

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: McDONALD'S - 45 EAST GOLF ROAD - PC# 19-010
 PUD AMENDMENT

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 28th day of August, 2019 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

TERRY ENNES, Chairman
 LYNN JENSEN
 MARY JO WARSKOW
 JOE LORENZINI
 BRUCE GREEN
 GEORGE DROST
 SUSAN DAWSON
 JOHN SIGALOS

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner

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

(Pledge of allegiance recited.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. Sam, could you call the roll?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Here. We had a meeting on 7/10 and we have minutes from that meeting to approve. I trust everybody received those that was here. I would like a motion and a second to approve those minutes.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So moved.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And a second. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And abstaining? I abstain; I missed that meeting.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I did, too.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, we're all in favor of the motion to accept the minutes, okay. Our first petition this evening is the McDonald's, PC# 19-010. Is the Petitioner here? Would you please rise? Will you and anybody else be testifying?

MR. OLSON: Yes. Potentially, yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Well, anybody who's going to come up needs to be here to swear you in.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: State your name and spell it.

MR. OLSON: Dan Olson.

MR. ABOONA: Luay Aboona.

MR. KERCHNER: Joe Kerchner.

LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

Chicago & Roselle, Illinois - Miami & Orlando, Florida

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

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you very much. If you would like to start and tell us about your project? Also, have you seen the conditions from the Staff?

MR. OLSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And do you agree with all of those?

MR. OLSON: Yes, we do.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Sam, all notices have been turned out?

MR. HUBBARD: They were, yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Could you tell us about your project?

MR. OLSON: Sure, I'd be glad to. My name is Dan Olson with Watermark Engineering. We are the civil engineers on the project. As you can see, we've got our team here with us tonight. We've got representation from the ownership group, from McDonald's, architecture, and traffic. So, we've got the gamut covered here. So, if you have questions as we go through, the team is prepared to respond to that. But what I'd like to do is provide a brief overview of why we're here, what we're looking to do, and then turn it over to you guys.

So, as you can see on the screen, this is an exhibit showing the existing site as it sits today. We dropped in some of the zoning around that, too, and kind of zoomed out so you can see where we're located. A big, main reason why we're here tonight and seeking approval is based on the fact that we're in an Office-Transitional zoning district with an existing PUD and land use variance ordinance that's been passed on this property. So, we're obviously seeking to amend that with these proposed improvements to the site, and that's why we're here tonight before you.

So, the site is just over 41,000 square feet. It consists of an existing McDonald's restaurant, a single drive-through lane, 36 parking stalls, and the landscaping and sidewalks that you see there. The site currently operates at a one-way, counterclockwise circulation pattern, and it has a single driveway in the southwest corner that you can see. That has access to the private drive to the west which is shared with Chase Bank next door to us, and there is an easement over that shared private drive. So, that's how we have access to the site.

Currently, the drive-through works, but it isn't optimized. That's one of the main things we want to improve on the site here. The current site has roughly seven to eight stacking spaces as it sits right now. It does have two order points on it but it's a single lane, and so what happens is if you've got somebody who's in front, who's slow, who doesn't know what they want to order or whatever, it backs up the whole thing. So, as you'll see as we go through the double drive-through, it's going to help alleviate that issue. So, that's one of the main site improvements we're looking to do.

I'll move ahead to the, this is the proposed site plan. Not a lot is changing on this in terms of circulation. The driveway will remain the same. The circulation will remain the same. The building footprint will remain the same. There's no additions to it.

The main changes that we want to accomplish with this project is the side-by-side drive-through, I have a closer-in site plan that I'll go to here in a moment, located on the west side of the building. We're doing all new ADA parking stalls and sidewalks throughout including the public connection. So, all of the site will be made code compliant in that way. We are relocating the existing trash corral which currently sits south of the building, directly behind the building. That's got its own set of issues so it's a good thing for the site, for us to be able to relocate that. That's in the southeast corner. That's also one of the reasons for the reduction in parking is we need to make room for that trash corral there.

The other reason for the loss in parking, we're going from 36 to 30, is the two drive-through lanes that wrap the building on the west. Previously, if we go back and look, there's a couple of accessible stalls there and a regular stall there. So, those are being moved to the other side, and we're opening that up for better circulation and better stacking.

The landscaping around the site, we worked with Staff on that. We're providing an extensive, what I'll call refresh to the landscaping there. Staff has asked us to provide some additional beyond what we even have on the plan now, and we're working with them to accomplish that. That's going to provide a nice screen. There's already significant landscaping around the site, but we're going to bolster that further. Any of the disturbed areas get brand new landscaping throughout the foundation, et cetera, seal coat and re-stripe the parking lot.

Then lastly, on the south property line, there is an existing privacy fence that's there between us and the residential zoning to the south. That's a six-foot fence with a two-foot lattice. That was a requirement of the original PUD agreement, and right now the fence is in disrepair. So, Staff has asked us to take a look at replacing that all together which we agree with. I believe that that's in the report. So, that fence will get rebuilt entirely and restored in that area.

The new stacking for the drive-through, we had seven to eight. We're going to be looking at somewhere between 14 and 15 spaces. So, it's going to improve lot flow and efficiency in the drive-through tremendously. Also, the side by side itself with the equipment, the efficiencies that are built in there, not only will we have more stacking room, we've got the ability to move cars through quicker because they have an option on which lane they're going to. I'll zoom in and show you that.

Lastly, on the site, the reduction to 30 parking spaces, we talked about why that's happening. As part of our approval process, we've worked with Staff on doing a parking study and a traffic study for the site, just to make sure we're not painting ourselves into a corner here. Operationally, we want the store to do well obviously. We want not only to satisfy Staff and the Commissioners, but we want it to work well as well, so we need to know that we have enough.

So, we hired a traffic engineer to go out there who is here tonight, took a look at six different days across peak hours. On those six different days, there was weekend and weekdays throughout. I believe the report might be in the packet. I also have a summary up on the screen that I'll show in a moment. But peak demand was shown to be 27 parking stalls. So, going down to 30, we feel confident with that.

We also understand that operationally, when you've got an efficient drive-through, cars are going to gravitate towards that, whereas today it's kind of messy. So, cars opt not to get into that queue if it's stacked up or if it looks cumbersome, they'll just go park.

So, we think the demand will flow even greater into the drive-through. Currently, I think we're looking at 70 percent drive-through and that's typical, 70 to even as much as 80 percent in different locations.

So, keep moving on, that's kind of hard to see what's going on, but here is just the summary of the parking data so you can see that. Wednesday, August 22nd, was peak demand at 27 stalls.

This is a look at some of the signage we're proposing. We've gone through the process with the Design Commission and we got, actually we were just there last

night. So, we've gone twice, once for a variance for the signage that you see up here. The reason for the variance is again because of the zoning district that we're in. I think we're allowed like one or two square feet, you know, of signage in the Office-Transitional, so it's clearly geared for that use. They have approved, they've given a positive recommendation on the signage and on the building. So, we've gone before them for both aspects of the project. This is just an overview of what we're proposing.

I apologize for the quality. I don't know if it's any better on your screen. But that's a look at the landscape plan. As you can see, we're showing both the existing and the proposed there. There's extensive landscaping throughout, especially buffered on the south property line in addition to that six-foot plus the two-foot lattice fence there.

Building-wise, I'll just go through that quickly. Again, we have Joe Kerchner from Lingle Design Group who's the architect on the project who can answer more specifics. But just real quickly, what are we doing to the building? We talked about the footprint is not changing. That's remaining as is, it's remaining in the same location obviously. There's going to be, the biggest change is going to be the removing of the existing mansard roof that you see there. So, that goes away, and I'll show you the proposed.

That's another look at the existing, and this is what the proposed building will look like. So, we go straight up with the parapet walls. We remove the mansard roof. We take off, we talked about the trash corral that was existing on the south side of the building, that's going away, obviously being relocated as part of this. The brick that's there today will remain. Some brick is being added for the parapet, some brick is being painted. So, there's a fair amount of brick to the building.

There's also, there's EIFS on the building. There's corrugated metal banding along the parapet. Then there's also the cementitious fiber board which is a product called Nichiha. That's located where you see the M's there, that's two of the brand walls on the north and west side.

Interior-wise, remodel throughout the seating area. Again, it's all refreshed, new seating layout, new decor. ADA compliance throughout on the inside. Bathrooms get updated as a result of ADA compliance and just general updating. So, that's what's happening on the inside of the building.

So, that's an overview of our project. We talked about Staff recommendations. We have been working with Sam since the beginning. We have no problem with the recommendations provided, and we look forward to the discussion tonight. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Mr. Olson, before you sit down --

MR. OLSON: Yes?

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I forgot to ask you to spell your name for the court reporter.

MR. OLSON: Sure. Dan Olson, D-a-n O-l-s-o-n. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, thank you. One of your other individuals who's going to come up and talk about --

MR. OLSON: Well, I think that concludes the overview. We're here for any questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, questions.

MR. OLSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thank you. So, Sam, can we have the Staff report

please? Oh, I should take care of another administrative point. Just after we took the roll, Commissioner Dawson walked in.

MR. HUBBARD: Noted, thank you. Okay, so the subject project is at 45 East Golf Road. As you've heard, it's an O-T Office-Transitional zoning district. However, it is zoned on the Comprehensive Plan as suitable for commercial uses. As such, in 1996, there was a land use variation and PUD granted to allow the present McDonald's on the subject property.

So, as part of the site remodel and additional second drive-through lane, an amendment to the previously granted PUD and land use variation ordinance is required, which is the reason the Petitioner is before you this evening. In addition, as part of that process, Staff is recommending the repeal of condition number five within that original ordinance that related to specific colors of the bricks and the roof on the McDonald's building because they're removing the roof and replacing it with parapet walls. That condition is no longer applicable. There are no variations requested as part of the additions with the second drive-through lane.

So, the Petitioner has gone to two different public commissions to date. On May 8th, they appeared in front of the Conceptual Plan Review Committee. The committee was generally positive for this change and looking forward to the enhancement to the building and the site. On June 25th, the Petitioners appeared in front of the Design Commission for the design review of the exterior architecture. The Design Commission approved it with no conditions.

Additionally, last night, the Petitioner appeared in front of the Design Commission again for the signage variations, and those were approved subject to certain conditions. Some of the more notable ones I would comment on this evening are that the menu boards, the two LED menu boards had to have volume control and dimming capabilities. There was no animation of the graphics allowed on those LED order screens. Of course the double menu boards was conditional upon approval of the second drive-through lane this evening by the Plan Commission.

So, here's an aerial of the site. You can see the subject property bounded in red. On the north side is the International Plaza Shopping Center. To the west is the Chase Bank that's also on an O-T zoning district. To the south, there are some single-family homes. To the east is an existing office complex.

So, here's kind of a zoom-in of the subject property. One of the conditions of approval from the original ordinance was to require this wraparound orientation of the drive-through so that cars would circulate around the site and then enter the drive-through. That was to prevent, you know, cars coming like this and just trying to enter the drive-through this way, and if there was queuing and stacking, it would stack out potentially into the shared drive and block access into the drive aisle of the site. So, the addition of the second drive-through lane maintains that requirement for the wraparound of the building to enter the drive-through.

I would mention that this picture was taken in September of 2018 at approximately 11:30 a.m. on a Tuesday which is one of the peak times for the drive-through. So, you can see here, there's multiple cars stacking in the drive-through, and this illustrates perfectly the problems with the stacking currently. As you can see, those cars are blocking parking spaces, and this is the parking row that would be removed to accommodate for that second drive-through lane.

Again, here is the site plan. You can see the wraparound

orientation, and then you can see the much greater increased capacity for stacking in the drive-through with the dual lanes, and then around the building as well, and then the relocated trash enclosure. I would point out that there's a small, tiny portion of the work proposed in the right-of-way that's up at this corner, that's to make the sidewalk ADA compliant. That falls in the IDOT right-of-way. So, one of our recommended conditions of approval is contingent upon review and approval by IDOT for that change.

There is no requirement for a permit through MWRD for stormwater. However, there are local requirements for stormwater management. The Petitioner is, I believe, increasing the impervious surface just slightly on the site, not enough to warrant MWRD permit but still kicks in Village requirements. So, as part of building permit, we're going to ask for detailed detention calculations to show if the existing capacity, detention capacity on the site can accommodate for what's calculated and projected for the potential volume needed for any of the proposed improvements. If there is a deficiency, because it would be so minor, the Village is going to require that the Petitioner provide a fee in lieu of additional detention. That's one of the recommended conditions of approval this evening.

Briefly, here is the interior floor plan. The only real change to the seating area is the reduction in size for this janitor closet that's being constructed there. Currently, I believe there is seating here as well, but these are future locations for electronic ordering kiosks. So, the actual interior seats will be decreasing slightly as a result of this remodel.

Again, here is the landscape plan. You can see some of the additional landscaping that they're adding, especially along the south property line to complete that southern screen. Then you've heard the requirement for the fence, and we've asked that, as a condition of approval, that it be replaced in its entirety at the six-foot tall with the two-foot lattice extension that's required by the original approval ordinance.

So, really the main thing that we reviewed with this was the traffic and parking. Based on our code requirements, only 10 parking spaces is required, and that's a result of the relatively small seating area size. To accommodate for that second drive-through lane, as you've heard, the number of onsite spaces will be reduced. You heard the number of 36, I count 37 spaces striped when I went out there. I think the plat of survey showed 36 but I counted 37 striped. In any event, that's going to reduce down to 30 spaces. Over six days of survey, the peak demand was for 27 cars, so the reduction to 30 spaces still should be able to accommodate peak demand for parking.

Relative to traffic, you know, all of the intersection studied included the existing operation of the McDonald's, so we really have a great idea of what type of traffic this will generate. The study did factor in a small increase due to increased business as a result of the more efficient drive-through, and then just general increase of traffic as always seem to happen in the future. All of the intersections studied did not have any reduction in level of service, so traffic is really not an issue for this development.

The other thing was the stacking, the peak demand observed with the existing stacking was 13 cars. As you've heard, the dual drive-through lane will have space for approximately 14 cars. So, hopefully, that will be able to much better accommodate the capacity of the drive-through.

That being said, the Staff Development Committee is recommending approval of the application subject to the four conditions which I have outlined this evening. That

concludes our presentation.

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

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: And a second?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Do we need a roll call vote, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: No, a voice vote is fine.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Anyone opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, Lynn, why don't we start with you? Any questions?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Not really. They did a nice presentation before the Conceptual Review Committee and I don't really have questions.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Warskow?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I don't really have any questions. I am supportive. The only concern I have looking at the new layout is that you've moved the handicapped spaces so that they will cross the drive. I'm just concerned about cars not paying attention as they're jostling their food and then coming across that sidewalk with the handicapped. So, that's my only concern.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Question about, glancing at this slide up, so when you come in off the shared drive, you have to circle around in a kind of clockwise way to get into the ordering line. But now that you're widening that lane, is there, and you're parking cars south of that drive-through lane, is there enough room to get by to get into that queue?

MR. OLSON: Yes, let me make sure I understand where you're talking about there. Can you --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Right there, yes, when you come in, you've got to circle around the building when you just come in.

MR. OLSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: To get into the queue.

MR. OLSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, is that enough, what's the driving room, what's the width of that aisle?

MR. OLSON: Yes, so it's actually, we're increasing the width of the aisle from what's there today and there is ample room for the new. The parking stalls are a little tight. They were designed that way originally just because of the size of the site. But we were able to push the drive-through actually a little bit farther north so there is going to be more room than there is today. I can't, I could look up the --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: That's okay, I got you. That's fine.

MR. OLSON: Yes, there is ample room.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: As far as ordering from these kiosks, I thought it was kind of a little surprising that 70 percent of the people go through the drive-through, but how many people order from the kiosks? Just curious.

MR. OLSON: I don't know. Anybody know percentage on the kiosk?

PETITIONER REPRESENTATIVE: 10 to 20 percent.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: All right, that's fine.

PETITIONER REPRESENTATIVE: Well, as well as from dine-in.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: All right, thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thanks, Joe. Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I really have no questions. I think it's a nice architectural facelift and it's great.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Commissioner Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: My first comment is not a question. So, I'd like to commend Dan for giving an excellent presentation of the project. I thought you did a very good job, Dan. I was also at the Conceptual Plan Review Committee meeting. I'm familiar with it. I think this is great. I understand the need for a dual drive-through lanes. Right now, restaurants, and again at least 70 percent of the business is through drive-through and pick-up.

The one question I have is in the parking analysis. Does that take into account the need, and maybe go to that site plan that shows the drive-through and the parking stalls, does that take into account the need for drive-through customers that have to pull over into a parking stall while their order is being processed because they have a large order or what have you?

MR. OLSON: Yes. I don't know if you want to speak to that, how that was calculated? So, we looked at all the stalls, and actually there's a breakdown in the parking study where he analyzed the amount of vehicles that were using those spaces in particular. So, yes, the parking study does factor that.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, there are a like couple of stalls that would have sign posting or whatever for pick-up ordering only or whatever?

MR. OLSON: Yes. I believe there are, in the upper right-hand corner there of the site, those two up there are currently and that's what we're going to do, yes.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: My last comment, I like the idea of having to relocate the trash enclosure to the southeast corner, more out of view of the drive-through traffic and such proximity to the building because it's not aesthetically pleasing --

MR. OLSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: -- but other than that, I think it's great. I'm glad to see McDonald's is wanting to improve here and stay in Arlington Heights at this location. My last question, approximately how long will this be down for construction?

MR. STEPP: I can answer that. Chris Stepp, area construction manager.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Will you please go up to the podium please?

MR. STEPP: Sure.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Can you state your name and spell it for the record?

MR. STEPP: Sure. Chris Stepp, C-h-r-i-s S-t-e-p-p. So, these projects typically take, we target eight weeks. They bid on average 9.5 weeks for our region. We try to leave the drive-through open fully throughout the duration of the project. We'll close the dining room roughly about a period of four weeks as we do the interior remodel portion. But the intent is to keep the drive-through open throughout. With the constraints of the site, we may have to flip-flop and go interior business versus drive-through. But the intent is to keep the restaurant open at one phase or another throughout construction.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I understand. The last thing, I know this will require some IDOT approval for a right-turn lane there. You're going through that process, but I mean in my experience with IDOT, you're looking at eight months to get any kind of response or approval from IDOT.

MR. OLSON: Let me just say I concur. It can be a painful process, especially as of late. But yes, we will have to go to them and we're obviously open to that as part of the project.

One of the things we're exploring right now is that we're working with the review engineer at IDOT District 1 who is looking at this corner. Apparently, there had been some improvements to the sidewalk and to the intersections in this area. This may be one of the corners that was improved, I don't really know. IDOT seems to think so. What that means is that from the time we got our survey done, the elevations may have been corrected already for, that's what we're hoping and praying for because that means we stop our sidewalk connection at our property line, we don't go to IDOT. So, we'll go if we have to.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Again, I've got to commend you for having the patience to work with IDOT, and Luay to also have the patience to work with them. I'm familiar with both of you.

MR. OLSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: My hat is off to you. All right. I have no other comments. It's a great project.

MR. OLSON: Thanks, John.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Very good.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Thanks, John. Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I have no questions.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and I don't have any questions. I commend you for staying in Arlington Heights. I think Ray Crob, a former resident would be very happy as well to keep the McDonald's.

MR. OLSON: That's the plan. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: I also think this is a good project. But I have the same concern about the handicapped parking being across.

MR. OLSON: Sure.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: How often does that happen in your site so it's not up against the --

MR. OLSON: Yes, it does happen. It's kind of a double-edged sword. To speak to your concern as well, code requires us to put them as close to an accessible entrance as possible. The downside to the current layout as they are, yes, they don't have to walk across, but they also get blocked in. So, somebody who's trying to turn around and back out has got to navigate some of that. So, there are some benefits to it. In a perfect world, I wouldn't have them blocking in right next to the building. But I will tell you, I would say it's maybe not quite half, maybe 25-30 percent of the sites that we personally have worked on I can think of where they've been on the opposite side of it.

We did one in Hoffman Estates not that long ago. It does work. But you're right. Again, we have them up tight, it's just a very small site.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: On the aerial here, at the back of the building, there's a bump-out. Is that, right in there, is that currently the garbage?

MR. OLSON: It is.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, that's going to be moved out of there? It will allow the queuing lanes closer to the building?

MR. OLSON: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Okay, that's all I have. Thank you.

MR. OLSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there anyone in the audience that has any questions or comments about this? Seeing none, we'll close the public portion of the meeting.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make the motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC# 19-010, an Amendment to PUD and LUV Ordinance 96-037 to repeal condition number five and modify the approved development plan to allow an additional drive-through lane.

This recommendation shall be subject to the following conditions:

- 1. IDOT review and approval of the proposed improvements within the Golf Road right-of-way shall be required.**
- 2. Should detention calculations show that the proposed site conditions cause a deficiency in stormwater capacity, the Petitioner must provide a fee in lieu of onsite detention at time of building permit issuance.**
- 3. The six-foot tall wooden privacy fence with two-foot lattice extension located along the southern lot line shall be replaced in its entirety.**
- 4. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.**

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

MR. HUBBARD: That was the motion for PC# 19-010.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Actually, George stated it as PC 19-110 but it's actually 010.

COMMISSIONER DROST: 0-1-0. 010.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: All right, that's a big number, I know.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Either way I still second.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: We need a roll call vote.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes. Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chairman Ennes.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: So, you have a unanimous approval. Has a date been set for them to appear before the Village Board?

MR. HUBBARD: We're targeting September 16th subject to availability at the Village Board.

CHAIRMAN ENNES: Good luck. Thank you.

MR. OLSON: Thank you all, appreciate it.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above petition was adjourned at 8:02 p.m.)