was our understanding that with the beginning of Phase II, that that development would be begun as well. We of the city are not opposed to having further discussions with the rest of that. We're certainly open to discussing the timing of it and whether or not the project will warrant it given the future traffic and parking studies. But we would like to have that discussion as well.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You're in the process of addressing that with the Village?

MS. PAYNE: Yes, we have reached out to the Village of Arlington Heights with regards to that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay.

MS. PAYNE: Another thing which we have reached out to the Village of Arlington Heights as well is additional improvements along Rohlwing Road. We are requesting that a five-foot wide sidewalk be installed within the right-of-way along Rohlwing Road. Initial plan review comments way back in 2012-2013 did request streetlights, at that time there were going to be I believe three curb cuts into Rohlwing Road which would have triggered those streetlights. But we would still like to see them included in the project.

Finally, this evening, we have a small, well, maybe not so small, we have a request with regards to the setback of the hotel. From what we could see on the plans, the hotel is set back 15 feet from the property line. We would like to see consideration given to a slightly larger setback of 30 feet to be in line with the properties from what we could understand the setbacks would be along Euclid Avenue and in conjunction with the setbacks within the City of Rolling Meadows. I'd like to thank you for your time this evening.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Elizabeth. Is there anyone else that would like to comment? Would you please come forward? State your name and spell it please.

MR. JANČEK: My name is Chris Janček.

## APPROVED

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Hi, Chris.

MR. JANCEK: I live in Rolling Meadows, I back up to Euclid.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Chris, could you spell your last name please?

MR. JANCEK: J-a-n-c-e-k. So, my concerns are obviously on noise, light pollution from the buildings that are there. I mean we're already dealing with the light, because my house actually is right where traffic goes in and out on Euclid for the Arlington Tower there. So, any time a car comes out, their headlights are shining right towards the back of my house. I do have a fence there and it's not as bad in the summertime, but the light that comes off like anything over there, I mean the whole back of our house that's in there area are lit up. The backyards are lit up. I mean at night, you can walk out there and don't need a flashlight. So, putting up that large apartment complex that close to the road with, you know, full-time residents there, it's only going to add more light. That's concerning.

The other is the garbage trucks that are coming and going, you know, extremely early in the morning, you know, before hours of when they should be operating. You know, I'm hearing that. Snow plows during the winter, all hours of the night, dropping blades, backup alarms going. You know, we're already dealing with that, with just what's there now. So, with everything else that's proposed to go in there, I mean that's a lot more noise and a lot more light.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, you're on the south side of Euclid?

MR. JANCEK: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You say your house is just across from the drive in to the race track?

MR. JANCEK: Yes, from where it goes into the Tower there for your entrances that are current.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, okay.

MR. JANCEK: Yes. Yes, we're on the south side there. Yes, when we look out, that street looks straight into that drive. So, those lights are basically kind of in my neighbor's house to the east of me.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: The fences along those properties, is that all one uniform like stockade fence?

MR. JANCEK: It is not.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: All different.

MR. JANCEK: If there's any kind of a privacy fence there, it's provided by the homeowner. The fence is an old dilapidated chainlink fence that I believe the county owns, and we all know how Cook County maintains. So, because they came through and mowed and just shredded garbage and everything all over the place today, that eventually blows into all of our yards.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes, nothing I can do about that.

MR. JANCEK: No.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: But as far as garbage trucks being out too early, that's something you can call the Village and they'll put you in contact with the right people.

MR. JANCEK: Okay.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sam, is there, I mean light from the hotel should not, it should not be going over the property line, correct?

MR. JANCEK: It's the lights at the entrance is what it is. They're bright

LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

Chicago & Roselle, Illinois - Miami & Orlando, Florida

(630) 894-9389 - (800) 219-1212



## APPROVED

enough to where, like I say it shines in the back of our house.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, but you're talking about the apartment development being a problem, too?

MR. JANCEK: Yes, I'm just concerned about all of the additional lighting that's going to go in, you know, I guess like the light pollution from that is going to be so much more over there besides just what's currently there. I mean we've already noticed it with just what's going on in there now, you know. Obviously, plus the lights, the noise from the additional traffic going in and out of there now. We've been there 15 years in our current location, so I mean it's definitely increased.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you for your comments.

MR. JANCEK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there anything that can be done about the headlights crossing the street?

MR. HUBBARD: I mean if you live across from a drive aisle, I mean that's something we try to plan for. But if it's an already existing drive aisle, there is not too much that can be done. Certainly the homeowner who can plant landscaping on, you know, their side of the fence, but it sounds like that's already done, but maybe some more evergreens for year-round screening.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: There was one ore lady in the back? Good evening.

MS. PACHECO: Hello.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, would you like to give us your name and spell your last name?

MS. PACHECO: Dane Pacheco, P-a-c-h-e-c-o. I also live right across the street, a few houses from them. First of all, I just talked to many neighbors that did not even receive, they did receive it but they did not know that they got this notice because it looked like junk mail. I almost threw mine away. Even though right now three of the houses on our block are vacant, and two of them are rentals, one family has four kids so they cannot come today, basically not very many people showed up because of the house situation right now. But not only the garbage truck noise, but if the backs of the buildings are going to be to Euclid, we get the, the wind comes from the north, so right now we always smell the race track because --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: You live next door, yes.

MS. PACHECO: So, then we would also be smelling their trash because of when it comes from the north across to us. So, if the buildings are there, we would get all that trash.

But as far as the hotel, that's my more concerning issue is the hotel. Within a mile away, there's three other motels. We know the problems that those motels have.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: What kind of problems?

MS. PACHECO: The Motel 6 right across the bridge, there's always police there like every single day for whatever the issues are.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, well, there's nothing I can do about that.

MS. PACHECO: Well, but if there's going to be another motel there or hotel, whatever on Rohlwing Road, that's going to be much closer to our house. Is there going to be anything that, any way to provide that it's going to be safer?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: There's not a lot we can do to control who comes into

## APPROVED

the neighborhood, but we have a very low crime rate.

COMMISSIONER DROST: One of the best.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER DROST: One of the best, safest city, villages, municipalities.

MS. PACHECO: That's what I'm just afraid of with the motel being there. As far as the noise, the light, seeing the light, a lot of times we also see the humming or buzzing from those tall tower lights. So, if there is going to be more lighting, is there going to be more noise pollution probably that's coming from the lights, like the electric current through the lights or something, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can somebody comment? Do the lights make noise?

MR. CAVENAUGH: I think from the lighting standpoint, you know, the parking lot lights that are required, the big hats that are on the driveway are something that are driven by the ordinance. They're all LED lights in our site, when we did the building, we did everything LED in the entire site. The lights on the top of the building that circle the building and also the lights within the units are all LED. So, those don't include transformers that drive noise and create pollution out of that apartment building. In One Arlington, when you look at that tower at nighttime and you see it, and how resident's lights are and the fact that we've got 97 percent dimming shades on every window, produces a lot less light than the hotel use that produces within that development. There's a lot less parking lot lights that exist today.

I'm not sure what the plan is within the retail side as far as replacing some of the lights that have already been taken down or fallen down in the parking lots. But there are substantially less because most of them are sitting back in, right now that have been taken down. All of the lights that we installed on the ring road going in are all LED towers. So, from a light pollution standpoint, part of that is just what's required by ordinance, part of it is what's required by Engineering as part of lighting for retail uses and drive lanes and fire lanes that are out there.

Maybe there's a bad light or two out there in the old parking lot lights that buzzes, but the Tower itself, the LED lights just don't buzz. They're driven by the low voltage wires so they don't produce the sound pollution for that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: The parking lot lights, the old parking lot lights will eventually probably all be gone?

MR. CAVENAUGH: They would all have to be replaced yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, that's going to improve.

MR. CAVENAUGH: Because the standards of the new lights that the Village requires on sites when you get a permit to develop, it will all go to the LED lights and will go to more of the thin tower lights that produce slightly better light for a lot less wattage being used. So, the old lights are the old metal halide lights is what they call them. Those do buzz a little bit. There are, as I said, there's less than half of what there was before. So, I think those lights will be replaced over time with more energy efficient lights according to the current energy codes on the site.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you again.

MS. PACHECO: I guess I'm just more worried about the hotel, especially with the transient thing, the safety of the kids.

## APPROVED

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes. I don't know about transients being in the hotel but --

MS. PACHECO: No, the other hotels, people actually live in them and that's all within a mile of where that's at.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you. Is there anybody else that has a comment?

MR. CAVENAUGH: One more comment, sorry. I apologize, I forgot to bring this up earlier. I appreciate Commissioner Drost's comment about the simplification of the process. I would ask, being the one who controls the declaration process from the Tower standpoint because we're the first ones to build, we kind of manage that and oversee it, I think it would be beneficial that when we have to make amendments to the declaration and to the plats, that be dealt with a little more administratively than we've had to in the past.

One of the fears we have as the developer and as we've looked at changes on this as it's evolved is that the time and the effort and the process of what we have to go through as we continue to cut this up into smaller pieces doesn't diminish. So, it was as much work, it will be as much work to do a two-acre parcel as it was to do 32 acres originally. I think the declaration, one of the things we have been talking about internally with the Petitioner is trying to create a master declaration so that sub-declarations within the retail site to manage theirs still honor the master but they don't have to go through laborious legal process and drafting. It's very expensive to do these things.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Oh, I know.

MR. CAVENAUGH: So, I encourage some type of simplification as this gets, as smaller and smaller pieces have become manageable versus the larger PUD concept that we had seven years ago when we first started this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I can appreciate that. Thank you. So, I'm going to close the public portion of the meeting and go back to the Commissioners. I don't know if there's any other questions or do we have a motion?

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

**A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC#18-010, a proposed amendment to PUD Ordinance Numbers 12-006, 12-037, 12-039, 14-025, 15-049, and 18-019, to allow modifications to the approved development plan for Arlington Downs; a Land Use Variation to allow a residential use as a principal use in the B-2 District for 'ADR-II'; Preliminary Plat of Subdivision to reconfigure Lots 3 and 5 to accommodate for the proposed 'ADR-II' and 'ADR-III' residential buildings; an amendment to the hotel Special Use Permit to reduce the number of rooms from 161 to 116 to allow the hotel within Zone D; and to allow for development within Zone C prior to constructing the foundation of the hotel, along with the following Variations:**

1. **A Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.4, to reduce the required onsite parking from 2.768 spaces to 2.333 spaces.**
2. **A Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-11.4(a), to allow dwelling units on the first floor on Lot 5A.**
3. **Section 10.7, *Schedule of Loading Requirements*, to waive the requirement for two (10' x 50') off-street loading berths for the retail/restaurant uses in Zone D.**

## APPROVED

This approval shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat of Subdivision approval is required.
2. A PUD Amendment will be required for the ADR-III and ADR-IV development sites when a project for those properties has been proposed.
3. The previous approved ordinances shall be amended as outlined in Exhibit 1.
4. Prior to Final Plat of Subdivision approval, the Petitioner shall:
  - A. Modify the plans for ADR-II as necessary to comply with fire lane requirements as mandated by the Village.
  - B. The Petitioner will revise the landscape plan to incorporate 12 additional evergreen trees along Euclid Avenue to screen the rear areas of Retail Buildings A and B.
  - C. Provide a revised site plan that shows the dumpster enclosures for Retail Buildings A and B as part of the building via a wing wall and the opening for these enclosures to be facing away from Euclid Avenue.
  - D. Provide better screening for the mechanical and loading/delivery area at the rear of the ADR-II. Such screening may require a screen wall.
5. The developer shall work with Staff to include a certain portion of the 39 required affordable units on site and shall pay a fee-in-lieu for the difference, compliant with the Housing Commission motion from June 12, 2018.
6. Prior to building permit issuance, the Petitioner shall provide the Village with a copy of the amended declarations, covenants, and restrictions for the PUD. To the satisfaction of the Village, this document shall provide for reciprocal access, parking, and shared maintenance amongst all developments within the PUD. The revised document must also contain language that addresses payment responsibility for water loss between the master meters and individual meters within the development to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department, or alternatively, the developer can enter into a separate onsite utility and maintenance agreement to address the concerns from Public Works (for review and approval by the Village).
7. Impact fees for ADR-II shall be required at the time of building permit issuance, compliant with Village Code.
8. The removal of any debris and dilapidated concrete/asphalt, and the replacement of any dead landscaping within each zone will be required if construction within any zone has not commenced within 12 months of approval of this PUD Amendment. Additionally, if at any time during construction within any zone said construction ceases for a period of 12 months, then that zone shall be cleared of debris, construction material, and landscaped to the satisfaction of the Village.
9. The Petitioner shall explore construction of a landscaped median in the Euclid Avenue right-of-way and shall construct said median if determined to be feasible by the City of Rolling Meadows and Cook County Department of Transportation. All maintenance costs for this landscaped median will be the responsibility of the property owner.

## APPROVED

10. **The AC units located in the front yard of the hotel building shall be screened with a screen wall that is architecturally compatible with the hotel building and provides complete screening of the units (three sides). Alternatively, these units can be relocated to the roof of the building and appropriately screened.**
11. **Prior to zoning approval being granted for future development of ADR-III and ADR-IV, the Petitioner will need to survey the existing parking within One Arlington and ADR-II to determine if the parking ratios for these developments adequately capture their parking demand.**
12. **The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.**

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll second the motion.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Are there any further discussions? No? Can we have a roll call vote?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, with comment.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Jensen?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, my comment goes to the issues that Commissioner Green raised. If the Village wants to encourage more affordable housing rather than just fees pay, I think we need to revisit that part of the code so that we don't end up in a very odd position where we're, you know, encouraging or nudging people to do something that's really not required by code. I think it puts us in an awkward position. I think it ought to be reviewed and there ought to be more clarity on that. I hope it ends up on the side of encouraging more affordable housing.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I would second that. So, you have a unanimous approval. Is there a date for the Village Board meeting?

MR. HUBBARD: Tentative date for the second meeting in August.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, good luck and happy building.

MR. KLUEMPER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Just a comment. I really didn't say anything about the affordable housing, but I totally agree. I think that we're making too many variances to the code, we're not ending up with affordable housing and I think we need to do something, if we want this to work, to do it better. I don't think it was ever the intention to build

## APPROVED

up a war chest of dollars, because what are we going to do with it? We're not going to go build one building that's going to be all affordable, I don't think.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Bike lanes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Bike lanes, there we go.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Bike lanes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: That's another subject. Okay, but anyways, so our next meeting is?

MR. HUBBARD: Going to be --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Beginning of August? Do we have --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: There's an issue with holidays, right?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, with the --

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Well, that's the 29th. We rescheduled --

MR. HUBBARD: That's the 22nd. Yes, we're looking to reschedule the meeting on the 22nd to the 29th. I believe Mr. Enright may have something on for Chapter 28 Amendments for the first meeting in August. I will have to double check. There's no Plan Commission petitions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Maybe you could send us a copy of the zoning for the Affordable Housing so that we can review that.

MR. HUBBARD: I can do that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: In our free time. Is there any other business? Can I have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And we're all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, good night, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for coming.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 9:07 p.m.)