

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: SHELTER, INC. - 207-209 EAST VALLEY LANE - PC #21-015
SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A SHELTER CARE HOME, PARKING VARIATION

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting held virtually, in response to the COVID-19
pandemic, which permits the public to fully participate via their computers or using their phones,
on the 20th day of October, 2021 at the hour of 7:31 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner
HART PASSMAN, Village Attorney

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, so let's call the meeting to order. Before we begin, I find that the public health concerns related to Corona virus pandemic render in-person attendance at the regular meeting location not feasible.

Could we have the Pledge of Allegiance, please? Bruce, you usually have our flag for us.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: There we go, we have one. If you guys would say it along with me?

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, we have two minutes to approve.

MR. HUBBARD: We'll take roll call attendance if you don't mind before we do that.

Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Present.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: 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: Chair Dawson. Chair Dawson, are you there? Your screen looks frozen. Uh-oh, we lost our Chair.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Hopefully she'll come back.

(Long pause.)

MR. HUBBARD: I am going to shoot her a text right now to see what's going on.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, sorry about that. I don't know where you're all at. I apologize, my one computer doesn't seem to want to connect to the internet so it jumped on to my other laptop.

Where are we at?

MR. HUBBARD: I was just finishing our attendance roll call, and I was at you, Chair Dawson.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: I am here.

MR. HUBBARD: All right.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, minutes? Approval of minutes? Is there a motion to approve the minutes?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll second.

MR. HUBBARD: Okay, Commissioner Cherwin.
 COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.
 MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.
 COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.
 MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.
 COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Unmute, Bruce.
 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: I was not in attendance so I will abstain.
 MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.
 COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.
 MR. HUBBARD: Chair Dawson.
 CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

Okay, so before we move on to our first agenda item, I think there's a couple of items we wanted to cover.

So, first, I wanted to say that as we open up tonight, I just wanted to say that I've been reflecting on the previous meeting. I think we can all agree that the individuals were very spirited I think, myself included. Sometimes as human beings, we on this board have a personal response to the matters before us; however, I'm cognizant that my role as Chair of this Commission is to facilitate open and respectful communications. As a life-long resident of Arlington Heights, I want my fellow community members to know that all of your input is valid. As a Commission, we are here to consider the issues before us, listen to the community, and reflect on your viewpoint.

I'd like to remind everyone that the purpose of the matter before the Plan Commission this evening is to determine whether this project meets the criteria for the requested zoning variation and the request for special use. The larger issue of whether this project is in the best interest of the Village of Arlington Heights is for the Board of Trustees to determine.

So, with that in mind, we'll move on to our first agenda item, but I believe that our attorney wanted to speak to us before we begin.

MR. PASSMAN: Sure, thank you, Madam Chairman, and good evening, members of the Commission, members of the public. A pleasure to see you virtually tonight.

I wanted to provide some context for why we're here, and some of this will be a little repetitive and what we discussed at the end of your last meeting on September 22nd, but there is, you know, we previewed that this meeting might happen and indeed here we are.

So, what happened on the 22nd, and I know that, you know, the Commissioners, eight of nine of you were, Commissioner Warskow, I know you've been made familiar with the events of the 22nd. After the public hearing was held, this Commission

entertained a motion to approve the zoning relief, and that motion garnered a four-to-four vote. The motion did not pass; however, as I advised that night, that did not mean that the matter was necessarily over. It simply meant the motion made did not pass.

So, we discussed that evening the various options that were available to the Plan Commission. One of those options would have been to continue the public hearing. That would have kept open the formal process. It would have allowed the Commission to accept additional evidence and additional testimony, both from the Applicant and the public at a subsequent night.

The Commission consciously chose not to do that. In fact, if you read your transcript from the 22nd, you discussed that, even inquired of the Applicant if they thought there might be more evidence that would be useful, and the Applicant declined to provide any additional evidence. So, the public hearing was not continued, and instead we adjourned the meeting at the end after that discussion.

Where that leaves us under the Zoning Code is I recognize perhaps a little unique and maybe unfamiliar territory for the Commission, because I know that typically you as many plan commissions in the area, you vote at the end of your hearing and you've had to vote it up or down and that's the end of it. This is a little bit different because there was no vote that was approved.

Under the Village's Zoning Code, the Plan Commission is given 30 days after the hearing in which to make its recommendation. In other words, this matter is still on your court for a 30-day period after the hearing is closed. Because the hearing was not continued on September 22nd, the 30-day clock started when that meeting adjourned; therefore, you have up to and through October 22nd in which to make your recommendation.

We've discussed this with Staff. We've discussed this with the members of the Village Board as well. I advised them that because the Plan Commission still has the right to make your recommendation, in any direction, the Village Board could not act on this until either you come together for a meeting and make your recommendation or the 30 days elapses without a recommendation.

We're here tonight because the decision was made to convene the Plan Commission to see if, having all nine of you here, the Commission could make your recommendation in whatever direction. It's important to note though, and my recommendation is, that because the hearing is closed, it is not appropriate to solicit any further testimony or input from the Applicant or from the general public. Their opportunity to testify, to provide evidence to you was granted in full on September 22nd. It would be inappropriate to take more testimony from anybody for, against, or indifferent to this proposal because then of course we would have to allow the others who may want to provide testimony to do the same, and this had not been noticed as a hearing, and so it would not be in line with the Illinois requirements for due process.

I do think that you can inquire clarifying questions of Staff. I know Mr. Hubbard is available to answer your questions. You may certainly deliberate amongst yourselves. But you should limit your consideration to the evidence that was placed before you on or before the September 22nd hearing. Anything that came after that, whether it might have been said or would be said tonight should be disregarded.

So, that's where we are. I know that kind of concludes my opening remarks, Chairman Dawson. I know a few members indicated they had some questions prior to convening the meeting at 7:30.

So, I'd be happy to entertain questions from anyone among the Plan Commission at this time.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, thank you so much for clarifying that. I think that's very helpful for everyone involved today. This is a bit of an unusual item, so Sam, if you could provide me some guidance on how we'll begin, please?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, based on what Mr. Passman has outlined, it sounds like the Plan Commission can, I mean, basically pick up where they left off after public comment was closed. They could discuss the project and somebody could make a motion. The Plan Commission could certainly discuss whether they want to even re-discuss the project or not, and maybe they make a motion or maybe a consensus is reached that it's not even appropriate to re-discuss it again at this time. Maybe they don't want to, but again, you know, the deliberations are open, so the Plan Commission is essentially free to talk amongst itself or ask Staff questions. Somebody could also throw a motion on the table and bring that forward. So, that's kind of our starting point this evening.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Commissioners, go for it. We're open to you.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I was the one who, in my absence, has instigated this unique situation. So, I'll just take a minute to tell everyone that I was not avoiding the decision or the meeting. I knew it was going to be controversial, but the only reason I was not in attendance at the meeting was I had a dental procedure done a few days before and I was not in a condition to speak that much, and I did have some facial things happening that would have distracted from the discussion. So, that is my reason for not appearing.

I would like the opportunity to weigh in, but I understand, you know, you all, my fellow Commissioners, have discussed this in full, so I'll leave it up to you as to whether or not you want to continue and, you know, hear other questions or comments I may have and then re-vote.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Mary Jo, I'd just like to ask. Did you hear, were you online and did you hear the public discussion?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: No, I wasn't online at the time, but I did, I was given a link to the recording of the meeting which I listened in its entirety.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: So, I did hear all the comments made by Commissioners, by the public, by the Petitioner and by Staff.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Well, I don't want to speak for anybody else, but I personally would like to hear what Mary Jo has to say about the issue.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I agree, I'd like to hear it as well.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, I would like to hear that, sure.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Nothing like putting Mary Jo on the spot.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: All right, so as I understand it, you know, our purview is limited to whether or not, as Commissioners, we feel the petition meets the special use criteria. I do think in particular people would be most focused on whether or not it is a detriment to the residential area in which it would be residing.

My opinion on that, based on all of the evidence and the testimony and then my own personal experiences, I won't get into details about that, but I do have personal experiences with young people who have troubles, and whether that's history or current, I have

had experience and it does impact how I think about that particular issue. I do not feel that it is a detriment to that neighborhood which I in fact grew up in on that Hill Drive from fifth grade until I graduated from college.

So, I'm very familiar with that neighborhood. I'm very familiar with the actual property itself. My opinion is that it is not detrimental, it does meet the special use criteria.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, thank you for that, Commissioner Warskow.

Commissioners, we have the opportunity here to discuss further if anybody would like to.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I would like to make a couple of comments here if I could. I for one do not want to re-discuss everything that we talked about that night. I have a little problem with this re-vote. I think that I would like to make a motion actually to leave it at a tie, because I think the way the night that was there, unless you experienced that first-hand, I think that was the best decision that this Commission could come up with, I think, is a tie. Not for and not against.

I have no problem going back to that vote, and I would like to encourage everybody to think about it. It doesn't make it and it doesn't hurt it; it doesn't do anything. Leave it up to the Trustees who have the final decision on this anyway.

Anyway, that's my feeling on it, and I would, if it's appropriate, I would like to make a motion to leave it at a tie vote, four-four. Four against and four in favor.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I would like to second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Commissioner Sigalos.

Just as a matter of discussion, you're right. You're absolutely right. For point of order, we have a motion and we needed a second. You're absolutely right, I spoke too soon.

Could you, Mr. Passman, speak if we can have such a motion?

MR. PASSMAN: I might, I would say that, you know, if the desire is, essentially Commissioner Green is asking that we stop discussing the matter and just move on because the vote that was taken was taken. Is that a fair statement, Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I would say. That's what I'm --

MR. PASSMAN: I'm trying to characterize it for a reason to try to fit it under the rules of procedure. I think it would probably be best characterized as, I would suggest perhaps it's a motion to postpone the matter. I realize postponement would mean this would, you know, it would likely, you know, go through the 30 days and it would take it away. I would suggest, Commissioner Green, a motion to postpone is essentially to take the matter on the table which is this item generally and push it off into some indefinite point in the future. If that's the motion that is made and seconded and then voted upon, then that would end this matter for tonight.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Well, would that leave it as a four-four tie?

MR. PASSMAN: It would leave it, there would be no further vote whatsoever. So, all we would, the record would reflect that the Plan Commission made a motion on September 22nd to approve that failed by a four-to-four vote and that no further substantive motion was made. I'm being overly technical for a reason; I hope you'll indulge me, but --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, but I think that you've answered my question. So, however we do this, the old tie vote would remain.

MR. PASSMAN: I would say that, Commissioner Green, to characterize that, I'm asking would you characterize your motion as a motion to postpone this matter indefinitely?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, like I say, I don't understand the legal part of this at all, I'm an architect. So, if we postpone that, that just pushes it off, the 30 days expires, and it goes back to the previous vote?

MR. PASSMAN: Correct, that's a fair way to say it.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, if that's the maneuver that has to be done to keep it at the four-four tie, then I suppose that's my recommendation based on expert legal advice. Thank you.

MR. PASSMAN: Sure.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, I have a question for Mr. Passman. Then it would go to the Board to decide?

MR. PASSMAN: Correct. So, right, on that note, I think Chairman, I'll characterize Commissioner Green's motion again as a motion to postpone indefinitely. I believe it's Commissioner Sigalos that seconded, is that correct?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: That's correct.

MR. PASSMAN: Okay, so if I, I mean, I'm happy to answer your remaining questions, and then obviously you can deliberate on this motion. Commissioner Ennes, that is correct. If this motion, this motion has been made and seconded, the motion to postpone, if this motion passes, then the matter, there will be no further discussion tonight on this agenda item because it will have been postponed.

As a practical matter, because of Open Meetings Act regulations that the Commission must abide by, there would be no way for this Commission to re-introduce the matter prior to the expiration of the 30 days. Once the 30-day expires, after the 22nd, then the ball bounces to the Village Board, and all the Village Board will have is the four-to-four vote that occurred on September 22nd. It will go up to the Village Board with the Plan Commission having failed to make a recommendation.

Let me point out, I know that sounds like a strong word, failed, there's nothing wrong with that legally. You are empowered to make a recommendation. Obviously, the code is written in your experience, I know you know generally you do make recommendations for or against, but there is nothing legally infirm if this motion passes and that happens.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: A question of you, Mr. Passman. What is the implication for what the Board has to do if the Petitioner goes forward with this split vote and the failure of the motion? Does that require the Board to turn to the super majority or simple majority or what are the implications of our not taking further action?

MR. PASSMAN: Good question, Commissioner Jensen. The answer is complicated. Under Illinois law and the Village Code, there is no implication as to the special use permit. There is no requirement in Illinois law or the Village Code for a super majority vote. However, there is a state statute that provides that if a variation does not receive a positive recommendation, then the Board can only approve a variation by a two-thirds vote. So, if this motion to postpone is approved, or if otherwise the Commission does not vote to recommend

the variations, then the Village Board will not be able to approve them except by super majority two-thirds vote. The special use permit will be on a simple majority regardless of what the Commission recommends or does not recommend.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I guess I'm still a little confused. I may be out of order referencing this, but in the supplemental thing that was in the list of items that, you know, were considered for this agenda item, it indicated that the Petitioners, they weren't asking for a variation relative to parking. Is that not the case?

MR. PASSMAN: I'll defer that to Mr. Hubbard. My understanding was that there were two variations that were still required.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Is the Staff requiring it? Because the Petitioner thinks they're not asking for one.

MR. HUBBARD: The code requires 10 parking spaces for a 12-person shelter care facility and a variation to waive the code-required traffic and parking study. The Petitioner may believe that the code does not require that, but Staff believes it is. I have not heard until this meeting, Commissioner Jensen, that the Petitioner did not agree that they're required to receive a variation for parking.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: It's the first item in the list of supporting documents. You've clarified it, Sam, I think what you've said, and I appreciate the clarification that in fact they would need to get the variation in parking if they went forward. So, then what Mr. Passman has laid for us is that now they might, the Board can do a simple majority on the special use, they would need to get the super majority or two-thirds vote for the variation that Staff feels they need. Thank you for clarifying that.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Can I ask a question?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Commissioner Dawson?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: I'm sorry, yes, Commissioner Warskow had her hand raised. If anybody else wishes to speak, that might be the best way. You can either show or raise hand by the emoji on your screen. Thank you. That way, I want to make sure everyone is heard and everyone has all the time to ask all the questions they need. Commissioner Warskow?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes. In reading the motion which I believe the motion sheet that I was given for tonight is the same motion sheet that was utilized the other night. The first condition on that motion sheet is the capacity of the two units shall be a maximum of one individual per bedroom, maximum of six residents on the subject property with one in each bedroom.

Sam, does that same variation apply to a group home of six?

MR. HUBBARD: So, they would still need a parking variation with the capacity of six. The parking requirement reduces from 10 to I believe five parking spaces, it's either four or five parking spaces. Their plan showed that they would have only two parking spaces within the driveway, so they would only be providing two on site, so they would still need a variation although slightly less.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Thanks for that clarification.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Sorry, I was on mute.

Commissioner Ennes, yes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes, a couple of points. The residents at this home are not allowed to have cars, I mean, that's a fact of the matter, they are not allowed to

have cars. There's two people coming in and going, the certified staff that are there 24 hours a day, three shifts a day from what I understand are the only people that would be driving. For us to, when we've had other cases like this, the common sense of this says there's going to be two cars there. They have parking in the garage, Sam, is that not correct? Two spaces in the garage and two on the driveway?

MR. HUBBARD: They do have two in the garage, but their plan is to convert the garage into living space, so they would be left with only two in the driveway. It would be a total requirement of five parking spaces with the capacity of six.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: With the capacity of six, but none of those people can have cars, right?

MR. HUBBARD: Right, those are the regulations of Shelter, Inc.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right. So, we have also, in situations like this, very frequently waived the parking requirement, I'm sorry, the traffic study. To me, the technical issues about the special use that we're supposed to address here are not what I consider that significant. I think we would be shirking our responsibility to not make our vote tonight.

You know, we asked Mary Jo her position. She came out, she stated it. Then we go, oh, we just want to leave it as a tie.

You know, I live fairly close to this neighborhood. I know a lot of the people in the neighborhood. I can understand the feelings that a lot of them have about having this home there.

I also have a real problem, and Mary Jo, you may know more about the residents in this situation than I do, but these are young men, 17-and-a-half to 21, who are trying to get ahead. From what I understand, they're not allowed in there if they've been violent, if they've been sexual offenders. They very closely watch who is allowed into this home.

The reason that they're in this home is because, from what I understand from the Shelter information, is that these are unfortunate young men who were born into family situations where they were abused and neglected. For us not to give them, afford them this opportunity because there is a lot of resistance within the neighborhood to have the home there, I think is a mistake for us as the Plan Commission. We're here to look at what are the zoning issues, and I think the issues, if I haven't hit them all, Sam, and you want to add something that I've missed need them, but I think they are all not that major of issues that we shouldn't be able to address and approve, and not just pass this on and require the Board to do a majority vote to get this type of a project approved. Sue, that's all I have to say.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Just to clarify, I think you said majority, I think you meant super majority?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Super majority.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: I believe it was that, but I just want to make sure that that your statement, super majority?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, Commissioner Lorenzini?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Thank you. I don't want to rehash our points. I mean, I think everybody still has the same opinion that we had before but, and I see where you're coming from Bruce, you know, we made our vote, let's just get on with it. But if it's going to cause, if us not making a recommendation is going to make it harder for the Trustees to pass it should they want to, you know, let's say they would pass it by one vote but if we were to

make a recommendation they would need three votes more or something like that, I wouldn't want to put that burden on them. So, I'm not in favor of just passing it along the way it was and not make a recommendation, because if that's going to make it harder for the poll people who may be in the majority to get the project approved, I wouldn't want to do that. So, I think we should take a vote.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: If I could just answer to both Terry and Joe?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Just part of the problem that we have with this whole meeting is the fact that everybody keeps talking about what the Plan Commission should do and we're failing this and we're failing that. I think we should keep our comments to what we think as individuals because I have the same kind of comment, I can give in rebuttal to that. I don't think this Commission should sell out the neighborhood for some idea, okay. There are other spots for this house to be. It doesn't have to be in the middle of a neighborhood.

So, if we're going to start saying how we're disappointed in people and the Commission for even thinking this and the things that were said last time which I don't ever want to revisit as a Commission, so I think we shouldn't be selling out the neighborhood. If that's where we're going with this, I want to get my digs in there as well.

So, that's why I think it should be left. Let the politicians deal with it, that's what they do best.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I agree with you, Bruce, but we're just making it harder by requiring a super majority to get it passed.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: If this is such a good idea, they'll make the super majority, if that's what you're telling me.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, I appreciate both of those viewpoints, and I agree. I'm thankful that we're not going to be rehashing all of what we said last time, but I do think, Commissioner Green, thank you for expressing that and reminding us of that viewpoint.

Do we have any further discussion before we vote on the motion before us? We do have a motion and seconded, so we do need to vote. Correct?

MR. PASSMAN: Yes, and as a reminder before Mr. Hubbard takes the roll on the vote, this is a motion to postpone this matter indefinitely. That is the question before the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Sure.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Does it make sense for me to vote on that motion?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

MR. PASSMAN: Each and every one of you have the right to vote as you see fit.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Okay.

MR. PASSMAN: I would say, to answer you, if that comes up again depending on how this goes, all nine of you have the right in my legal opinion to vote on any motion that comes before you tonight.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: So, Mr. Passman, I don't know that this is a necessary clarification, but I feel like when the motion is stated, and Commissioner Green, this is your motion so I want you to speak to this, but I feel like the motion stating that it's going to be

postponed indefinitely sounds, it might just sound a bit harsh. I think if we postponed it to the next meeting would still suffice, I just, Commissioner Green, this is your motion. Are you happy with it as stated by Mr. Passman? I just want to make sure that you feel that it's not being misrepresented or in any way turned into a comment you're not intending to make.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: You heard what I wanted it to be. I want it to go back to the tie vote, I'm very clear on that. The legal jargon that a few of you understand to me might have a tainting sound to it, but if they listen to what I'm asking for and this is the procedure that we have to follow, I guess we have no choice. So, yes, I have to agree with this. According to our Village Attorney, this is how you would make it stay as a four-four tie.

MR. PASSMAN: Yes, I would say, Chairman Dawson, I framed it that way, that is right out of Robert's Rules of Order. I mean, I don't want to get fussy about this, I'm trying to bring it where it makes some sense. What I understood Commissioner Green's desire, I'm trying to frame the motion to reflect his desire, is the last substantive vote is the four-four vote and that's it. The way we do that is we don't allow another substantive vote which the proper Robert's Rules motion for that is a motion to postpone indefinitely. That would accomplish the goal.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you for clarifying. I understand now why you're using the word indefinitely, and I hear Commissioner Green saying that he's comfortable with the revision to, no, not comfortable, no?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I don't think there's a choice. You have to do it this way, so let's try it this way.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay. All right, any further discussion before we go to a roll call vote on the motion before us? Does anyone need clarification on what it is we're voting on? Do we need to state it again, what the motion is?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes, one more time.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you. Mr. Passman, I think that maybe, you can speak for yourself, but I think you'd appreciate it if he said it, right, Bruce?

MR. PASSMAN: Yes, I'm happy to do it. My understanding of the motion before the Commission is a motion to postpone indefinitely this item on the agenda, I believe item number five on the agenda indefinitely. So, rephrase that, sorry. The motion on the table is a motion to postpone indefinitely item five and the agenda concerning the Shelter, Inc. zoning application.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, I don't know if we need to restate the second but just for all purposes, John, could you just restate? Just to make sure we're sure that we have appropriate --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, I certainly second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, let's proceed to a roll call vote then.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Commissioner Drost, you're on mute if you're

trying to speak.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Sorry. No.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: No.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: No.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: No.

MR. HUBBARD: Chair Dawson.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: No.

MR. HUBBARD: So that motion has failed.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: That motion fails. We are still open for discussion or for another motion if somebody wanted to present another motion.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make the motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #21-015, a Special Use permit to allow a "Sheltered Care" home on the subject property, and the following variations:

- 1. Variation to Chapter 28 of the Municipal Code, Section 6.12-1(3), to waive the requirement for a traffic and parking study from a qualified professional engineer.**
- 2. Variation to Chapter 28 of the Municipal Code, Section 10.4, to reduce the required off-street parking spaces from 10 spaces to two spaces.**

This recommendation is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Capacity of the two units shall be a maximum of one individual per bedroom (maximum of six residents on the subject property with one in each bedroom) plus staff/counselors.**
- 2. No less than one staff per six residents shall be present at the facility at all times, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, so adequate supervision can be provided between the two units.**
- 3. All staff must be trained in CPI and think/trauma training (or substantially similar training) to be able to de-escalate conflict and provide appropriate care for residents.**
- 4. The Petitioner shall establish and follow screening procedures which will allow them to identify and accept the most appropriate candidates for the program.**
- 5. Operation of the facility shall occur in substantial compliance to the "Transitional Living Program Handbook," which shall be updated for review by staff prior to appearing at the Village Board.**
- 6. The Petitioner shall work with the Police Department to establish appropriate on-site security, as applicable, and shall establish regular reporting of statistics and resident contact information if warranted.**
- 7. Residents living on the subject property shall not be allowed to park cars on the subject property.**

8. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll second that.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Commissioner Ennes seconded.

Any discussion on this motion?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'd like to make a comment and remind everybody that we are not voting on the value of what Shelter provides to these youths, to the community in general. We're voting on the location in this residential neighborhood, and that's what we should be voting on. I said it before and I'll say it again, I'm fully supportive of Shelter, but this is the wrong location. They've got to find a better location and not infringe upon the residents that reside there.

So, again, we're not voting on the value of Shelter, what they provide. We're voting on the location. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, thank you for that.

Any other discussion on this point?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, seeing no further discussion, let's move to a roll call vote.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: No, with comment.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chair Dawson.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes, with comment.

MR. HUBBARD: All right, that motion passes by a five-to-four vote. I believe Commissioner Cherwin had a comment and Chair Dawson had a comment.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, this is Jay. I haven't spoken tonight, you know, as I had at other meetings and listened to whatever the evidence. You know, the basis for my opinion is the special use, it's not a permitted use for a reason, right? You have to look at the existing area and the circumstances and give particular consideration to the adjacent established uses. We have several criteria that we looked at. You know, I think the testimony of neighbors is very important in a special use request because they're the ones that are going to

be the most affected. I didn't think that they're, I mean, I suppose you may disagree with their concerns, but I didn't think it was irrational or unreasonable. For them to think that their established single-family, you know, it's a family housing neighborhood, would be affected by adding this use with those young adults living in close quarters, I don't think the neighbors were out of line or irrational and I give it a lot of weight. At some point, the people's voices have to matter, particularly the people who are directly affected by it.

So, in coming to a decision of whether it's detrimental or not, I don't just rely on my experience or my own viewpoint, but I have to give consideration to people who have the most at stake. I'm reluctant to disregard such an overwhelming plea from the people who are most affected, and so I absolutely would vote no on this. That's all.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you for your comments.

My comment was only that, again as I stated at the beginning, I had thought long and hard, I apologize for my pet, about the last meeting and the many things that were said. I have gone back and forth actually with my own vote as to whether or not I would change my vote at this meeting. I took a very long look, a hard look at the required criteria and, in the end, felt that I would leave my vote as is and allow the Village Board to make the determination. However, the zoning criteria gives me pause because it is a neighborhood issue, and I think that there are very valid arguments there from a zoning variance issue. But as a Commissioner pointed out here, it's more of a technical issue, and because of that, I would really like to see how the Trustees weigh in on this. Our purview is very small, and they really I think are better suited to make this determination. So, that was my comment.

Okay, with that, Sam, what are the next steps?

MR. HUBBARD: So, we do, as a public meeting, we do have to open up for public comment. I do, I have received several e-mails with requests for comments to be read in this evening. So, I can certainly read those in or we can open up the floor for public comment first. I guess it's up to you, Chair Dawson.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: I don't know that procedurally it makes a difference.

Mr. Passman, do you have any preference to that? Why don't we, since people have been waiting on the line to speak, why don't we let them speak first and then move, if that's okay, and then we can move forward to reading the e-mails that you received into the record?

MR. PASSMAN: That's fine, Chairman.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, absolutely. I will ask anyone in the public who wishes to make a public comment, please click the Raise Hand feature in Zoom. If you dialed in on a phone, you can dial *9 and it will raise your hand via your phone number here and I can eventually bring you in. But I will start bringing in individuals who have their hand raised currently. Let's see, three or four people would like to make comments. Let me bring over a Mr. Keith Moens.

Mr. Moens, you should now, yes, there you go, you should now be in Zoom and it should be asking you to unmute. You can, yes, I think we can hear you now.

MR. MOENS: Okay, thank you, Mr. Hubbard. I just want to thank the Plan Commission for all the work they've put into this. I understand the concerns and everything that was involved in that, and I really feel like you gave it its just due. I do agree with your vote, I think it's really something we can be proud of as a Village to help these kids move forward in a

good home and a good neighborhood.

So, thank you for your vote, and again I appreciate the time you spent. Thank you.

MR. HUBBARD: All right, thank you for your comment. I am now going to bring in a Jolanta Szymanska. Sorry, I'm sure I'm pronouncing your name wrong, but Zoom should now let you in the meeting and you should be able to unmute yourself and provide your public comment.

MRS. SZYMANSKA: Good evening. Thank you so much for your hard work. I really feel disappointed that you guys approved the motion. I feel that you did not listen to the community and I am afraid that the shelter will compromise our children's safety, senior safety. I personally walk around the neighborhood and I am truly disappointed with your decision today.

At the same time, it was nice to go around the neighborhood collecting signatures. We have a great neighborhood. Unfortunately, I don't think whoever is voting for the shelter is considering our vote. Most of the people on the Valley Lane, Knob Hill Drive, and Ivy Lane are opposing that. Basically, I feel that my voice is not heard.

I appreciate your hard work this evening. Thank you so much.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you for your comment. Okay, I'm going to bring in MBlock. All right, MBlock, you should be joining the Zoom meeting. You can now unmute yourself and provide your comment.

MR. BLOCK: Okay, I think I got it. Can you hear me now?

MR. HUBBARD: We can, thank you.

MR. BLOCK: Okay, my name is Matthew Block. I live in the Ivy Lane neighborhood in close proximity to this residence. I've just got a couple of comments I would like to make or something I would like to point out that I don't know if it was mentioned in the last meeting on this subject because I was not there for that. But on May 17th of 2021, an elementary school child was sexually assaulted on Valley Lane walking to Ivy Hill School, within 100 yards of the location of this property. To my knowledge, that offender has not been apprehended and I don't know if that was factored in the position on this.

I've talked to numerous neighbors in this neighborhood, and everyone I've talked to nobody wants this. The only other comment I have is in response to Shelter, Inc. They were sending flyers out to neighbors, people in the neighborhood, about DCFS, if any of these residents cause a problem, DCFS will be called. Well, I can tell you, as a retired law enforcement officer with 27 years on the job, I can assure you there is not much that DCFS can or will do if they are called.

That's all I have to say. Thank you for listening to me and thank you for your work.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you for your comment. Okay, I'm going to try and bring in a Heidi Graham. All right, Heidi, I see you joined. You should now be able to unmute yourself and give your comment.

MS. GRAHAM: Yes, hi. Thank you so much for your hard work for our community. My name is Heidi Graham, I am both a resident of Arlington Heights as well as the President of the League of Women Voters of Arlington Heights, Mount Prospect and Buffalo Grove.

I very much appreciate your vote tonight on both League level, for

the work that I do with League, as well as a personal level. In regards to the League, we support fair housing. We support housing that meets basic human needs, and we also support low and moderate income housing, all of which is lacking in Arlington Heights, a community that claims to be a village of good neighbors. So, this particular plan helps us to actually live up to our city model of being a city of good neighbors.

I also want to speak on a personal level. I am a court-appointed special advocate in the foster care system. I actually deal with young people exactly like who will be served by these particular residents. These young people have been let down and failed by the system over and over and again, and the good people of Arlington Heights, most of my neighbors will say we want to do something, we want to be better, and this is our chance to be better.

These young people just need a chance. They are not violent. They are willing to add to our community, both economically, spiritually, and otherwise. We have to give them a chance. It is time that people that live in a community like Arlington Heights step up and actually do what they claim they want to do, which is to be a city of good neighbors.

So, anyway, I really do thank the Village and all of you on the Plan Commission for your yes vote tonight. I do recognize that this is hard work.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you, Ms. Graham. Okay, I'm going to bring in an Al Gould. Mr. Gould, I see Zoom has now let you in to the meeting. You should be able to unmute yourself and provide your comment.

MR. GOULD: Good evening, you guys, hey. I'm not the best speaker, but I live at 419 East Valley Lane. I just think an issue like this that's going to have the impact that it is on our neighborhood for this project and for our future zoning decisions in our neighborhood going forward shouldn't be decided by a one vote majority at the Trustee level or whatever level it's going to next. I think it's a travesty. Thanks.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you for your comment, Mr. Gould. All right, I'm going to bring in a Marcel Ciongan. Okay, I do see you have joined the meeting and you should be able to unmute yourself and provide your comment.

MR. CIONGAN: Good evening. I want to thank everybody for your effort and activity in your roles. I'm a little disappointed to see this motion being, you know, promoted with five to four. As other people said, I don't know, one vote, you know, shouldn't decide, you know, such a tight, you know, decision. It's a long-term decision. We try not to be emotional as some of you on the line. This is not about the activity of Shelter. This is just to point out that this is not the right location.

I'm 16 years in this address, 306 East Valley Lane. 24 years, you know, paying taxes in Arlington Heights. I felt, you know, that my voice can be heard here, and not only mine. We are talking about 399 signatures in this neighborhood, you know, all against, you know, this particular location.

Again, we are not against, you know, the activity of Shelter, but this is the wrong location, guys. As was pointed before, if you don't care about the safety of the kids, you know, or with the bus, you know, being in proximity, you know, of this address, at the end of the line is the Ivy Hill, if you don't care about the traffic issues of these properties right behind the corner, Valley Lane is extremely busy, there is no visibility for any driver backing, you know, another car there. Nobody cares, you know, about the precedent that would be set, you know. What will be next? Probably gambling, you know, casino or something. I don't know, maybe a

gentlemen's club, you know, in the duplex, you know, next to me.

I'm really, really disappointed. Thank you.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you for your comments. Okay, the last hand I see raised, I'm going to bring in a Bruce/Donna A. Okay, we've got, one more hand just got raised. So, Bruce/Donna A, we're bringing you in to the Zoom meeting. You should be able to unmute yourself and provide your comment.

MRS. ACKERMAN: Hello, my name is Donna Ackerman, my husband is Bruce. We live on Knob Hill Drive and we've been here over 18 years.

As I listened at the last meeting, I was in attendance until the last minute after midnight, and I am concerned about the behaviors and attitudes of the board. I think the Plan Commission did not remove their emotion from it. One of you stated that it is a vote about a location and it is a vote about the zoning and changing the parking, and there's a couple of others in there having six or 12 residents that was also requested. Parking will have at least four cars there. When you change shifts, the two people that drove are going to have two more cars come up, so there will be four cars for at least an hour at the change of shift. I'd like that noted.

So, the emotion has not been removed. It is emotional, but you guys are supposed to vote without emotion. The location is what we are against, not the Shelter. We are not against the Shelter. For others to come on and say we're not standing up as residents of Arlington Heights, I don't think that's true.

They requested 12 kids to be in the house, and now all of a sudden it's changed to say they requested six kids to be in the house, one per bedroom. That is not the paper that we received. They asked for 12.

So, I am disappointed in tonight's vote, and I think that it should be a super majority vote for the politicians, but I also feel that the politicians should listen to the residents. I don't think that has happened tonight.

So, I do thank you for your time, but I am very disappointed in the outcome tonight. Thank you.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you for your comment. Okay, I see three more hands are now raised. I will start with an Ana. Ana, I'm going to bring you in to the Zoom meeting. Let's see, I see you've just joined. Zoom should give you the option to unmute yourself and provide your comment.

MR. PALTOLPA: Hello, this is Peter, last name Paltolpa. I live with my wife and my kids at 407 East Valley Lane. This is like one minute away from the proposed Shelter, Inc.

You know, we are very disappointed, you know, with the result of the voting because we think you should listen to the community, especially the community which lives close to the proposed house. You know, we're against, most of us, you know, are against this protected shelter. I don't see this result in the voting, you know. So, you should take into consideration the closest neighborhood, you know, of the Shelter, Inc.

We are not against the Shelter as a company, but we are against the location. We have so many kids living over here and, you know, they're really afraid. You know, at this moment, they are afraid of what they can expect in the future. For our kids here, it's really important. Their childhood, you are talking about a second chance for these young guys, you know, yes, that's true, for them the second chance, but for our kids it's their first chance. They

deserve a safe childhood.

So, just take this into that consideration. The first chance of childhood I think is most important and the future of those kids will be much better, you know, I think without this kind of not-known shelter. Thank you for listening to me and thank you for taking into consideration our voice.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you for your comment. All right, I am going to bring in a Tim McRaith. All right, Tim, I see that you have joined the meeting. You can unmute yourself and provide your comment.

MRS. McRAITH: Hi, my name is Pam McRaith. I live 250 feet from this duplex. I have been a resident of Arlington Heights for 30 years and 22 years living at my current address at Knob Hill Drive.

I'm disappointed in the vote tonight. The location is what we are against. I'm not against what the Shelter does, it's the location. In the minutes that were read or presented on September 22nd, they mentioned that these young people which are males, 17-and-a-half to 21 years old males that will be living in this facility that are overcoming extreme difficulties and challenges, we don't know what these extreme difficulties and challenges are. As just was mentioned a few minutes ago in the meeting just now, they said some of the kids are abused. If you have any background in that, you know that some children that are abused become abusers as they grow older.

I'm concerned for the safety of the neighborhood. This, having 12, six people worried me, six young males living in the house, at that age living there worried. When I heard it was 12, you can imagine that worried me even more. There's a bus stop directly across the street from this location. You have young girls standing outside waiting for the bus. You have young boys that will be waiting there. You have teenagers that will be walking past this location to go to the Jewel around the block.

This is a concern for me when there's 17-and-a-half-year-old to 21-year-old males all living in this complex. There is no facility that has had that or a precedent like that in our neighborhood. We don't have any houses in our neighborhood that have six to 12 young boys like that. They originally said 12 boys, or 12 young men I should say. That's almost like a fraternity in our neighborhood, 12 young men that are going to be supervised by two 25-year-old males.

If you take into consideration, that was considered at one of the meetings when they said that they received curfew calls, well, now you have 12 young males, you're going to have additional curfew calls. On top of that, you're dealing with the comings and goings of the ages of these boys. You don't know when one leaves and another one comes in. What difficulties are we going to face as a neighborhood as well?

Besides the disruption, it can be detrimental to our neighborhood with these police calls. I'm concerned about that. Again, the people that are saying we approve this, well, where do they live in Arlington Heights? They don't live within this proximity. They may live blocks away or miles away, but they're approving it because it's not in their neighborhood.

This is why we have a variance. We have a variance for this housing as a residential community, that's what we are, a community. If you open this precedence up to allow other facilities as such, then we could have this through our whole area and it's no longer a residential community with our kids able to play safely out front.

On my last note, we are a village of good neighbors. We pride ourselves for that. We have shown this by welcoming the Shelter at their current location in Arlington Heights also. TLP has been in Arlington Heights, as they said, since 1990's. The only reason they're moving is because their current facility is for sale. The current commercial neighborhood worked fine for them for many years. This neighborhood community that they're living in currently has apartments nearby. So, that's a community for them, and they have plenty of jobs in that area that are accessible by walking. So, I'm sure there are many housing opportunities available that meet the same need at their current location. As they stated, it worked so well for them.

So, I want to thank you for the time and I do want it noted that I'm very upset with this vote.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you for your comments. I am going to bring in a Beth Arnold. Beth, I see that you have joined the meeting. You should be able to unmute yourself and provide your comment.

MS. ARNOLD: Good evening. My name is Beth Arnold, and I'm a retired educator. I spent most of my years at Buffalo Grove High School. Many of my neighbors know me, I've had some of their children as students. I have done nothing but dedicate my life to improving and supporting youth.

This shelter has a wonderful goal. It has picked a horrible location to do it. That is all we are trying to express. It is insulting to be accused of not being a city of good neighbors, for us here in this area to be accused of that. I agree with the previous speaker, the people who are supporting this are not in this neighborhood. They have not watched the traffic, looked at the bus stop, walked the streets, gotten signatures, platted 399 signatures meticulously on a street map to demonstrate the strong unity that this is not the right place.

We live right here, and I'm very sorry that you could not take that into consideration and understand this is about a variance, not about the goal of a worthy organization like Shelter. Thank you for your time.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you for your comments. I am going to bring in a Diana Morris. Diana Morris, I see you've joined Zoom. You can provide your name and your comment.

MS. MORRIS: Yes, thank you. I'm Diana Morris. I am an employee at Shelter, Inc., but I have also worked in residential youth care for over 25 years in different agencies that provide neighborhood group homes like this, neighborhood-based group homes. I understand the concerns of the neighbors, but I've also seen that it does enhance the neighborhoods rather than detracting from them.

When we moved our girls home into Schaumburg 30 years ago, we requested a special use permit. At the time, the neighbors came to the plan commission and fought against it because of the same concerns we've heard. A year later, they came back and said it was actually a benefit to the community, having 24/7 staffing, there's neighborhood watch where we can notice when things are going on in the neighborhood and report them.

We've been in Palatine and Schaumburg, in a neighborhood for 20-30 years, each of them, and I feel like this is a benefit to the community rather than a detriment. So, thank you very much for your time.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you for your comments. Okay, I'm going to bring in a Katherine Scortino. Katherine Scortino, I see that you have now joined the meeting. You

should be able to unmute yourself, provide your name and your comment.

MS. SCORTINO: My name is Katherine Scortino, and I just want to take exception to some of the previous speakers who have said that the neighbors in Ivy Hill are against this and don't want it. I have been a 42-year resident of the Ivy Hill neighborhood, and I am in very strong support of this facility.

We're not accusing other people of not being good neighbors, but I am going to say people are not taking the opportunity to really show that they are good neighbors. We're living here. They will be living with us. Some of us, especially me, have raised many young males, and we know the kind of support that they need. To be making comments about that on May 17th there was a sexual assault of a student going to Ivy Hill and tying that in with this home, that makes no sense. Why are we assuming that these young men are going to be doing things like that? It just, it appeals me that these kinds of comments are being made.

This is a wonderful, wonderful opportunity for us to be friends, to be neighbors, to hold the space for these young men who are only asking, who have applied for and have to apply for to be accepted into this program, for us to be able to hold the space for them to allow this growth, to be a part of a neighborhood, this is an opportunity we should not be avoiding. Again, I'm a 42-year resident of Ivy Hill and I want this. I'm in full support of this and I want this.

Thank you so much for your vote tonight. I'm so grateful, thank you.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you for your comment. I don't see any more hands. I'm going to begin reading in the e-mails that I received.

E-mail No. 1: The proposed shelter on Valley Lane is the right mission in the wrong location. I support Shelter but I will never put anything above the safety of my family. This location is inappropriate due to the close proximity of the elementary school, bus stops, and middle and high schools, and neighborhood parks. In review of the police activity report for the current shelter location, our safety concerns are one hundred percent justified based on the current documented calls. Why are the residents who actually live near this location being ignored about our concerns? We pay more than enough in taxes to be listened to. Nobody is against helping people in need, but we are against sacrificing our own personal sense of security for this. If you truly cared about this shelter, then you would figure out a way to buy the existing location so this rezoning is not necessary. Anyone who believes this is a wonderful idea can reach out to Shelter and offer up a room in your own home to house one of these residents. If you have any reason not to, then you yourself are not aligned with putting a shelter in a family neighborhood. Please be sure to vote for the actual residents of Ivy Hill who will be impacted by this decision. Regards, Kerri Hood.

E-mail No. 2: Dear Plan Commission, I support the zoning changes for the new home for Shelter, Inc., the transitional housing for boys. The reason I support your yes vote is:

1. The kids admitted to this program have volunteered for it. They want to improve their lives and want to learn emerging adult skills like budgeting, working with others, and other life skills. The emerging adults have been vetted very carefully, and an adult will be on the premises 14-7. Many kids place out of foster care and are not taught further skills. What happens to them? It's a hard life, and many turn to ways to earn a living that hurt the community. Why would we not want to help the kids now when they want to learn

rather than wait until they're arrested and have made bad choices. This program protects and saves the kids from making bad mistakes and gives them love in a community that they crave.

2. There has been one police call over the last five years in the former facility. Calls are now mostly handled in-house because staff is more deeply trained.
3. The emerging adults are not allowed cars so there is no traffic problem in the neighborhood. This is also a DEI issue and that we can include youth in our town that seek help. It is an equity issue in that we can raise up everyone so all can attain their highest potential.

Please vote yes for Shelter, Inc. Linda Waycie, South Minster Presbyterian Church Member.

E-mail No. 3: As someone who worked at the DMV, I've encountered many homeless individuals. Many are women with children, victims of domestic violence. Sometimes people need a hand. God asks us to help the poor, so look deep in your heart before you vote. Gayle Bernacki.

E-mail No. 4: To whom it may concern, please vote to support Shelter, Inc. opening a home on East Valley Lane in Arlington Heights. If not here, then where? Where will these young adults go? They have already been short-changed by life by being in the foster care system. Now they need us as a greater community to step in and give them a helping hand to be able to function as full adults in our society. Let them live among us, let them live with us. Thank you. Patricia Rich.

E-mail No. 5: Dear Plan Commission members, I'm writing to ask you to please support Shelter, Inc.'s proposed site request for its Transitional Living Program. For over 10 years, Shelter, Inc.'s Transitional Living Program has provided vital services to the Arlington Heights community, providing help to hundreds of families and young adults. The tenants receive medical and dental care, clothing and assistance with general living and social skills so they can be successful upon graduation. The participants in this program are students at local schools and employees at local businesses. In other words, they are neighbors, and having these resources available to them only strengthens the community. There is a thorough screening of all applicants to the program. All residents are required to work or go to school. They must abide by strict curfews. Visitors are strictly monitored. Per the information prepared by the Village, there is no one call for police service at the existing two-unit residence over the last five years. This is a result of staff at the facility having implemented strategies to reduce the number of police calls and an able resolution of conflicts without outside assistance through intensive CPI training, Think Trauma training, enhanced screening, and the establishment of clinical services for their residents. They pointed out that over the last five years, the majority of calls at their existing facility have been for curfew violations, mental health checks, and other non-criminal reasons. The police had said they can accommodate the call volume. Thank you for your consideration. Joyce Slavik

E-mail No. 6: I, Tim McRaith, living within 250 feet of the property at 207-209 East Valley Lane, oppose the issuance of a variance to Chapter 28 of the Municipal Code. First, I trust that each of you have read all of the letters from those that live in the immediate neighborhood on Valley Lane and Knob Hill Drive, especially those within 250 feet. I strongly oppose this variance. The responses are overwhelmingly against this variance. If you look at those that are in favor of the variance, they are blocks if not miles away. Please take that

into consideration. Their voices should not count as much as those that have to live in the neighborhood and must deal with the consequences of this decision. Some, including the Chair of the Plan Commission, tried to paint an ugly picture as if we the neighbors are heartless individuals that don't want to help these young adults. That is the farthest from the truth. We have lived here for 22 years and the neighborhood has always been a peaceful and pleasant neighborhood and everyone has been so nice. We do not want to disrupt the fabric of this neighborhood with this variance. Many others have outlined the reasons why we don't want the variance, including traffic congestion, safety to our children, property values, and police calls at all hours of the day and night, so I won't belabor it. Shelter was never meant to go in a neighborhood like this, that's why they had to request the variance. We need to stick with the original code and not allow this variance. Thank you for your consideration on this matter. Please vote no. Sincerely, Timothy M. McRaith, 208 East Knob Hill Drive.

This will be e-mail No. 8: Dear members of the Arlington Heights Plan Commission, as a resident of Arlington Heights, I'm writing to urge you to support this special use permit to allow a shelter care home and minor variation approvals on the property purchased by Shelter, Inc. This program has a track record of success in serving young adults in our community and supporting them to transition into adulthood. These are vital services for those served by the program, and our community is enriched by these efforts. Continuing these services for participants in the program at a new location within our Village is something that should be facilitated by approving permit requests. Concerns presented by the opposition to this program being housed at this new location have been thoroughly addressed in response to nearby residents' input and concerns. As a resident who lives near the proposed site, I'm fully in support of this program. Our community has spent time and given lip service to being committed to diversity, equity, and inclusion. By allowing the Shelter, Inc. program to relocate and continue to thrive in our community, we demonstrate our commitment to have a more inclusive community that supports a whole range of residents. Please consider voting to support this permit. Erin Wyatt, Arlington Heights.

E-mail No. 9: Please vote to allow Shelter, Inc. to continue their work with youth, 17-and-a-half to 21 years of age, at their new location. As youth age out of the welfare system, they are vulnerable to being able to survive without additional help to finish schooling or seek employment. Shelter, Inc. is providing this opportunity for these young men to become productive citizens which is the goal of all developmental programs and the family. Shelter, Inc. provides also a strict set of guidelines for them to develop life skills. Please consider it a positive to have this organization in the area of Arlington Heights. Barbara Mass.

E-mail No. 10: Plan Commissioners, please open the attached file to show the breadth of the opposition of immediate neighbors within half a mile of the proposed Shelter, Inc. location. To date, we have 399 opposition signatures on the petition filed with the Village. Of those 399, there are 185 residents represented by red dots on the attached map who have signed the petition in opposition who live within a half mile of the proposed location. We used the neighborhood map from the 2020 Arlington Heights Zoning Map to create this document. Please consider our opposition to the requested rezoning. We live and have lived here in this neighborhood for an average of 22 years of residency across the body of opposition. We will bear the burden of the risk of the impacts to our safety, the character of the neighborhood being compromised, the decrease of property value, the increased traffic, et cetera, if you don't vote to deny this rezoning request. Thank you for your consideration to the

burden we will have to bear. Cathy Vaughn, 315 East Knob Hill Drive, plus 184 others in opposition.

E-mail No. 11: Hello, I would like you to support the Shelter project in Arlington Heights and vote yes on it at tomorrow's Plan Commission meeting. I believe Arlington Heights should be welcoming for these young folks who are learning how to become good citizens of the community through hard work and skills and education. Police calls to the current premises on Golf Road have been minimal over the past five years and have been mostly for curfew violations, mental health checks and other non-criminal reason. The police have said they can accommodate this call volume. The program has 24/7 on-site supervisor oversight with many restrictions on behavior within the premises. Arlington Heights needs to support people who are trying to improve their lives and the lives of those in their communities. Thank you for your consideration. Rosemary Walter.

E-mail No. 12: Thank you to the Commissioners for their service to the Village. Although my family has lived in Arlington Heights for six generations, I never realized the work of the Plan Commission. Since you will be reading this message after the vote on Shelter, Inc.'s request, I hope I will be thanking you for your yes vote as well as for your service. The futures of some very special young people are in your hands. Thank you if you've chosen to support them. Sandy Bourseau, 151 West Wing Street, Arlington Heights.

E-mail No. 13: My name is Daniel Crusius, and I am a life-long resident of Arlington Heights. I'm 25 years old. Shelter, Inc. is an important service for our Village to continue supporting. Shelter, Inc. provides mentorship and assistance to at-risk youth and will help create futures for our neighbors and will help build good residents of Arlington Heights. When an at-risk youth can succeed, everyone succeeds. Investing in youth and services to support our fellow neighbors will improve their quality of life and, as a result, will decrease crime by addressing the root cause of crime such as poverty. We have a moral obligation to support the vulnerable. The services Shelter, Inc. provides will help build good, upstanding citizens, and this mentorship will strengthen the Village of Arlington Heights, benefiting us all. We have an obligation to live out our priorities of diversity, equity and inclusion. Let us be the city of good neighbors. Please vote to support Shelter, Inc. Thank you. Daniel Crusius, 204 North Patton Avenue, Arlington Heights.

E-mail No. 14: The Transitional Living Program is not at issue. The requested variance is at issue.

1. The Staff report concluded that the request cannot be supported.
2. The variance request is why public comment is being made. The community should be heard. The community is against the variance being granted.
3. This is a precedent-setting situation. It should not be taken lightly or considered in one-off situation.
4. This is being placed directly into a residential area unlike the current location.
5. Safety. Current data should not be viewed at face value. The pandemic and small sample size impact the results. There is no guarantee that this will continue, especially considering that this plan will be doubling the size of the program. It is uncharted territory.
6. Concern over transparency. Did Shelter, Inc. communicate with members of the Plan Commission or Board prior to their purchase? Shelter, Inc. is handling this as a done deal. They have purchased the land and are going through the motions.

I believe the voices of the community should be heard and honored.

The Staff report supports not approving the granting of this variance. I believe that the variance should not be approved at this location. Dave Wichmann, 609 East Ivy Lane.

E-mail No. 15: I am asking the Plan Commission to vote in support of the new location for Shelter, Inc. At the last meeting, it was heartbreaking to hear some callers insinuate that the residents are delinquents or even predators because they have been under the guardianship of DCFS. Shelter, Inc. has a thorough screening process and the residents are well supervised. I have an 18-year-old who would absolutely not want to agree to a midnight curfew. The fact that these residents have agreed to this rule shows me that they are committed to this program to better their future. A vote of yes shows your support of Shelter, Inc., words of faint support do not. Wendy Dunnington.

E-mail No. 16: Dear Mr. Hubbard and members of the Housing Commission, I'm writing to urge you to approve the special use permit to allow a shelter care home for the two-story building on Valley Drive. The Transitional Living Program has been run successfully here in Arlington Heights. This program has 24-hour supervision, screens potential residents who must be either working or going to school, maintains strict curfews, and will be receiving training of various kinds that help them become vital members of the community. Sincerely, Alta J. Draut, 524 South Banbury Road, Arlington Heights.

Dear Decision Makers, this is e-mail No. 17, the last e-mail: Dear Decision Makers of Arlington Heights, I am a long-time resident and homeowner in Arlington Heights since 1987. I'm writing in support of Shelter, Inc. This program helps young people aging out of foster care with additional support before they must live on their own. The program has been a good neighbor in Arlington Heights for years and merely needs to move because their current location is no longer available due to the owner selling the property. We need to be good neighbors to these disadvantaged young people counting on the continuation of Shelter's much needed Transitional Living Program. The new location is walking distance from a shopping center, near potential jobs, and a bank, which is very helpful to them. It is in the best interest of everyone in the Village to help our youth to become more skilled with independent living and, through their vetting to be part of the program and their 24-hour supervision, they are sure to be successful. Please vote for the rezoning to allow the Shelter Transitional Living Program to continue with their desired new location without obstruction. Thank you for listening to our views. Patricia Crusius, 204 North Patton Avenue, Arlington Heights.

That is all of the e-mails.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, thank you to everyone who spoke today and who sent in e-mails and comments. We appreciate your time and efforts on this matter.

Sam, should we officially then call the public hearing closed, do you believe?

MR. PASSMAN: Public comment.

MR. HUBBARD: The public hearing is closed already, but the meeting could be --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry, the comment. The public comment. Thank you, Mr. Passman, for pointing out my mistake.

MR. PASSMAN: Landing the aircraft carrier, so thank you. Sorry.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right, yes, thank you. I meant the public comment period.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, a motion could be made to close the public comment

LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

Chicago & Roselle, Illinois - Miami & Orlando, Florida

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

period and I will take a roll call vote.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'll second.

MR. HUBBARD: Okay, Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: You've got to unmute, Terry.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes. Thanks, Lynn.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chair Dawson.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

All right, well, as I typically like to say at the end, though we didn't have a full hearing today since we had it last time, again the Plan Commission's view, we focus really over a small element of the project and this is just a recommendation. I encourage all of you, both in favor and opposed, to please come to the Village Board of Trustees meeting and speak again, speak your voice. Your voices do matter and we do hear you. So, thanks again.

Do we have a date for the Village Board meeting?

MR. HUBBARD: We do not have a finalized date yet, but I do see the Petitioner in the audience, so I will certainly reach out to them once we have finalized the date.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: I don't believe there's any other items on the agenda, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: There is not.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Can we have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll make the motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Roll call.

MR. HUBBARD: Right, Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chair Dawson.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

All right, thanks to everyone for your time this evening.

(Whereupon, at 9:04 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
 COUNTY OF KANE)

I, RON LeGRAND, SR., depose and say that
 I am a digital court reporter doing business in the State of Illinois; that
 I reported verbatim the foregoing proceedings and that the foregoing
 is a true and correct transcript to the best of my knowledge and ability.

 RON LeGRAND, SR.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO
 BEFORE ME THIS _____ DAY OF
 _____, A.D. 2021.

 NOTARY PUBLIC