

# APPROVED

PLAN

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

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

COMMISSION

RE: SIGWALT 16 (37-45 S. CHESTNUT AVE. & 36-40 S. HIGHLAND AVE.) - PC# 19-005  
PUD, REZONING FROM R-3 TO R-7, SUBDIVISION, VARIATIONS

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of  
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village  
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,  
Illinois on the 26th day of June, 2019 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

TERRY ENNES, Chairman  
MARY JO WARSKOW  
JOE LORENZINI  
BRUCE GREEN  
SUSAN DAWSON  
JOHN SIGALOS  
JAY CHERWIN

ALSO PRESENT:

BILL ENRIGHT, Planning & Community Development Deputy Director  
JACOB SCHMIDT, Assistant Development Planner

## APPROVED

CHAIRMAN ENNES: This meeting of the Arlington Heights Plan Commission is called to order. Welcome, everybody. Would you please all rise and join us in the pledge of allegiance?

(Pledge of allegiance recited.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Please be seated. Jake, would you please call the roll?

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Here.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Drost.

(No response.)

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Jensen.

(No response.)

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. SCHMIDT: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Here.

MR. SCHMIDT: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Here. Have all public notices for both of the hearings that we have this evening been posted?

MR. SCHMIDT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, our first item of business this evening is to approve the minutes from our last meeting on June 12th. There were three petitions that evening: Dogtopia, Arlington Downs, and 1400 West Thomas. I trust everyone received --

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I make a motion to approve the minutes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I trust everyone received them. I'm sorry, Mary Jo, what did you say?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes, just making a motion.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, and would you --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anyone opposed?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I will abstain. I wasn't here.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I wasn't in that meeting also, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: It was very lonely on this side of the desk; it was just me.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Everyone else votes yes? Okay.

Let's see. Our first petition of the evening is the Sigwalt 16, 37 through 45 South Chestnut Avenue. Is the Petitioner present?

## APPROVED

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Would you and anyone else that's going to speak with your group please come forward and we'll swear you in? Please raise your hand.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, and whoever is going to start, as you would speak, if you would please state your name and spell it for our court reporter?

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Marc McLaughlin, M-a-r-c M-c-L-a-u-g-h-l-i-n.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Would you tell us about your project?

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes, thank you. So, yes, I'm Marc McLaughlin, I'm the land entitlement manager with Taylor Morrison. Along with me is Mark Hopkins and Eden Richards of HKM, and Mike Firsel of Firsel Ross, our legal representation.

Real quick about Taylor Morrison. We are the America's Most Trusted Homebuilder for four years in a row, that is by Life Research Magazine. Over 30,000 surveys per year is how they calculated who ends up being the most trusted homebuilder. We are that for 2019 and we expect to hit it again for 2020. Our national, we're the fifth largest homebuilder in the US. We currently operate in 17 markets and nine different states. For the Chicago division, we're expecting to close 110 homes this year. We currently have 11 active communities: Hawthorn Woods, Lake Barrington, Lincolnshire. Then we also have 10 communities in planning: Barrington, Libertyville, and Rolling Meadows, which is actually just a four-minute drive from here.

I want to leave this here for a quick second. I'm going to introduce Mike Firsel to go over our project overview. He had done a little bit of our variation requests, a little bit of how we're developing this. But that is the rendering from HKM of what we propose to build.

MR. FIRSEL: Hi, good evening. Michael Firsel, F-i-r-s-e-l. It's good to see you all.

So, the Petitioner is proposing a new class A row home residential for sale development. The parcel is just under an acre at 41,939 square feet. On the southern, I believe around one quarter of Block 425, located between Sigwalt on the south, Highland Avenue on the east, Chestnut on the west, and adjacent to and immediately south of the Arlington 425 proposed development. The vision of the existing master plan is an all residential development in an R-7 zoning which is exactly what is planned here.

There are six existing legal lots on the property. The proposal is to consolidate and subdivide those lots into a new PUD. There will be 16 townhomes built in three separate buildings, and then two outlots, for a total of 18 total legal parcels. We're requesting an underlying zoning for the entire project of R-7. Each building will be fee-simple ownership, and each homeowner will be a member of the association and will pay their proportionate share of the common area, maintenance upkeep and repair.

The variances requested are very few in nature. Most significantly, there is no height, density or parking variation requested. Each residence will have a two-car garage. There is a possibility, should a homeowner choose the option, to create a third spot which would be a tandem spot inside of their garage; hence, the request for the tandem variance. There will be eight surface parking spaces for guests. Since the total parking of 40 spots will exceed more than 50 percent of what is required, we need a variance for having too much parking. Haven't heard that much lately, but we are requesting that variance to certainly

## APPROVED

comply with your ordinances.

The other variances, which I'm sure Bill will go through, deal with some by necessity because since each lot is going to be a, each home will be a separate lot, obviously there aren't side yards and things like that that we can satisfy. I did not see anything in the Village code for separate townhome type of developments into separate lots that didn't need any variances like this. Obviously, there is an eight-foot dedication on each of the east and west of the property which basically shrinks the property on both sides, which causes us to require a setback. Other than that, they are three to four-story units.

There are no extending balconies. All the balconies would be on the top of the development. If we go back to the plan, you can see the folks standing on the development, standing on the roof in that area. Obviously, all of the HVAC and other utilities, both on the roof as well as at ground level, will be fully screened. As you can see, there is a lot of landscaping involved.

On that note, I'd like to ask Mark Hopkins from HKM to go through the architectural elements of the project. Thanks.

MR. HOPKINS: So, it's Mark Hopkins, 43 South Vail, HKM Architects. Mike got a good leap on talking about the architecture. It's substantially similar to what you saw last time on the preliminary round. We've gone through a couple of rounds with Staff, working with Planning Staff, and then making tweaks to the plans and architecture also with the input of the Design Commission. So, what you have tonight I think should be very recognizable, but it's gone through a series of enhancements that are more detailed in nature rather than substantive. So, from the long view as in the perspective, it's largely the same as what you saw before.

I'll go through this geometric plan and I'll settle on this. This illustrates I think the core of the concept, and you'll recognize I think everything. The three buildings, one that faces Chestnut, one Highland, one Sigwalt, and then the pedestrian passages in between the three buildings, they are leading out onto the sidewalk on Sigwalt. I think as it says in the Staff report, you know, one of our variances is to not have those code minimum separations but we, you know, could have connected those buildings and avoided that request. But those are for the convenience of those folks that are using the, to get through the project on a, you know, just a pedestrian basis, but also to be able to use those guest spots and get to the front doors of the units.

So, looking back at the back of the project, we have a green space. There is underground detention below that. Those were held away from the north property line, enough for us to get that line of spruces there. The reason for that is the project north of us is about 4.5 feet higher than our project, so we're going to have a retaining wall there that we need to cover. So, that's what's going on there and that's simply a green space. It's not a dogwalk or anything else, it's just some open space relief.

Then, it's hard to see, but the center of the field of that motor court is permeable pavers. So, you know, part of our detention stormwater management requirement is being handled there, and it's aesthetically nice as well. So, those are concrete L-shaped pavers with about a 24-inch gravel base that gives us some staging for some of our stormwater, as well as an underground vault system which is under that green space.

So, then the three buildings, you can kind of see the beige color, and those are the walk-out roof decks. The white color roof is the partial floor story that extends, there you go, Bill is cursoring it. So, all of that light tan color is walk-out. So, each one of those

## APPROVED

units has a balcony on the fourth floor, partial balcony on the fourth floor and a partial enclosed floor which is a stair leading up to a family room kind of space and a bathroom. It can be built out in a number of ways. We can get an office up there, another bedroom, what have you.

Then the end units, there's three of them that are the extended units. That's where the garage and the second floor is projected out away from the standard unit. That's a larger unit. The base unit is about 2,400 square feet, and the large unit is about 2,700 square feet. That has also a balcony at the third floor level. So, the master bedroom can walk out onto that roof deck on top of the family room which is on top of the garage. We'll see that real briefly, I won't belabor the floor plans but they're coming up next.

So, every unit has a front door that is out on the street connected up individually to the street as well as those passages that I mentioned. Then every unit has a two-car garage door back on the motor court. So, there's two cars side by side in each unit. So, the optional tandem that Mike was talking about is in addition to that. So, they can choose on the first floor, do I want to build that out as part of my enclosed unit, you know, some space there whether it's a family room, bonus space, those kind of things on the first floor, or do I want to get an extra car there. So, there's the opportunity for the buyer to get that third car, that's where that variance is coming from.

We have modified Chestnut, the curb line on Chestnut. You know, there is that eight-foot taking that Mike talked about, the extension that is to the right-of-way on both Chestnut and Highland. Then, to be harmonious with what's happening with the Chestnut curb on the north, you know, the big project, that it's got the cutouts in the road there and the parking, so this is doing the same thing. So, the character of Chestnut is going to be consistent along.

In the same way over on the Highland side, as you get out of the project, the driveway on the project also has a knuckle there. The geometry of it is intended to get that car turned as perpendicular as we can to Highland so that the driver is, you know, the entrance to that parking deck where cars come in and out is in their field of view, and yet it's pulled away from that overhead door so that it's not right on top of it. So, it's doing those couple of things there.

One of the variances that we asked for was the width of that driveway. There is room there on that site plan to get to 24 feet that is the requirement, but what we're trying to do is we're trying to get a little bit more green stuff up against our building and then up against the retaining wall which is not as tall where the hand is now. What it does is it's highest in the center where we've got the spruces, and then it tapers down to almost nothing on the east and the west according to everything that we've seen so far. We're trying to coordinate properly with that. Okay, I won't belabor that too much.

Now, there are, you know, the living level of these units is on the second floor. Let me go to those. Here is a typical in-board unit. It's got lots of different options. You can see on the left, there is the first floor and there's a couple of different configurations for the front facade. That's what all those drop-down plans are.

That one is showing the tandem garage, so that's the three-car garage option there. There's another option that's not even illustrated that's got a built-out space at the front, the bonus space. Then there's a stair that leads up to the second floor where you've got the living room, dining room, and then kitchen and breakfast island up there along with the powder room, and a utility room up another floor. There's a three-bedroom layout, and we also

## APPROVED

have a dual master layout for this unit. So, conceptually, we'll be building a few less bedrooms than just three times the number of units that we have.

Then upstairs, you can see the plan with the optional build-out out there, and then the roof deck out a series of sliders. Then there's your air conditioning condenser up on the upper level, so that's all screened up. There's an optional balcony that hangs off the back. So, that would be hanging over the garage door, so that would come off off the back.

There is a big long list of sustainable features. We talked about a couple of them on the site. I will not belabor reading them all.

If there's questions on the traffic study, Luay is here.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes, Luay is here. This slide is pointing out that we are meeting all the recommendations of the independent traffic study. That was a traffic and access study, so we'll be doing a full single access point that is stop sign controlled on Highland, one point of access. But we are meeting everything that is in the recommendation.

MR. HOPKINS: These are your slides then.

MR. FIRSEL: As you can see, we met with the Housing Commission, had a hearing. Based on Staff's recommendation, we had agreed to pay the full guideline recommendation of \$75,000 per unit times 1.6 which is for 16 units. Guideline's call on a project of this size is 10 percent. This is I believe the highest dollar equivalent Arlington Heights has received on affordable housing, and the total fee of \$120,000 is equal to the highest fee paid by any developer, and this is only 16 units. So, we received a unanimous approval from the Housing Commission and are very pleased to be able to enhance the affordable housing fund by this significant amount.

We can go through additional items. Mr. Ennes -- Chairman Ennes, excuse me, the last time I was here, you started off with what don't you agree with on the Staff report.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We're not going to do that at this time.

MR. FIRSEL: We've got the Staff before you and Marc can go into that; we might as well dive into it right now and give you our thoughts on it.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: So, we thought the Staff report was excellent. We agreed with the majority of the recommendations. There was just a last minute adjustment from Staff that we don't agree with, and I've highlighted that here.

We do not agree with doing the downtown streetscape along Sigwalt. We also don't agree with widening the sidewalk along Highland from six to five feet. There are two reasons for that. To go back one more, our parcel is in blue. As you can see, it's not part of the B-5 downtown zoning district. It's not in the central business district; it is a residential zoning district. You can see that all residential zoning districts have a residential streetscape, a five-foot concrete sidewalk. It does not have the brick paver at various widths, five to 11 to 12.

We are a residential development. We are for sale. We're not a condo; we're not a high rise. We are a suburban residential development that calls for a traditional residential sidewalk.

Furthermore, on Highland, the existing, to the north, the existing pavement that is in place and is not to be removed is five feet from the curb. Our engineering has that following that line to remain five feet off the curb for the entire length of the sidewalk.

## APPROVED

We feel it would be silly to go out an extra foot and then have a jog of something that we're not adjusting.

But the rest of it, we agree with. On that, I'd like to thank you guys and open it up for questions, plus Bill's presentation.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Bill, are you going to do the Staff report?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, Chairman Ennes. The developer is seeking a rezoning of the properties from R-3 One-Family to R-7 Multi-Family, which is consistent with the Village's Comprehensive Plan which has designated this portion of Block 425 as high density residential for over roughly 20 years. Previous to that, it had been designated as a mixed-use downtown, but that was scaled back when the Plan Commission previously reviewed it and the Village Board changed the Comprehensive Plan. They're seeking a planned unit development for the 16 row homes, a final plat of subdivision which we have tonight if approved, and the requested variations as Mr. Firsel outlined.

The site plan has already been fairly well described. The Petitioner has made quite, you know, a lot of improvements from really the very first iteration when we met with them the first time to doing a more traditional, urban type row home versus a more standard suburban type of townhouse complex. So, it's really come a long way. They have been very amenable to making changes that Staff has requested. They have worked with the Housing Commission on the fee, and as well as the Design Commission, going twice to the Design Commission, once for preliminary review and then final review.

So, they've made a lot of changes to the architecture and there's a couple more tweaks that the Design Commission wants to see as the project comes in for permit if it's approved as is. A lot of landscaping in front of all the buildings, there will be a lot of base landscaping, and then at the corners, they've done a good job accentuating here at the corner of the project, right at Sigwalt and Chestnut, and then over at Highland as well. So, it's a very ample landscape plan.

The next slide here which we've already seen is kind of the elevation looking northeasterly from above the intersection of Sigwalt and Chestnut. As you can see, the upper level is set back about 14 feet for the fourth level. It's going to be optional, although the end units of all three buildings are going to be required to have these. The developer wants to have each of the end units with a fourth level. The middle units, it will be optional for the individual homeowners. You know, in discussions with the developer, I think they have a high degree of probability that people will opt for that option because it's such a nice amenity to have, the roof terrace.

The building itself on Chestnut is about 42.5 feet to the roofline of the fourth level. The third level is about 10 feet less than that, around 32 feet to the roofline where you see the terrace levels. The other two buildings, because of the grade elevation actually is lower as you go east towards Highland, the buildings are a couple of feet taller when you get over to Highland. So, for instance, let me check this here, 43 feet 10 inches for the Sigwalt building, and the Highland building is 43' 9" where the Chestnut is 42' 6". That's to the flat roof deck of the fourth level; again, it's about 10 feet less for the third floor.

This is the general site plan. Mr. Firsel, there's two dedications required of eight feet that will allow for the developer to extend the parking. Chestnut is very narrow right now. We do allow parking on one side of the street, but if there are cars there, it's very narrow for passing cars going north and south. So, this will help alleviate that condition,

## APPROVED

and it's not going to be a row of parking just endlessly. We're going to have these bump-outs here for landscaping, and that will happen as you go north if the rest of the block does develop pursuant to the PUD that was recently approved by the Board. So, it won't be your traditional on-street parking; it will have some of these bump-outs which kind of breaks up the asphalt in the parking spaces and the ability to introduce additional trees to make for a nicer streetscape.

One of the variations is, as Mr. Firsell pointed to, is on Chestnut for 17 feet for the front facade. Normally, it's 25 feet. With the dedication of eight feet, that is the primary cause for that. We do think though that, we're fully supportive of that given that this project is a lot lower in scale and density than could be typically allowed in the R-7. The R-7 allows up to 60 feet, and this project as I mentioned is quite a bit less than that dimension. Especially at the front of the building on Chestnut, it's about 32 feet where the building is 17 feet set back.

The other variation is off of Highland. It's 12 feet; again, eight feet of dedication. Nothing will change around Highland in terms of the streetscape. We're not adding to the street. There's parking here now. They're going to lose a couple of spaces here where the driveway is coming in. But the developer is also going to put in a bump-out here to landscape it, and then you'll have three parking spaces to the south.

I know they touched on traffic. Eventually, if the rest of this block does develop, the Village wants to put in a four-way stop sign here at Highland and Sigwalt. It won't be necessary for this development based on the traffic counts, but it's always something the Village can do really at any time if it's deemed necessary.

Another variation is at the north end. The setback of this first building that fronts on Chestnut is eight feet set back; the requirement is 15. Then the parking area here, the drive aisle is 21 feet; normally, it would be 24 feet. They could accommodate it but then they would lose some of the landscaping here. We thought it was a fair tradeoff to just go to 21 feet which is more than enough room for two cars that pass one another. That's not an issue. It does widen out to the normal 24 feet back here in the courtyard, the motor courtyard. One of the nice things, too, about this is all the garage doors are internalized to the development, so they won't be seen, I don't want to say completely from the street, but eventually as the block to the north redevelops, you really won't see back in there, although they've done a really good job with the landscaping.

The Chestnut Street, this is just kind of a cross-section, this would be looking north along Chestnut if you were standing in the middle of Chestnut and Sigwalt Street. So, you can see here the additional parking lane on the east side of the road with a 5.5-foot parkway for trees, and then the five-foot sidewalk which is typically one foot off of the right-of-way line. So, this is the area here that would be dedicated to the Village, at no cost to the Village.

The setback is to the facade of the building which here is about 32 feet high, and then you can see the fourth level terrace is back about 14 feet. This is a screen wall here, a divider in between the different units on the roof terraces.

The plat of subdivision, since they're doing a fee simple plat, each of the individual homes more or less follows the lot lines. In the front, there's a little extra room in front that's part of the individual home. So, basically, you're creating a zero lot line with these individual homes being platted this way, so that's why there's a series of variation. This has occurred before, and quite frankly, we should probably look at changing our code because it's



## APPROVED

just, practically it's somewhat nonsensical. But to the letter of the law, each of these are technically zero lot line to these internal lots. But of course we're looking more at the overall setbacks for the development.

This just gives you an idea of the property to the north that was recently approved by the Village Board. This of course is the taller building that has the garage in the first several levels before going up to 12 stories, and then the Chestnut building. There will be an access off of Chestnut into the south end of the second phase of that project. So, there isn't a lot of room in between the two developments here. This will obviously go down in slope, so it will probably be at this point maybe eight to 10 feet lower, but there will have to be a guard rail, or not a guard rail but a decorative fence there.

In addition, this developer is proposing quite a bit of landscaping. This is where their detention is going in this, behind the motor court underneath in a detention vault. They do meet all the requirements for detention on site, and they're doing quite a bit of extensive sewer work and new water mains to accommodate the development.

This is a visual of the driveway that's proposed. They've angled it south of some of the utility boxes here that are just south of the facade of the Village Garage. So, this is the entrance/exit to Highland to the garage. I took this picture today just standing probably 30 or 40 feet inside the garage looking south. This is approximately, well, this area here is where we have the utilities which is indicated by this curbing. That's there today. Their new curb will be just south of that. This green icon here is really somewhat mimicking where this island will be which will be landscaped by the developer.

So, you can see there is a bit of a, you know, distance between people coming out. This approximates, you know, about the field of vision for someone if that were a vehicle pulling out. So, since there is a parking lane here, there is extra room to clear the sidewalk and have the visibility into the garage to see cars coming out. We may put a sign here on the internal wall of the garage that says slow down, you know, there's a curb cut coming up. There's also curb cuts to the left on the east side as well, but of course AT&T is vacant right now but, you know, eventually there will be something there.

So, we're not concerned about this geometric because we think there's more than enough visibility. They've done some geometric studies as well as part of their traffic study, and the volume of traffic is going to be very minimal for this project with the 16 units. There's about eight to 12 trips coming in and out at a peak hour which is very, very low.

This is just again their engineering plan. They're going to have a series of underground detention vault underneath the back green space going in a little bit of the driveway. One of the really nice amenities they're doing here, and it helps the stormwater retention, too, and lowers their needs for the vault in terms of capacities, is brick pavers in the back here which is much nicer aesthetically for the people who live there, but also it helps environmentally. So, they'll have these sewer drains here that will eventually go out to the new sewer that's going to be built along Sigwalt. Everybody that lives in the neighborhood is well aware of the significant construction that's going on in this part of downtown with the new sewer project, so they'll be tying into that down here at Sigwalt and Chestnut. They'll also have stormwater detention, or I'm sorry, stormwater pipes, drainage pipes in the fronts of the buildings that will carry water over to that system.

There will be a new water main that will actually have to be located on their site in an easement in front of the building on Sigwalt. That will be a Village water main.

## APPROVED

There's a water main on the south side of Sigwalt right now, but there is also a 36-inch mass of water supply line that is actually one of our main water supply lines to Lake Michigan. So, that's kind of in the way for them to just tap in. So, there has to be a new water main put in here, but it's on their property in an easement.

Some of the recommendations, well, there's 12 specifically: the dedication of eight feet of land; the Petitioner widening Chestnut to accommodate the parking for four spaces. As the Petitioner has alluded to, the brick paver sidewalks on Highland, six feet wide. We don't oppose if it's five feet, that's fine, but they are indicated as pavers. Sigwalt Street, the developer is correct in that it historically wasn't in the master plan for this block to have the paver sidewalk, but we thought that it would be a nice amenity as a transition in between our B-5 which has 11 to 12-foot wide paver sidewalks in the residential single-family as you go west really. But they are correct, across the street it's your normal standard five-foot with parkway. Chestnut itself from Sigwalt north is just a normal five-foot concrete sidewalk as well, and that will remain although it's obviously relocating as development occurs in this block.

They have to post all fees prior to final plat approval, an on-site utility maintenance agreement for their underground detention prior to permit. We want them to work on, you know, any aboveground utility equipment, transformers, switch gear, to be in the rear as feasible. We've had some developments where they just end up popping up in the front yard very close to the sidewalk. That won't be tenable here. So, if they are, if any of the gear is in front, they have to be close to the building and screened. They did show the transformer at the rear of the property in their motor court area, so hopefully, I know they've outreached to ComEd on that because that's probably the biggest component. But we want to see those as feasible to the back and certainly screened if they're up front. Rooftop mechanicals should be screened which are showing on their plans.

The potential loading zone, let me skip back here, we don't think there's really a need for a loading zone in front of the buildings. We have shown an optional 60-foot loading zone, it could be three parking spaces and/or loading. Given that there's, you know, the units are spread out, I mean the reality is, you know, UPS or Amazon is just going to come to the front door and either double park or park in any available parking spot and run in and make the delivery, as will the mail carrier. So, you know, we'd rather just have the green space. There are some overhead utilities here though that, if it's deemed necessary by the Plan Commission and Village Board to have some sort of loading area, which again we're not a proponent of necessarily, we don't think it's necessary for only 16 lots here, but it is an option if needed.

Then finally, the architecture has been recommended unanimously by the Design Commission with a couple of modifications that they're seeking when they come in for permit.

Final staging and construction plans, they're proposing to do all their construction staging either on site or on the property to the north. If this project gets approved, they're looking at moving forward with this pretty quickly and starting in the fall with about, I think, a 12-month timeframe for all three buildings.

As I mentioned, the \$120,000 fee for affordable housing was presented to the Housing Commission. They deliberated it at a public hearing, had public comment which was reflected in the minutes which was included in your packet. So, that's a recommendation that will be going to the Village Board. It's under their purview for discussion, not necessarily Plan Commission as you look at zoning issues. But that will be the

## APPROVED

recommendation moving forward to the Village Board for final decision.

The normal school, park, and library contributions will be required for impact fees for each of the units at time of permit. That would conclude Staff's presentation.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Bill, thank you. Is there a motion to approve the Staff report?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can we have a roll call vote on it?

MR. ENRIGHT: Voice vote is fine.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Voice vote is fine. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, do any of the Commissioners have questions they would like to address to the Staff and/or the Petitioner before we move on to any public comment that there might be? Anybody?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I have no questions.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'd like to hear public comment.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Public comment is fine with me.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, can I see a show of hands of the number of people who would like to address the Plan Commission? So, two people? Let's start over here on the right. Young lady, if you'd like to come up, introduce yourself, give us your name.

### **QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE**

MS. ROJEK: Good evening. My name is Gabriela Rojek.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Please spell it for our reporter.

MS. ROJEK: Gabriela is G-a-b-r-i-e-l-a. The last name is Rojek, R-o-j-e-k. I live at 104 South Highland, directly across from the development.

I expressed my comments at the Design Committee. I think it's a much better project than the one that was previously under consideration. I really appreciate the way that they've listened to the comments that the residents and the neighbors had presented previously in our objections to the previous development. I think this is much more thoughtful consideration to those objections.

I think the design looks perhaps not cookie-cutter like other buildings downtown. I appreciate that it looks a little different. I also appreciate the transition, the scope of the project itself as it moves in to the rest of the neighborhood. As long as the landscaping stays as nice as it looks here, I think it would transition well.

As I listened to the Staff comments about the traffic and the parking, I don't think that cutout on Sigwalt is appropriate, so I agree with that. For years, I've been complaining about a stop sign needed at that corner of Highland and Sigwalt. Nobody has ever listened. So, if you guys are considering that, kudos to you finally for acting on it.

That's all I have. Thank you for your time.

## APPROVED

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you very much. Please introduce yourself.

MS. HARP: Lauree Harp, L-a-u-r-e-e H-a-r-p. Good evening. I am a downtown resident, and I do agree that this is a much better presentation than from what we saw before. I walk that area, I actually live in the Vail building and I walk the area everyday. I did notice that the alignment on the parkway is about three feet into Sigwalt as you make that transition from Highland going west. So, the street is more narrow from Highland west.

That being the case, so it's a narrower residential street similar to what Chestnut is. So, that being the case, and having to dodge the UPS trucks and the mail trucks and the moving vans, I am a proponent for that cutout so that cars can get off the street there, because it is narrower. I don't know if you've noticed it. I noticed it in the renderings. They have it pretty much aligned but it's not, it's got to be three feet narrower from Highland to Sigwalt.

But I like the design. Other than getting some of those trucks off the street which I think would be helpful, that's my only comment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you, Lauree. Bill, do your drawings confirm what Lauree Harp is saying?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes. Well, in front of the former AT&T building, there's parking introduced in the downtown district, so the street is wider to accommodate that. Once you get west of Highland, it's a little bit narrower because, you know, of the no parking.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is that much like three feet?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, it's probably about three, yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anyone else? Okay, I'm going to close the public portion of the hearing. If we can start at one end, yes, and go all the way through?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay, well, I actually don't have many comments. I saw this in the committee and I like the development. I think they did a great job with it. There really hasn't been any significant changes. They answered most of my questions then, so I'll defer to the rest of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, I also was at the Conceptual Plan Review Committee and saw this project. I like it a lot, I think they did a great job. They've listened to previous resident comments. I think it will blend in greatly with the local residential neighborhood. So, I don't have any further comments.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sue?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: The questions that I have relate to the comparison between this and the development, the 425 development. Just out of curiosity, is there any way to see this with that rendering? I mean we know what's going up there, correct?

MR. ENRIGHT: I don't have the renderings. I know you had, in your PowerPoint, you had a broader --

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. We have, it's not necessarily the rendering, it's more of an elevation to show reference.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right, no, I was just looking for the renderings because we have the photo of what is being built there at 425. But then your photo shows nothing next to it, so it doesn't actually give an accurate portrayal of what that corner, what that lot section is going to look like. I mean I see that, but that's --

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes, that's what we have available at this time.

## APPROVED

Obviously, we're the little four-story guy there compared to Arlington 425. But this is the closest that I have available.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: That you have, okay.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Because from looking at the 425 building drawings to compare to your buildings, they just don't seem design, I know it's a Design Commission element, but I didn't really see much discussion of that in the Design Committee minutes, it seems like a completely different building on the lot to me. It doesn't seem to me as cohesive with the rest of the lot. So, Design Commission approved it, I understand that, so I'm not really, there's nothing I can do it at this point. But that would be my primary comment is I just feel that it doesn't blend with the rest of what's going up there.

On the sidewalk that you're proposing, not having pavers on Sigwalt?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Do you have any renderings of what that would look like? Because you're going to have pavers coming down --

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes, regular concrete sidewalk, right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: What, not Highland, well, Highland and, tell me my other word, Chestnut?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: So, Highland has pavers. There we go. Highland has pavers, that is part and across from other pavers. We're good with that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: We're just concerned about the width.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Sure.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: But we're still going to do the downtown pavers to match across the street. Then at the corner, it will transition to a traditional residential concrete sidewalk, and then again north on Chestnut.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I think the Village was looking to carry it along the Sigwalt path to extend those pavers.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right, but it's not going up Chestnut as well?

MR. ENRIGHT: It's not.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: That was my understanding was that it was the whole block around.

MR. ENRIGHT: No.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, it's really just Highland we're talking about. Then you wanted to carry it, okay, so now I can understand your argument. I thought it was also on Chestnut. So, I had that confusion.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: No, Chestnut in front of Arlington 425 and us we all agree is regular residential sidewalk.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, all right. So, then I think that makes sense to leave it regular because it won't look, I was thinking it would be on both sides.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Right, no.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And then suddenly we would have this cement, and I thought that doesn't make any sense.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But I understand what you're saying now.

## APPROVED

So, that was the only clarification I needed.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: That it?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Bill, how do you feel about the Petitioner's, about them not going along with this issue on the corner and with the sidewalk?

MR. ENRIGHT: You know, I don't think this is a major issue from the Village's perspective. The Petitioner has made some valid points about the context to the area. We just thought it would be a nice transition from the sidewalks in the downtown as you get into residential.

But they're correct; the south side of Sigwalt does not have pavers. As we just pointed out, Chestnut is not going to have pavers either.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Right, going up to 425, right? That's going to be concrete.

MR. ENRIGHT: Right, that will just be a normal sidewalk, concrete.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, Mary Jo?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I don't have any questions, just comments that I appreciate the green space being considered here, and also the detention being accommodated by the permeable pavers. So, I really like that. I'm very supportive of the project, and I agree that it's a better solution for the residential section than the previous petition was.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Joe?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, so one question to the developer. The landscaping, who is going to maintain this over the years?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: It will be HOA maintained.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Pardon me?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: HOA, homeowners association.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, and Mr. Enright, well, it's a question for you. So, explain to me the parking. Each unit will have two parking spots just in the garage, but there's also an option for a tandem space that will be --

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes. The rear of the buildings have a garage door in the internal courtyard. So, you get two cars side by side. There's an option though that you could pull farther into that first level towards the front of the building, although internalized you won't be able to tell that from the outside, to have a third car. So, you'd have a car here, and then behind it another car, and then another car over here. So, there would be some jockeying. No different than, you know, a lot of residential homes with their cars in the driveways.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: But if they just, if everybody just built the standard two spots, there'd be 32 spots with the 16 units, and then you've got eight guest units. So, that's a total of 40. Does that meet code, 40 for this development?

MR. ENRIGHT: It's well over code, yes. Yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: That's fine.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Just one point of clarification. We will have the three-car tandem as standard, and then they will have the option to the space, not the reverse. So, three times 16 will be as offered. We expect some to be built out, not nearly as many as the rooftop, but it will be the standard three-car.

## APPROVED

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Some of the units, if you put in all the optional bedrooms, you can have up to four units, four bedrooms per unit, correct?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Actually, we have one that we're planning that could actually get up to five in the corner.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: But is that, Bill, there's no issue with having families there with kids and of the school district and all that?

MR. ENRIGHT: No, we're not concerned about that. This is a low density development in our downtown area.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Village policies as far as affordable housing, it seems like we're always taking a fee in lieu of affordable housing. At what point do we stop doing that?

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, that's not the case. Block 425 to the north which was recently approved by the Board, our new group of Board members, required 18 actual units out of 361 and, in addition to that, a fee in lieu of for an additional nine units at \$25,000 per unit. So, that will be another \$225,000 to the trust fund. Our Village Board has been very clear that with these developments they want to see affordable housing units in their rentals.

Projects like this, it's just, you know, you've got units that are going to be \$750,000. It's not practical to reduce one of these units to quite a bit lower than that. So, the fee in lieu of was found to be more suitable by the Housing Commission. Of course that will be forwarded to Village Board for their decision.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: That makes sense, thank you. Final question, could you go to the cross-section of the street that shows the eight-foot dedication strip? Just explain to me, what are we going to do with that strip? Why are we requiring that?

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, the eight feet is required by code because the street is only 50 feet of dedicated right-of-way right now. That doesn't mean it's 50 feet of pavement, but that's how much Village-owned property we have for the street. Normally, it's 66 feet. So, the required eight feet is to give us the 33 feet on that half, the east half. We'll probably never get on the west half, but it won't be necessary either. This will allow the pavement to be expanded to accommodate parking so it won't block north and southbound cars.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Makes sense because it gives you an opportunity for more green space at this point, too.

MR. ENRIGHT: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Bruce?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I really have no comments, but the one I want to make, I agree with the concrete versus the paver scenario. I think that makes a lot of sense. I think it's a nice-looking development.

Just a comment for public consumption. Is all the property across the street on Sigwalt zoned R-7?

MR. ENRIGHT: No.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: At the Comprehensive Plan?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes. So, the property to the south, directly across the street there's a couple of properties.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Gabby's Place.

MR. ENRIGHT: Pardon me?

## APPROVED

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Gabby's Place.

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, there's two properties to the south. The one that fronts on Highland is zoned R-4 which would allow two units on a zoning lot. Then across from, fronting on Chestnut, it's still R-3 Single-Family. However, both properties are designated as, let me double check this, well, one of them is single-family attached, and one of them is high density multifamily. So, the property that fronts on Highland is actually designated the same as the subject property here for a potential R-7, whereas the other property on Chestnut would be more like the R-5 or R-6 zoning which is not --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: But Sigwalt is, on the Comprehensive Plan, is that to be R-7?

MR. ENRIGHT: Just for the property half the block. So, the eastern portion, there's two lots, so it would be the east lot would be designated as high density multifamily. The western lot which fronts on Chestnut is moderate density.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, no, that was just for --

MR. ENRIGHT: Or I'm sorry, single-family attached R-4.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, so in that R higher density, what's the heights that would be allowed by code on the other side of the street?

MR. ENRIGHT: 60 feet in the R-7.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: R-7.

MR. ENRIGHT: So, that would be the one property that fronts on Highland. The other one would be corresponding to R-4 which is the same as single-family. As I recall, I think it's 25.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, no other question. I think it's a great project, and I think I'm looking forward to this thing moving forward.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. I have a couple of questions since I wasn't at the preliminary review of this. Can we go to the slide that shows the driveway coming in and the parking lot? Yes, on this. I don't remember seeing in our packet a drawing showing a fire truck being able to come in and turn around in there.

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, this is the developer's. Obviously they did provide that. The Fire Department does not anticipate, unless there's like a car fire where they'd have one of their normal-sized vehicles, well, not that any of them are really normal but other than ambulances, but their smaller vehicles, not the larger ones that they have, they can make that turn and do a three-point turn or back out. They can actually back out in case they have to get back into their motor court if there's an auto fire. If there's another type of fire, God forbid, they'd be able to fight it from the street. So, they're okay with this development and the scope and magnitude.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, I just didn't see a vehicle, much of a truck being turned around in there.

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Yes, the rear of it is not the regulatory fire lane. The fire lane will be on the three public streets.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: For the Petitioner, there's an overhang from the buildings over the garage door?

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Optional balcony.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: An optional balcony? Is there room --

MR. MCLAUGHLIN: Oh, I'm sorry. Are you referring to the cantilever?

LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

Chicago & Roselle, Illinois - Miami & Orlando, Florida

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



## APPROVED

CHAIRMAN ENNES: The rear of the buildings.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'm going to defer to Mark Hopkins.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, okay. So, at the rear of the buildings, there is an overhang of the building over the garage door.

MR. HOPKINS: Right, correct.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, can a car park, is there room for cars to park along the front of the doors?

MR. HOPKINS: No.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: No.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, initially, I didn't, eight guest spots seems like not a lot for 16 units, especially on a holiday. But then I guess people can park on the street.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: They can, yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Staff mentioned a price, a value for the units. What do you anticipate the range of prices will be within the development?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Sure. The interior unit which is what we showed on the floor plans will start on the high fives. The corner units will end up starting in the high sixes, low sevens. Then once you add all options, they'd be in sixes and sevens, potentially eight depending on how fancy someone wants to get.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a possibility for elevators in there?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: We looked at it and we have decided to not offer it.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Not offer it, okay. Okay, let's see. That's all I have. Can we have questions or can we have a motion on the project?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Commissioner, I just had one question regarding the fee in lieu of for the affordable housing. I understand that this project you're paying \$75,000 per unit. But the 425 project, they're paying \$25,000 per unit. Is that because those are rentals versus purchase? Or what determines that?

MR. McLAUGHLIN: There is different criteria between the two, but it's a guideline. This is what we negotiated with the Housing Commission.

MR. ENRIGHT: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay, all right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Could I just have Mr. McLaughlin, did you put the revised language that would be acceptable on your --

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. That was one of my last thing before, thank you.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay, I would like to make a motion, Chairman Ennes.

**A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC# 19-005, a re-zoning from R-3 One-Family Dwelling District to R-7 Multiple-Family Dwelling District; a planned unit development to allow the construction of a 16-unit residential townhome development; and a final plat of resubdivision to subdivide the subject property into individual lots for each townhome unit and for common areas, as well as the following variations:**

- 1. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.2, *Minimum Area for Zoning District*, to allow the R-7 District to be approximately 1.39 acres where code requires a minimum of**

## APPROVED

- two acres for the R-7 District.
2. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, *Required Minimum Yards*, to allow a front yard setback for the townhome building along Highland Avenue to be 12 feet where code requires a 25-foot setback.
  3. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, *Required Minimum Yards*, to allow a front yard setback for the townhome building along Chestnut Avenue to be 17 feet where code requires a 25-foot setback.
  4. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, *Required Minimum Yards*, to allow a side yard setback (north) to be eight feet for the building along Chestnut Avenue where code requires a 15-foot setback.
  5. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.10, *Spacing Between Multi-Family Buildings*, to allow five-foot spacing between principal buildings where code requires 25-foot spacing.
  6. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-8, to allow a two-way driveway width of 21 feet where code requires a minimum of 24 feet for a two-way drive aisle.
  7. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-9, to allow tandem parking spaces.
  8. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-13 maximum number of spaces to exceed code by more than 50 percent.
  9. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, *Required Minimum Yards*, to allow a front yard setback of 4.6 feet for Lots 1 through 11 and 4.3 feet for Lots 12 through 16 where code requires a 25-foot front yard setback for all lots.
  10. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, *Required Minimum Yards*, to allow a side yard setback of zero feet for interior walls on Lots 1, 6 and 12 where code requires a 2.6-foot side yard setback, and zero feet for interior walls on Lots 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14 and 15 where code requires a two-foot side yard setback, and zero feet for interior walls on Lots 7, 11 and 16 where code requires a 2.1-foot side yard setback.
  11. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, *Required Minimum Yards*, to allow a side yard setback of zero feet for outer walls on Lots 7, 11 and 15 where code requires a 2.1-foot side yard setback, and 4.3 feet for outer walls on Lots 1 and 6 where code requires a 2.6-foot side yard setback, and 4.6 feet for outer walls on Lot 12 where code requires a 2.6-foot side yard setback.
  12. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, *Required Minimum Yards*, to allow a rear yard setback of zero feet for Lots 1 through 16 where code requires a 30-foot rear yard setback.
  13. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.7, *Maximum Building Lot Coverage*, to allow approximately 291 percent building lot coverage for Lots 2 and 15, approximately 290 percent building coverage for Lots 3 and 8, approximately 287 percent building lot coverage for Lot 16, approximately 284 percent building lot coverage for Lots 7, 11, 13 and 14, and approximately 283 percent building lot coverage for Lots 4, 5, 9 and 10 where code allows a maximum building lot coverage of 200 percent on all lots.
  14. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.11, *Maximum Floor Area Ratio*, to allow approximately 73 percent FAR on Lot 1, approximately 74 percent FAR on Lot 12, approximately 75 percent FAR on Lot 6, approximately 84 percent FAR on Lots 4, 5,

## APPROVED

9, 10 and 14, approximately 85 percent FAR on Lot 13, approximately 87 percent FAR on Lots 7 and 11, approximately 88 percent FAR on Lots 2, 3, 8 and 16, and approximately 89 percent FAR on Lot 15 where code allows a maximum FAR of 55 percent on all lots.

This recommendation shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. Eight feet of land shall be dedicated for additional right-of-way along both Highland and Chestnut Avenues.
2. The Petitioner shall widen Chestnut Avenue approximately eight feet and construct four on-street parking spaces.
3. Brick paver sidewalks shall be required on Highland Avenue (five feet wide) including decorative streetlights within the parkway.
4. All fees required for final plat approval shall be provided prior to Village Board consideration of the final plat.
5. An on-site utility management agreement must be provided prior to building permit issuance.
6. All new aboveground utility equipment, transformers, switch gear, and building-mounted mechanical equipment must be appropriately located and screened. All gas and electric meters, as well as all cable and phone connections, should be routed to the rear of each unit, as feasible rooftop mechanicals shall be screened.
7. The Petitioner shall cooperate with implementation of a parking/loading zone on Sigwalt if required.
8. Final staging and construction plans shall be provided at building permit.
9. Architectural design shall be in substantial compliance with the Design Commission recommendation of May 28, 2019.
10. Petitioner shall pay a fee of \$120,000 for affordable housing at time of building permit per the Housing Commission recommendation of June 11, 2019.
11. School, park, and library contributions shall be required per Village code prior to the issuance of a building permit for each row home building.
12. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can we have roll call vote?

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Sigalos.

## APPROVED

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes. So, you have a unanimous approval from the Plan Commission. You'll be moving on, as you know, to the Village Board.

MR. ENRIGHT: Just a note. The Village Board is not meeting July 1st to the 4th of July holiday, so this will likely be on July 15th, although the public should check the Board agenda several days prior to that, typically it's posted the Thursday prior to that, to confirm.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, good luck.

MR. FIRSEL: Thank you all very, very much. I did fail to mention Staff has been phenomenal to work with on this project, and we're glad that this is the development. We think it's the one you wanted, the people wanted. We thank you and the Staff for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: It sounds like you worked with Staff quite well, thank you.

MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you to all.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned public hearing was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.)