

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: GUIDEPOST MONTESSORI - 1000 WEST NORTHWEST HIGHWAY - PC #21-021
SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR DAYCARE, LAND USE VARIATION TO ALLOW A
DAYCARE CENTER WITHIN THE R-3 DISTRICT, LAND USE VARIATION TO ALLOW A
PRIVATE SCHOOL IN THE B-2 DISTRICT, SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A
PRIVATE SCHOOL WITHIN THE R-3 DISTRICT, REPEAL OF SPECIAL USE PERMIT
ORDINANCE 12-059, VARIATIONS

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,
Illinois on the 9th day of March, 2022 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BRUCE GREEN, Acting Chairperson
LYNN JENSEN
JOE LORENZINI
GEORGE DROST
TERRY ENNES

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: I'd like to call this Plan Commission meeting of March 9th, 2022 to order. Our first agenda item is the Pledge of Allegiance.

If you'd all please rise and join with me?

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: So, Sam, would you take the roll, please?

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye, here, aye. I'm here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Chair Dawson.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: We have a quorum of five this evening.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: There we go.

The next agenda item is approval of minutes, and that's Little Paw Animal Rescue from 2/23/22. Is there a motion for approval?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'll second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: All those in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: And I abstain because I was not there. I've got a nice old cheat sheet that they handed so I would get all of the things right here.

The first petition on the agenda is Guidepost Montessori. Is the Petitioner here? If you'd please step up? And anybody else that's going to speak on your behalf, I'd like to swear them in, so anybody that's going to be part of it, just stay right there. Just raise your right hand.

(Witnesses sworn.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: I always wanted to say it that way. Thank you.

So, if you would tell us, oh, before we get on to your presentation, have all the public notices been made on this one, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: They have.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Okay, and then if you'd make your

presentation, please?

MS. MENZA: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Thank you.

MS. MENZA: Can you hear me?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: And if you'd give us your name and spell your last name for the court reporter?

MS. MENZA: I will, I will. Hi, my name is Diane Menza. I represent the Petitioner, Olympia Acquisitions. I'm here, oh, M-e-n-z-a, that's my last name. I'm here to request the redevelopment, our plan to redevelop the 12,232 square-foot vacant building located at 1000 West Northwest Highway. We're also, this request includes expanding the building by approximately 1,156 square feet on the west side of the building facing the parking lot which will bring the total up to 13,338 square feet.

Our use for the building will be a Guidepost Montessori Daycare and Private School. Exterior upgrades that we're doing include a new roof, new storefront windows, and door systems replacing the existing openings. Also, the parking lot will be resurfaced, and currently there are no landscape islands in that and the landscape islands will be provided.

Right now, to the rear of the building, there is a surface parking lot. That will be replaced by a playground for the children which will be completely fenced in. Also, access by staff and children to that playground area will be protected, it will be right from the building into the fenced area.

Based on some comments that we received from Staff last week, we revised the site landscape and elevations that you received for this meeting. Our architect, Tom Seibert of Soos Associates, will walk you through those. Before I turn this over to him, we also have representatives from Guidepost Montessori to answer any of your questions, and our traffic consultant from KLOA. So, they'll be available to answer any questions. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Great, thank you.

MR. HUBBARD: Tom, there's a pointer up there. If you press the right button, it will move the slides.

MR. SEIBERT: I noticed that, and it's already up. Name is Tom Seibert, S-e-i-b-e-r-t, just like it says on the screen up there. I was wondering if any of the board members would prefer having a paper copy to make any scribbles on or if just screens that they're using are adequate? I have copies if you need it.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: I'm a paper guy. As an architect, I like to draw on your stuff. I'll try to get it back to you in good shape though, I promise.

MR. SEIBERT: Well, I've got plenty.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Well, why don't you share another one?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Here, see.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: He's got it.

COMMISSIONER DROST: You've got it, all right.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: I was going to take them all home.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay, good.

MR. SEIBERT: Okay, this controls the --

MR. HUBBARD: Correct.

MR. SEIBERT: Okay. Anyway, this is the existing building. We have the rear, sorry, not used to, there, okay. We've got, I just can't see it pointing at the screen. Anyway, the north elevation is the rear of the building, and then you have, south elevation is the very front

of the building. It faces Northwest Highway. The east elevation which are the two middle photographs are along Kennicott, the side street, and then west elevation is the existing elevation that's going to change the most facing the parking lot on the site.

Our new proposal here, you can see two angles showing the, from the Northwest Highway, the upper view is of the parking lot side where we have our small addition towards the left-hand side of that with the main entrance in the middle behind the tree. Then we have the portion facing the street off to the right with the existing mansards, and right now it's unpainted dark brown brick. All the features on the street side of the building are essentially the same as they are right now other than beefing up some of the columns a little bit. Then we've got the small addition that Diane mentioned on the, the upper view on the left.

These are a few more views of everything. You can see the entranceway on the middle with a little bit of an overhang. We've got some of the things that we've added based on the Design Committee requirements. We've got some gooseneck lighting over the signage on the front of the building. The exact placement will depend on what the signage actually ends up looking like. The signage that's on our elevations here is just temporary, to be used as an example of approximately what might happen.

We have our finishes labeled on this sheet. We essentially have a charcoal-colored single ply roof membrane that will be visible from the Kennicott side. There's no parapets on that portion of the building. We've got a weathered wood, sort of a grayish brown shingle on what are now dark gray slate shingles that will be replaced because of abatement requirements. We've got some awnings over the windows on the parking lot side of the building based on requests by the Design Committee.

We also have, the fencing on the site is basically going to be two different heights of PVC fence, picket style. We've got four-foot down at areas inside the site, and we've got six-foot with no visual spacers that will be on the, sort of perimeter of the site where it's bordering on the residential areas. I believe we also have a six-foot spaced fence on the Kennicott side so that it has a little bit of a relationship to the neighborhood, but it still gives you the security you need for the private play area.

On the back side, you'll notice that we've gotten rid of the air handling unit enclosure and the dumpster enclosure that are immediately up against the back side of the building right now.

On the site, this is the basic site with an aerial view on the back. We've got the playground area on the portion of the lot that's to the north with subdivisions by the four-foot fencing between different age ranges. We also have the fencing separating it from the parking area. The green space between the addition and the parking lot is also play area for the very youngest of children. We also anticipate, because of existing grades and all of that, that we'll probably have a rather tall curb separating the parking from that play area that will also act as like a barrier from vehicles being able to run up through the fence and all of that. They'd have to mount a fairly tall curb in order to do that. So, we've got some safety factor there.

We have the required handicap spaces. We have 48 parking spaces. The version that we had submitted to you about a week ago had an extra parking space at that northernmost landscape island at an odd angle that we've since removed based on the Commission's review. We have, the dumpster enclosure is right along the very north edge of the parking lot in the about four to five-foot space between the property line and the parking lot. It would have room enough for residential style garbage bins as opposed to full-sized dumpsters.

We also have at the play area, we've got some protected areas with

shelters. The large play equipment inside the oval, that has a shade structure that will be about 16, almost 17-foot tall, 16.9 feet I believe. The information is in one of the later slides, but that's going to be something we're looking at. Let's see.

This is the same slide, just showing some of the, removing some of the extraneous site information.

This exhibit just shows we have clearances to get Fire Department vehicles through the parking lot from either direction, and you also have access obviously on Kennicott to get every place except behind the short elevation of the building.

Here we have the landscape plan which, we have the plan here and the next page has a list of all of the landscape materials that will be used. We have trees at the end of each parking island. We have landscape along the street side of the parking lot that will be planted at least three-foot tall to begin with. I believe we also had comments saying that the landscaping on the fencing facing the north-south portion of Kennicott should also have minimum three-foot height at the time of planting, so we would be having that as well.

We do not have any planting on the north side of the north fence between the residents and the play area based on a request by that resident that no planting be provided there. They planned on taking care of it on their own.

We also have a sewer line which is about, not a sewer line, a catch basin opening about a third of the way from the west corner to the east corner of that north fence line. That will be within our fence, it's not going to be under a fence. Ah, a little bit to the left, there's a little dot, yes, right there. That's where the sewer manhole will be, and that will be something that will be regularly maintained by the landlord to avoid any ponding in that area.

This sheet includes all of the landscape materials anticipated for the site, including where we're having turf and planted grasses of various sorts. I should back up and mention that on the Kennicott side, the existing parking access that's facing Kennicott will be vacated and planted with grass and sidewalk replaced in that area to eliminate any thoughts about vehicles entering where the playground is.

This is the basic floor plan of the building with the younger children on the left side and the older children will be in the right upper elementary classrooms. Most of the rooms have their own toilet rooms. We have the reception area at the front where we've got the main entrance. We also have the accessible doorway on the side of the reception area that goes directly to the accessible parking spaces. The younger children all have direct exterior exiting the toddlers straight out to the exterior of the building, as well as the two larger elementary classrooms because they're too large to have just a single exit out of the classroom.

We have playground equipment with information about the different age of children in the different areas, and you also on the right, you can see the largest shade structure designed that we would be having over that play structure in the oval, that is, the taller unit.

Just some photographs of what the interior is anticipated to look like. These are existing higher ground facilities. I believe that's everything that I need to present.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Great. Thank you, Mr. Seibert. Just a question, did you get a chance to look at the conditions of approval at the end of the Staff report, and are you in agreement with those?

MR. SEIBERT: The required conditions, I believe we have those all included on our drawings already with like the requirement of the goosenecks. The only thing that we're not certain about is there was something in there about adding some blue on to the

building facility, and we don't recall that actually having been brought up at the meeting. So, we're a little confused about that, and at the moment until we get that straight. I don't think we really have anything specific intention of doing that unless we get a better understanding of that.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Okay, when we get to the Staff report, we'll get into that.

MR. SEIBERT: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Okay, thank you.

MR. SEIBERT: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Thank you very much.

Sam? Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. SEIBERT: One thing. I was told to say that the signage for Guidepost Montessori will have a blue, probably a blue circle is their typical signage, but again, we don't have their final design yet. But the circle on our drawings would probably be a blue sign and they want that to be their only spot of that color as part of their general scheme.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Was that what they were referring to here, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, it's a Design Commission thing, and I'll touch on it, yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Okay, great. Thank you.

MR. SEIBERT: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Sam, would you like to give the Village report?

MR. HUBBARD: Absolutely.

So, as you've heard, the property is 1000 West Northwest Highway, that's at the corner of Kennicott and Northwest Highway. It's currently in two zoning districts. So, the rear portion of the site falls within the R-3 district, and that's the portion of the site that's currently a secondary auxiliary parking lot and is proposed to be the exterior play area for the daycare and Montessori school. Then the front portion of the site is within the B-2 Zoning District. This portion, the B-2 portion, is classified as commercial in our Comprehensive Plan, and then Single-Family Detached in the rear, so the existing zoning on the site is compliant with the Comprehensive Plan.

The Petitioner would like to establish a Montessori school with a daycare component, actually, I guess I'd call it a daycare with a Montessori elementary school component. Because the site is in two zoning districts, there's kind of a patchwork of zoning approvals that's required to establish this use. The first one is, in any B-2 zoning district, a special use is required, so a special use is required for this B-2 portion of the site. Daycares are not allowed in the R-3 District, so a daycare use on the R-3 portion requires a land use variation.

Similarly, our definition of a daycare is for children younger than six, because this facility would have students all the way up to sixth grade, it is not only a daycare, but it falls under the classification of a private school. So, the private school component in the R-3 District requires a special use, and in the B-2 District requires a land use variation.

Finally, as part of the approvals here, we're requesting to repeal Ordinance 12-059. That was from a daycare that was approved for this site back in 2012 that never moved forward, and I'll touch a little bit more on that later on in the presentation.

There are five variation requests associated with this application. The first three relate to the accessory structures, the playground equipment on the site. The

fourth one relates to parking, and the fifth one is a landscape island variation, but based on a recommendation from Staff to eliminate one of the parking spaces, to which the Petitioner has agreed and has provided a revised plan showing that space eliminated, it also eliminates the need for this landscape island variation.

There have been several actions that have gotten the Petitioner to the point they're at this evening. Back in June, they appeared before the Conceptual Plan Review Committee. I would characterize the meeting as generally supportive. There was discussion on impact to neighbors, specifically to the north and the lot line and fence there. There's an existing fence that's actually five-foot inset into the subject property that's along the north lot line that pretty much creates green space five feet on the other side of the fence, on the northern side of the fence that's used by the property owner to the north. So, there was a little discussion about how that should be handled if this application moves forward.

The Conceptual Plan Review Committee did encourage the Petitioner to hold a neighborhood meeting prior to appearing in front of the Plan Commission. So, on January 20th of this year, they did advertise for and hold a neighborhood meeting. From what I understand, only one resident attended the meeting. It was that residential property owner directly abutting to the north, and from what I understand in the meeting minutes from the Petitioner, it sounded like it was a pretty informational meeting. I do see the resident here in attendance this evening, so I'm sure she'll have some comments about the project.

After the neighborhood meeting, on February 8th, the Petitioner appeared in front of the Design Commission. They were continued and requested to make some changes. They reappeared on the 22nd and did receive a unanimous recommendation of approval subject to two recommendations and one requirement. The two recommendations related to color, and you heard one of those related to the color, a blue color on, I believe it was one of the awnings. It's only a recommendation from the Design Commission, so whether or not the Petitioner wants to incorporate that color change is on them, it's not a code requirement, assuming the Plan Commission and Village Board approves the application subject to these conditions. The one requirement was to add gooseneck lights. As you've heard this evening, they did incorporate that change.

So, here's an aerial of the property. You'll see it bounded in red here. I just want to point out some of the neighboring uses. These are all single-family homes to the north. To the northwest, there is a motorcycle dealership. To the southeast, there is a multi-tenant commercial development. Then to the, so this is southeast with Northwest Highway the front of the site, and then the Metra tracks.

So, as you can see, the existing site, it does have two access points along Northwest Highway. These are full access points. Cars can come in and leave from them. Then there's a third auxiliary access point along Kennicott. At the intersection of Kennicott and Northwest Highway, it's under stop sign control. It's a full access intersection. Again, as you can see, there is two-way traffic and circulation throughout the site under the present configuration on the property.

Under the proposed plan, the Petitioner is proposing a revised circulation to a kind of a horseshoe orientation. It would be one way coming in this way, around and out on the southeast side of the site. Overall, I think the site is going to experience quite a bit of revitalization as part of this project. Again, you've heard about resurfacing the parking lot, refreshing the exterior and interior of the building, upgrading the landscaping, et cetera. So, there will be substantial improvement to the site if this project is approved.

You did hear mentioned briefly the closure of this existing curb cut on Kennicott that has also been proposed. That's going to help to reduce traffic on the residential street here, so we are supportive of that change. We think that's a benefit. It's not needed for a fire access and circulation, so it's not going to have a detrimental impact to emergency services for the site.

One of the items, and this is the site plan that went to the Plan Commission, one of the items that Staff recommended and requested a condition of approval for was this parking stall proposed right here. Technically, the stall here requires variations, and it would be a very tight stall to maneuver to come in. I mean, if you're driving a large car, it would be very difficult to back into or to access that space. The space is proposed at 8.5 feet in width. If anyone has parked in the spaces in Village Hall here, you'll know they're also 8.5 feet in width and they're pretty tight. So, we didn't think that this stall was a good stall to have here due to the orientation, the substandard width, and the odd configuration where it abutted three parking stalls that were also proposed at 8.5-foot width. We are recommending removal of the space, and that is going to eliminate the need for that variation which was to the landscape islands that weren't present.

Overall, I think Staff is supportive and recommending approval of the special use. The Petitioner submitted a market study that did show there was vacancies in some of the nearby daycares, so there is a market demand for this. Additionally, the private component, elementary component up to sixth grade is not a common feature in daycare, so this would cater to kind of a niche market. So, we believe it is necessary for the public convenience at this location.

We also do not believe that this special use and daycare here would have a detrimental impact on the welfare of people living and working in the vicinity. This use is compatible to the neighboring land uses. Similarly, in 2012 when there was a previous daycare proposed for the site, albeit a little bit smaller and it did not have that elementary component to it, that was approved as well at that time and found to be compatible with neighboring land uses. So, we are supportive of the requested special use permit.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Thank you, Sam.

I'd like to entertain a motion to enter the Staff report.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: All those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

MR. HUBBARD: I wasn't quite done.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Oh, I'm sorry, Sam, I thought you were done.

MR. HUBBARD: I'll stop now if you want. I'm happy to end early.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Keep going, Sam, sorry.

MR. HUBBARD: Just so everyone is clear on what these variations are that are being requested this evening, I'll try and get through this quickly. There's three variations relative to the accessory structures.

The first one is the placement of the structures, and they're not allowed to be placed in the front yard if extended of the neighboring property to the rear. So, you can see this kind of blue box, that's the home on the neighboring property to the rear. This is their

front yard if extended, and so there are no accessory structures allowed in that area. As you can see, there is some play equipment here, these are two 10 by 10 shade structures that are going to be placed in the ground with footings. So, that technically requires a variation.

We are supportive of this variation. These structures are fairly small, they're 10 by 10. They almost look like an umbrella. They're fabric canopy structures with singular poles coming up. They have no walls on the side. They're partially screened by a fence that would be here. So, we are supportive of the variation to allow these within the front yard extended.

The second variation relates to the size of one of the larger shade structures proposed. It's 816 square feet. Code limits the maximum size of an accessory structure to 300 square feet, so a variation is required. Again, we are supportive of this variation. The structure, here's a picture of it, it's got open walls. It's set back, let's see, it's set back 12 feet approximately from this property line where code would only require a minimum of five-foot setback, so it exceeds code requirements as far as the setback to the north. We are supportive of that variation.

The last one relates to the height of this structure, and accessory structures are limited to 15 feet in height. The structure is just under 17 feet, about 16.9 feet. So, that 1.9-foot overage above code requirements really only applies to this top part of the ridge here. Again, because this is an open air structure, no walls, we think the visual impact will not be significant, and we are supportive of that variation as well. I would mention there are no chimes or noise-making devices proposed in the playground area.

Briefly, we'll touch on the landscaping. Again, as you've heard, the landscape plan you're looking at now is the landscape plan presented to the Plan Commission as part of the packet. Last minute changes by the Petitioner, which were made to address the removal of the space and removal of the landscaping in this area here, is what they showed in their presentation. But based on communications with the abutting property owner to the north, she did not want any landscaping installed here. She would prefer to have the existing plantings there untouched and would maintain them and add additional plantings herself if she believed them necessary. So, we recommended a condition of approval to revise the landscape plan and remove the landscaping shown in that area.

Overall, it's going to be a big improvement as far as green space. The site is, I think, 97 percent asphalt or building. After this project is completed, if approved, it would be only 75 percent asphalt and building. So, green space would be increased from about three percent to 25 percent. Additionally, they would be installing 10 new shade trees within the parking lot where none are existing currently.

Again, I just want to outline that the change here, this is the parking space that Staff recommended be removed and we had a condition of approval to address that. A plan provided towards the end of the day on Friday last week that shows the elimination of the parking stall there and a code-compliant landscape island, thus, eliminating the need for that variation. However, removing the one parking space does create a one-space deficit relative to code requirements on parking. Before I get into that, I'll touch briefly on traffic.

Just kind of to set the stage and understand where Guidepost Montessori compares to some of the other daycares that recently have been proposed in similar areas, there's a chart here that just kind of shows the comparison. So, here you'll see the Montessori School. I have the Goddard School here as well, this was approved by the Village in 2018. It's located in a similar, along a similar thoroughfare where it's two lanes of travel in each

direction, full access, no signalized intersection with the site. Then, also, the Bright Horizons development, this was proposed in 2015, was ultimately denied by the Village Board. It was in a similar location very comparable to Guidepost where it's two-lanes in each direction with full access, unsignalized.

So, they're roughly all, they're all very similar in size, but if you look at the number of vehicles on the other two daycares on a daily basis compared to Guidepost Montessori, Northwest Highway is just not quite as heavily traveled as those other thoroughfares. Additionally, the amount of traffic, as supported by on-field observations, is less compared to those other daycares at the times when they were proposed. These are the, you know, peak trips back in 2015, and then again this is the peak daily traffic back in 2015, 2018, and then currently. So it's located in a little bit less heavily traveled thoroughfare compared to some of these other recent daycares that we've discussed.

The Petitioner hired KLOA to perform a detailed traffic and parking analysis. I think the key areas to analyze are the exiting from this site, specifically in relation to left-hand turns heading across traffic on Northwest Highway. The traffic study found that those movements would be adequate at a level of service E. So, we don't feel that this would create a substantially detrimental traffic impact on the surrounding street network. We feel like the traffic would be accommodated without needing any significant improvements to any of the neighboring intersections.

Relative to parking, a one-space variation is required upon removal of the one space within the central parking row that's going to be replaced with the landscape island. Code requires 49 spaces, 48 spaces would be present on the site. We are supportive of that variation request. ITE forecasting would anticipate a need for a peak demand of 47 spaces, 48 would be provided on site. So, you know, from an ITE perspective, it's where it needs to be relative to parking, but there of course was concern that, you know, with all of the staff and influx during pickup and drop-off times, is there going to be enough on-site parking? So, we asked, and the Petitioner did provide, some information on how that works.

So, the top chart here, this shows the times and peaks in parent drop-off and pickup, and the bottom chart shows the employee peak as far as number of parking spaces needed throughout the day. So, you'll see during the morning when the, you know, the demand is highest for drop-off and pickup, it coincides with the time where peak staff is not going to be present on the site for parking. Similarly, the same is true for the afternoon, it does not correspond to the peak time of staff parking. So, we believe that there will be adequate parking on site to accommodate for the proposed use.

I would point out that it's probably the afternoon that I find is usually the key for parking at a daycare. I think during the mornings everyone has somewhere to be, they're on their way to work. So, parents dropping off their children, they're in and out pretty quick. It's in the afternoons when they come to pick up their kid that they maybe, you know, staying there for 10-15 minutes to talk to the teacher or let their toddler say goodbye to all their friends, et cetera, et cetera. So, I think it's, you know, it's more important to make sure in the afternoons that there is enough parking on site, and from the information provided we believe there will be.

So, we are recommending approval of the application. Just one small change, and again we're recommending approval of the application with exception to the landscape island variation which is no longer necessary. We are recommending a revision to

one of these conditions because the Petitioner has already provided that revised plan showing elimination of the parking stall, so we don't need to see that before this project goes to the Village Board. We've reviewed it on a conceptual basis and we believe it to be viable.

So, we are recommending approval of the application. There are some minor modifications on the motion sheet that the Plan Commissioners have, hopefully it makes it clear what's being requested and recommended. That's all I have, thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Thank you again, Sam. Is there a motion to enter the Staff report?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll try it again; I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'll second it again.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: All those in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: All those opposed?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Motion carries.

Questions? The way this works for the audience is we're going to open it up to the Plan Commissioners here to come up with any questions they might have of Staff or of the presentation, and then we're going to close or end that and open it up to the public for questions.

So, Terry, would you like to start?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I do. I have two I think relatively minor issues. The teacher parking in front of the playground, you mentioned there might be an elevated curb. Will there be an elevated curb there as protection for the playground?

MR. SEIBERT: Right where the indicator is now, that would be where the -- should I go up to the microphone?

MR. HUBBARD: Please.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Please.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Come on up here, just so the court reporter can get it.

MR. SEIBERT: Up by the, along the landscape area where you have the red circle traveling, that's where we expect to have an elevated curb because the exit doors of the classrooms are higher by about a foot, maybe 16 inches, than where we would like to have the grade for the parking lot. But up by the angled parking closest to the play area, we don't anticipate anything more than a normal height curb, but it is fenced off.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: It is fenced, and the surface in the play areas, is that an impervious surface? Will that be grass or some kind of a --

MR. SEIBERT: Around the play equipment, it would be a wood fiber material that is designed to be compacted well enough to work for ADA access. It will require regular maintenance, but there are plans to do that regular maintenance to do that. You will have the required cushioned areas around all of the play areas in case any of the children fall off.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, one last quick one. The roof on the old existing structure that's kind of a bowstring roof?

MR. SEIBERT: Right.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: That will remain?

MR. SEIBERT: We're re-roofing the whole building. It's an existing single ply, because of the addition where we're actually also taking part of the existing very low roof and

raising it up so we can get mechanicals inside, we are going to be re-roofing the entire building with single ply dark gray membrane.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Oh, so the whole roof will be the same color?

MR. SEIBERT: Right.

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Thank you, Terry.
George?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I've got three questions for the Petitioner, and they're sort of, I think it helps to give us a little bit more fabric to the project. One, as far as, Montessori schools, are there any agencies or organizations that monitor or make recommendations like you would have for any public/private schools where there's agencies that monitor the requirements? Also, if you are affiliated with any national organizations like the American Montessori Society, you know, some of the credentialing that you've got?

MS. SCOTTY: I'm Jocelyn Scotty. I'm the VP of Schools for Higher Ground and Guidepost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And you're name?

MS. SCOTTY: Jocelyn Scotty.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Not loud enough.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, the microphone. I don't know if you --

MS. SCOTTY: Jocelyn Scotty.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Spell your name please for the court reporter.

MS. SCOTTY: Can you hear me now? Yes, Jocelyn Scotty, S-c-o-t-t-y. We are accredited through an organization called Cognia, and all of our schools are accredited. So, we go through a very detailed process to validate our programs that are quality educational programs.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and you're affiliated with some organizations? Do you pay fees to these organizations to, you know, help support the method of Montessori or how are you affiliated?

MS. SCOTTY: We are an independent organization, and so we do have membership and we do have accreditation through Cognia as I said. We do have membership to different kinds of organizations like the American Montessori Society, but we do that as part of our professional development, not that we're required to pay to them.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and how is it owned or managed? How is this particular school --

MS. SCOTTY: We're an independent school; an organization where --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, but is it private ownership?

MS. SCOTTY: Yes, it's private ownership.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, so, and is it for profit or not for profit?

MS. SCOTTY: For profit.

COMMISSIONER DROST: For profit, okay. Now, that's clear. So, what are the typical enrollment costs? I know there's different programs to plan.

MS. SCOTTY: Like how much does tuition cost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, tuition, enrollment.

MS. SCOTTY: I don't know what it's going to be here. Do you know, Scott?

COMMISSIONER DROST: You know, what's sort of the economic model

that you have?

MS. SCOTTY: It's probably around \$1,600 a month for tuition. It depends on the age of the child, and so there is a variation and it depends on the location. So, they're not the same in all the schools.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and you're projecting about 200 children?

MS. SCOTTY: I think we have a cap of 194 at this school if I'm remembering correctly. Is it 200? 203? Okay, 203, yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and so in the daily activities, are there food, food services that are provided?

MS. SCOTTY: So, we're required through our licensing through the State of Illinois, we provide a catered lunch for all of our students. Then we provide snacks, like morning and afternoon snacks as well, so that's how the schools in Illinois are operated.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, where I'm going with that question is, as far as any sanitation or cleanliness issues, those are all pretty much regulated and you know how to do that.

MS. SCOTTY: Yes, we follow all of the licensing recommendations and requirements.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay, and that's enough for now, but I just wanted to get a little bit more texture to the organization.

MS. SCOTTY: Okay, sounds good.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Thank you, George.

Joe?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes, could you come back up front please?

MS. SCOTTY: I should back up here now.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, you're not done.

MS. SCOTTY: I didn't know.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Well, hopefully you're the right one to answer this.

MS. SCOTTY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, I'm just curious, there's going to be six grades but there's only two elementary rooms. How is that going to work?

MS. SCOTTY: So, Montessori has multi-age classrooms. So, for our elementary programs, it's multi-age lower elementary which is first through third, and upper elementary which is fourth, fifth and sixth. Generally, when we start a school though, it's first through sixth all together until we grow enrollment, and then we split the two elementary groups.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you.

Sam, was there any issue with drainage or storage needed?
Stormwater storage?

MR. HUBBARD: No, it's not triggering any stormwater improvements or on-site detention beyond what's there now. They are going to be required to enter into an on-site utility maintenance agreement, so if they do not maintain their on-site utilities, for example the stormwater inlet in the back of the property, the Village has the right to go on to the property and maintain it and then bill them.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Are they going to resurface the parking lot at least?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, and I've got a couple of questions for Mr. Seibert. There seems to be a lot of doors to the outside. Is there going to be security alarms on them?

MR. SEIBERT: Well, there'll be for the most part, there are going to be no hardware on the outside to open the doors themselves. We will have the required panic hardware for fire exiting. That's primarily most of the exterior doors except for the one door that leads directly to the play area, and I suppose the three doors to the play area between the parking lot and the building, those four doors and then the main entrance would be the ones generally used through the day. The doors off towards the southwest portion of the building are only there for egress purposes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, and the driveway that's on Kennicott, that's going to be taken out?

MR. SEIBERT: Right, that's being removed and the curb cut fixed including out into the street as required and we'll replace that with grass and also be expected to replace the sidewalk that cuts across that which is in kind of disrepair because of the vehicle traffic.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, because when you were mentioning high curbs, I thought maybe you're kind of replacing it along Kennicott to kind of protect the play area.

MR. SEIBERT: No high curbs there. I mean, we do have, what, the five-foot required setback for the fence with the landscaping, and then we have the whole parkway. We don't anticipate any real issues with vehicles off at that part of the site because they'd have to go through quite a bit to get to the fence in the first place.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, and I'm not sure if this is best for you or Sam to answer, but the parking lot, you're going to have one way in and one way out. But is there going to be certain signage placed so people know? Because that could be confusing as opposed to two entrances.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, for sure they'll have to put signs up to notify Do Not Enter and so forth.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay. All right, that's all. Thank you.

MR. SEIBERT: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Thank you, Joe.
Lynn?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Just a few informational questions. So, this is actually to the lady in the back. To sort of expand on what Commission Drost asked, so what is the range of the enrollment cost or tuition cost or whatever for the youngest to whatever the highest level?

MS. SCOTTY: Generally, the youngest students are actually the most expensive, so it's most expensive for infants, and then generally it tiers up. It's usually a range of a couple of hundred dollars difference.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: What would be the amount for the younger and the older then?

MS. SCOTTY: I don't actually know exactly for this location. Scott was mentioning it's \$1,600, so that's probably the average. So, probably infants might be closer to \$1,800 and some of the older children are probably closer to \$1,500 or \$1,600. That would be my guess.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Are meals included or is that extra?

MS. SCOTTY: I'm sorry, what's the question?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Meals, the cost of meals are included in that?

MS. SCOTTY: It's included, yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Thank you.

Sam, you mentioned the Bright Horizons that came before the Board and the Board denied it. It's one of the comparables you gave us. Why did the Board deny that?

MR. HUBBARD: I believe it was about impact to neighbors and traffic. It was a slightly different situation. I mean, it was comparable in the fact that it was a two-lane highway both directions and a full access, non-signalized entrance into the site, but that particular property was right near a corner with a signal that had a tendency to have cars back up and stack and block access into the site. So, I think that was one of the concerns back when the Village Board reviewed it, and then I think just impact to neighboring property owners as far as their play area and site configuration.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: But there's nothing about this current project that would be a problem based on what happened with Bright Horizons and they wouldn't expect the Board to take a similar action if it's necessary?

MR. HUBBARD: I'm sorry, what was that? I couldn't --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: The question is there's nothing in this project like the Bright Horizons project had to make the Board hesitate in approving it?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, as far as traffic goes, I mean, yes, it's --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Traffic, right.

MR. HUBBARD: Right, Northwest Highway is not as busy as that location was. So, from a traffic standpoint, yes, I think that this is not going to have the same type of impact that the other one would have had.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Last one, I maybe did not hear this right, but you said the property that abuts it on the north, the fence was five-foot deep into their property; is that correct?

MR. HUBBARD: So, the Guidepost fence is, instead of being right on their property line, the existing fence, they actually set it inside five-foot into the Guidepost site. So, they're essentially giving the last five feet to the property owner to the north.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: They can't do that.

MR. HUBBARD: I mean, they're not, okay, let me clarify. They're not giving her the land, but they're letting her use the land.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: It's not an issue from the Montessori School point of view. I didn't hear you.

MR. HUBBARD: There is no issue.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, it's all been worked out. It's not a problem for anybody, it's not going to come as a problem that could come back to the Village in anyway. Okay, I don't have any further questions. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: And my questions have been answered, so I would like to open it up to the public.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I've just got one more question.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Oh, sure.

COMMISSIONER DROST: For the record, Sam, this site, wasn't it, didn't we approve a school, a Polish ethnic school? So, I mean, this is not the first time that we've had

a school that has sought petition for the use.

MR. HUBBARD: Correct, it was a 127-student daycare school back in 2012.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I mean, there was a comparable use and I don't remember how long it is but I do remember.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: That will open it up for public comment, and we'll start on my right or your left.

Anybody on that side that would like to comment?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Good crowd. Okay, we'll close that side. What about on this side? Please step up, ma'am. Please give us your name and spell your last name, and your address if you'd like.

MS. THEESFELD: My name is Carole Theesfeld, T-h-e-e-s-f-e-l-d. I am the property owner at the north end, 712 North Kennicott. I have two major concerns. I have many concerns, but we'll do the major.

First, I still have the concern about traffic on Northwest Highway and the congestion, not necessarily in the afternoon but in the morning time. The interference with Kennicott people coming down on Kennicott because it's the major thoroughfare for Rand, in the morning it's very heavily traveled. We have school buses. We have the food trucks that take the food to the Lutheran Home. Very heavily traveled, and I'm still concerned about traffic congestion on Rand Road and the interference with Kennicott and maybe even Patton on both sides, and the congestion going in because you have them coming from two ways going in and two ways going out at the same timeline. You could have heavy congestion there and it concerns me with fender benders, accidents, mom and dad are in a hurry, they're not paying attention.

That's my major concern is that with the parking lot and then going around and finding a place. I know we've talked about the numbers, but I'm still concerned about, because they have to park and bring their kids in. It's not like at Patton School or Thomas or even St. James or St. Peters where the kids get dropped off and walk in on their own. I'm concerned with there's going to be some congestion in the parking lot, but mainly the in and out on 14 and what's happening with Kennicott since I live there, and I think it's going to be a problem for the people on Patton also.

Part two is on your landscape plan, okay. I think you've covered that, Sam, but I'm not quite sure what everything was said. Since I live right next door and there is that sewer line, a third of, right about there. Now, are you saying that they're not going to put a fence around that back part, they're going to use my fence as the back of there? Because the original one I have from before shows a fencing going all the way around the whole playground. Is there a fencing all the way around the whole playground?

MR. SEIBERT: There is fencing around the whole playground. The plan was to try and reuse your fence --

MS. THEESFELD: Yes, for part of it.

MR. SEIBERT: That stretch, and then tie into it on this plan here. Your fence is, it's hard to read at this side but it's like a black line there.

MS. THEESFELD: Right.

MR. SEIBERT: It's remaining existing.

MS. THEESFELD: Right.

MR. SEIBERT: And then the red line is a brand new, six-foot tall privacy fence.

MS. THEESFELD: So, you're tearing down the old one?

MR. SEIBERT: Well, we have to because it's actually not on an area in our property.

MS. THEESFELD: I know.

MR. SEIBERT: We would have to replace it --

MS. THEESFELD: Okay, okay.

MR. SEIBERT: -- and then at the blue line is this four-foot tall fence within the site, and then one green line along Kennicott, that's going to be a six-foot tall picket fence where you can see through but it will be six-foot tall.

MS. THEESFELD: Okay, so you're using my fencing.

MR. SEIBERT: Yes.

MS. THEESFELD: Okay, that's fine. Therefore, the sewer line is going to be open and that whole back part will be able to have maintenance done.

MR. SEIBERT: Yes, very easily.

MS. THEESFELD: Okay. All right, that was my big concern, was if they put this fencing up and my fencing is there, they had to leave an opening because that sewer line gets clogged with everything. That's the drainage for all the way around the back. Okay, those are my two major concerns.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Okay.

MS. THEESFELD: Okay, did you have any questions for me?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: No, not at this time.

MS. THEESFELD: Okay, thank you very much.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: I just think that, just to address your traffic issue, almost all the commercial properties along Northwest Highway have the same problem of left-in and left-out.

MS. THEESFELD: Right.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: And so, you have this congestion. So, I think that this property doesn't add or subtract from the big picture of the cars coming and going along Northwest Highway. Just the traffic count shows that this is not as busy as let's say Arlington Heights Road.

MS. THEESFELD: Right.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: So, in that respect, it's a little safer in that there aren't as many cars. So, I personally don't see where this is going to change, in the big picture, the 900 or 1,000 cars or however many cars come by here in an hour at that time enough to really impact.

MS. THEESFELD: So, my question is you don't think there is going to be backup on 14 either way where people are lined up to get in?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: My experience with pickup and delivery at these types of places, if it is, it's a very slight thing, personally, this is my personal experience.

MS. THEESFELD: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: You know, it's not like you're queuing there for five or six minutes waiting for cars to come and go. So, if it's a problem --

MS. THEESFELD: Okay, the only reason I asked that is we do have a problem on Kennicott and, is it Maud by Patton Grade School, when they come to pick up their kids and their parents are lined up for 15 minutes, and then over by Thomas Middle School.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: All of our schools, all of our elementary

schools --

MS. THEESFELD: Got the problem all over.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: -- have traffic plans that are, some are more or less successful than others.

MS. THEESFELD: Right. Okay, that was my biggest concern.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: I have the experience actually in that school with one of my grandchildren, and they've actually worked out a pretty good system. The latest take on that since I was involved everyday in it seems to work pretty well.

MS. THEESFELD: Okay, great. Thank you very much.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: It's busy for about 10 minutes and then it all goes away.

MS. THEESFELD: Yes, the wrong 10 minutes is not fun.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Of course, you just don't want to be there in that 10 minutes.

MS. THEESFELD: The wrong 10 minutes, it's not fun. Okay, I think that's all for my major questions.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Thank you, ma'am.

MS. THEESFELD: Thank you.

MR. HUBBARD: I would just briefly point out, too, that I think we've experienced these stacking and queuing problems onsite that kind of can lead to traffic congestion on other streets when drop-off and pickup occurs in the car, but when the parents actually have to park and walk their kids in, the stacking doesn't occur on the site. There could be a parking issue, we don't believe there will be in this case, but it's not necessarily a stacking issue.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Thank you, Sam.

Yes, sir? If you could give the court reporter your name and spell your last name please.

MR. WINKELMAN: Winkelman, Jim Winkelman, W-i-n-k-e-l-m-a-n. I'm at 715 North Kennicott, been there for 48 years. After reviewing the plans or looking at the speeches, I'm all for it. I hope you give it a favorable review. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Thank you, sir.

Is there anybody else on this side of the room?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Seeing none, we're going to close the public part of this hearing and come back for deliberation or a motion.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I have one last final question of the Petitioner.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Is Guidepost Montessori, is that a franchise operation of the Montessori School? Anyone who knows?

MS. MENZA: I think as Jocelyn stated, it's a privately-owned company. It is international and national. They have many, many units, and Jocelyn can speak to how many schools they have. So, it's across the country right now. So, the data we got when we were giving it to Sam, a lot of the data was averages of all of these different schools in different locations and different site conditions.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, technically not a franchise.

MS. MENZA: Not a franchise, no.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: It's a privately-owned company.
 MS. MENZA: It's owned by Higher Ground Education, and the Guidepost
 Montessori is under their umbrella.
 COMMISSIONER ENNES: They regulate and oversee you, your
 operations?
 MS. MENZA: Right, right.
 COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, thank you.
 MS. MENZA: As does the State of Illinois. They have to be licensed in the
 State of Illinois, and so they have all kinds of licensing in Montessori and everything else, yes.
 COMMISSIONER ENNES: Thank you.
 COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Before you sit down, I'd like to follow-up on
 that.
 COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, you raised an issue.
 MS. MENZA: Okay.
 COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, to use the Montessori name, don't you
 have to have some relationship to Montessori, whatever the Montessori national or international
 or whatever it is?
 MS. MENZA: Yes. Jocelyn?
 COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I mean, you've got to have some kind of a
 connection or you can't just use Montessori because you want to.
 MS. SCOTTY: It's actually not a trademarked pedagogy, and so you have
 to have accreditation to prove that you're a real Montessori school in sort of all of the things that
 we do as far as our affiliations with memberships and things like that.
 COMMISSIONER JENSEN: You said there was an accrediting body on all
 Montessori?
 MS. SCOTTY: For all of our schools, we're accredited, yes.
 COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And other Montessoris have to be accredited
 as well, I assume?
 MS. SCOTTY: They don't necessarily have to be, but we choose to be
 because we care about high quality programs for students.
 COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, great. Thank you.
 It seems like Mr. Drost and I could probably start a Montessori class if
 we choose to.
 COMMISSIONER DROST: We would, we would do that, but our
 constituency would probably be over 65. We're going to teach them what they didn't learn.
 ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: And nobody drives a car anymore.
 COMMISSIONER DROST: So, I would like to make the motion, and I think
 this is a really worthwhile project for the community because it will basically strengthen the
 younger population in our community. So, I will make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #21-021, a Special Use Permit for a daycare center within the B-2 portion of the subject property, a Land Use Variation to allow a daycare center within the R-3 district, a Land Use Variation to allow a private school in the B-2 district, a Special Use Permit for a private school within the R-3 portion of the subject property, repeal of Special Use Permit Ordinance #12-059, and the following variations:

1. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.5-3 to allow accessory structures (play equipment) in the front yard, if extended, of the adjacent property to the rear.
2. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.5-7(b) to allow an 816 square-foot accessory structure (toddler shade structure) in a rear yard where code restricts the maximum size of accessory structures to 300 square feet.
3. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 6.5-6, to allow a 16.9-foot tall accessory structure where code restricts the maximum accessory structure size to 15 feet.
4. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.4-4 to reduce the total required off-street parking stalls on the subject property from 49 to 48.

This recommendation is subject to the following conditions:

1. The single angled parking space located on the north side of the central parking row shall be eliminated and the landscape island within this area expanded to negate the need for a parking lot landscape island variation.
2. The landscape plan shall be revised to eliminate the proposed plantings on the north side of the existing fence along the northern property line. The existing landscaping in this area shall remain untouched.
3. Compliance with the motion from the February 22, 2022 Design Commission meeting shall be required, including:
 - A. A recommendation to go back to the colors proposed in the first revision that include 'essential gray' and 'mink gray.'
 - B. A requirement to add gooseneck lighting on the front (south) of the building, to be reviewed and approved by Staff.
 - C. A recommendation to add a light blue color to match the signage, which could be approved by Staff.
4. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Roll call vote.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Acting Chair Green.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: It's a unanimous recommendation of approval.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's what I thought.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: I guess we got another yes vote

somewhere.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: So, you we have a unanimous yes for this, and this is going to move on to the Village Board of Trustees.

Do we have a date for that, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Not yet, but we'll be working with you to get a date.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: So, congratulations!

MS. MENZA: Thank you, all.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Can we give you back your presentation? They're beautiful. You may want to use it for some other purpose.

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, I'm going to keep it.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: You want to keep it?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I am, because I'm going to circulate it among the constituency, young people.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Okay, you want this one?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I do. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Oh, you want mine, too?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Thank you all for coming in.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hello?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, hi.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I just wanted to say, will you use your clout and leverage to end the TIF, Tax Increment Finance Districts in Arlington Heights?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: We're here discussing a Montessori school, so we can't.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I thought you were supposed to take public comment?

MR. HUBBARD: The public comment is for the items that are on the agenda.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: That are on the agenda. We have to stick to the agenda, ma'am, just like in the other meeting, the same requirement.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh, I was told at the Board meetings that have public comments --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Well, you should go to the Village Board meeting and you can make your comments to the Village Board.

MR. HUBBARD: Board meetings are a little bit different, so yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: They're elected.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: All right.

MR. HUBBARD: But we still need to adjourn the meeting. I don't think we've officially adjourned the meeting.

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

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: Is there a second for that?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll second that.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: All those in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: All opposed?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON GREEN: We're adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 8:38 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)