

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: HANA DOWNSIZING - 121 WEST FREMONT, 116 WEST ST. JAMES, 200 WEST ST. JAMES, 204 WEST ST. JAMES, 206 WEST ST. JAMES, 208 WEST ST. JAMES, 407 NORTH CHESTNUT, 401-403 NORTH CHESTNUT - PC #23-005
RE-ZONE FROM R-6 TO R-3, COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT, 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 28th day of June, 2023 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: All right, we'll call the Plan Commission hearing to order.

Can we all please stand and say the pledge?

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: Roll call, Sam.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

(No response.)

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

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 Vice-Chair Warskow.

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: Here.

MR. HUBBARD: And Chair Dawson, not present at this time.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Not yet.

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: All right, first on the agenda is approval of the minutes from the last Plan Commission hearing.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I would like to make a motion for approval.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll second.

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: Any opposed? Abstaining besides me? I wasn't here for the last hearing.

(No response.)

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: All right.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: The motion carries.

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: The motion carries, all right.

So, our first petition is the HANA Downsizing, PC #23-005. Do we have the Petitioner here?

MR. GAYNOR: Greetings --

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: Greetings.

MR. GAYNOR: -- to all Plan Commission. It's been a month since I've seen you. I'm Tom Gaynor, I'm living with my wife.

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: Yes, can you hold on one moment?

MR. GAYNOR: Yes?

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: We've got to swear you in.

MR. GAYNOR: Oh, yes, yes, sorry.

(Witness sworn.)

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: Thank you. Can you state your name and spell your last name please?

MR. GAYNOR: Sure. It's Tom Gaynor, G-a-y-n-o-r. My wife and I, Sue, live at 208 West Fremont Street and have been for the last 41 years. I'm currently serving as the HANA Board President, and I'm also here as the Petitioner representing my neighbors for this down-zoning and variance that we're looking for.

So, let me give you a, if I could, just a real quick overview of HANA. HANA has been around since 1980. We were formed back then when we were looking at some concerns about a knock-down of houses on St. James. So, the neighbors got together and said we need to get together and make certain we preserve our historic neighborhood. We have enjoyed 40 plus years now of collaborative engagement with the community and the Village, and done things like creating Festival Park. So, we've got a really good, long track record. HANA consists of 625 households in this area shown, and it's just north of the downtown as you can see.

The southern part of HANA is what we call the triangle, Northwest Highway, Euclid and Vale being the three sides of the triangle. The issue that we're talking about today has actually been a longstanding one for HANA based on what happened in 1980. We said we'd really like to preserve our southern border and make certain that our historic neighborhoods are kept in tact. So, we're actually talking about seven houses today that we're looking to down-zone from R-6 to R-3. I guess in talking to Sam, I guess this is the first time we've ever had a down-zoning, so we ought to get some award for that maybe.

In addition to the down-zoning, we do have one variance for an R-6 which is technical details I'll let Sam speak to. He can better handle that one.

But really, the point of this is that these homes range in age from like 75 to 106 years old, and when the Comprehensive Plan was drawn, as we discussed at the last Plan Commission, nobody really knows when the Comprehensive Plan for this special area was actually created, but we have a B-5 right south of St. James. So, we go from B-5 to single-family homes. Those single-family homes were R-6 with, you know, the supposed, you know, step-down to the neighborhood, but in reality it's not been a step-down. It goes from B-5 to single-family, and those have been single-family for their entire existence. They're all homeowner-owned, they're not rentals or anything.

So, really the goal here is to, you know, try to draw some clarity to what maybe wasn't so clear 40-50 years ago when the Comprehensive Plan was created in that we've clearly defined this as single-family. Maybe 50 years ago it wasn't obvious how the Village was going to shake out in terms of development, and this might have been, you know, townhomes or condos or something of that nature. But with the nature of what has happened on a case by case basis, these single-family homes have been not only preserved but updated and turned into really gems that are a part of our community.

Now, let me brag up my neighborhood just a bit. The HANA triangle consists of or has a whole bunch of historic homes. Every one of them has been part of what I'll call a self-declared Historic District. Chapter 6 of the Comprehensive Plan talks about historic preservation. As you know, we really don't have a Preservation District in town, but for whatever reason people of like minds have moved to this special area and taken these old homes and brought them back to life in some cases and made them into things that are very special and really add a lot to our town as you can probably well imagine. So, here's a number of these

homes, here's even some more. Terrific neighborhood to be a part of right north of the Central Business District.

So, this is the houses on St. James Street which is kind of our southern border of HANA, and we talked about these guys a lot at the last Plan Commission meeting in understanding how to best handle the Eastman project that was being proposed. Since that meeting, that developer has reached out to me and has done a significant redesign he says, which he's going to share with the HANA members next Thursday. So, based on my discussions with Joe, it does sound like we're going to essentially come up with our own step-down plan, so we will continue to adhere to the philosophy of the Comprehensive Plan but we'll have a B-5 to R-3, if we can get this petition approved, we'll have a B-5 to R-3 special situation, but I think it's a win-win in that we preserve our neighborhood and we continue to invest in the growth of our town and take a blighted site and make it something special.

So, I think we have a win-win opportunity that's in progress, a couple of moving parts just yet but I think we're demonstrating the collaborative spirit that HANA has shown for, you know, four plus decades. We're going to figure out how to make this design right and make it a win for our community.

So, if I could, I'm not going to talk much more, but I don't have anybody else speaking tonight so you guys can draw a sigh of relief that we're not going to keep up until 11:00. But I do want to at least point to the seven houses that we're looking to down-zone so you get at least a feel for the homes. If the neighbors are here, I'll turn around and point them out. Betsy and Jacob live at 208 West St. James; if you're here raise your hand. I think they're out. The Lingrens, Katy and Jason, live at 206 West St. James, another cute house. Celeste and Eric, oh no, the Niemiec's are at 204 West St. James. Very good, hi, Julie. Celeste and Eric I think are out, I think they're elsewhere, but they live at 200 West St. James. The Asa residence, Karen and John are there, good to see you.

We've got, the one house on Fremont Street which is adjacent to the parking lot which is an R-6, so that's again kind of a special situation, are represented tonight by Elena, and Justin can't make it but to fill in for Justin we have Luke. Luke is soon to be the not the baby of the neighborhood anymore, but we welcome them. Sam and Ryan live at 407 North Chestnut. Juan is the owner of our duplex, the one duplex at 401 North Chestnut which is also a part of this overall petition.

So, essentially, that's what I wanted to share with you tonight. We're looking to down-zone and handle the special R-6 situation that hopefully will, you know, make all this like the win it needs to be. So, I'll leave it at that.

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: Thank you very much.

Sam, before you get into your presentation, have all notices been given?

MR. HUBBARD: They have, yes.

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: Thank you. Go ahead.

MR. HUBBARD: All right, so before you this evening, you have the HANA down-zoning petition. You've heard a little bit from Mr. Gaynor, President of HANA, on the reasons for the request. I'll touch on some of the zoning implications.

The subject properties in this application consist of eight lots, seven of which are currently occupied by single-family residences, and then the eighth lot on the corner of Chestnut and St. James is occupied by a two-family residence. All lots are currently zoned in the R-6 Multi-Family Residential Dwelling District and are currently classified as "single-family

attached" on the Comprehensive Plan except for the one lot on Fremont which is classified as "single-family detached" on the Comprehensive Plan.

The Petitioner is requesting a rezoning of seven of those eight properties from the R-6 to the R-3 District, as well as a Comprehensive Plan amendment for six out of the eight properties from the single-family attached classification to the single-family detached classification, as well as two variations. The first one relates to the corner property, the two-family property that will remain in the R-6 District, and I'll touch on that a little bit later. The second variation relates to a waiver of the required traffic and parking study which is a requirement on any rezoning that doesn't abut a major arterial street. The Staff Development Committee is supportive of that variation. There is going to be no proposed land use change as part of this application. All lots will continue to be used as currently used today, so there should be no impact to traffic and parking.

On March 22nd, the Petitioners appeared before the Conceptual Plan Review Committee. I would say the review there was generally positive. I think the Commissioners in attendance thought the proposal, at least on a conceptual basis, made sense, and the petitioners were encouraged to move forward.

I just want to give a little bit of brief history on the downtown area that gives some context to the existing zoning on the site. So, in 1964, the Downtown B-5 Zoning District was created and it rezoned all of the properties in the downtown business core from B-2 to the B-5 Downtown District. Then in 1965, all land within 330 feet of the B-5 District was reclassified as suitable for R-6 uses, multi-family uses, and this reclassification included much of the HANA neighborhood.

Then in 1987, the Downtown Master Plan stepped back the R-6 multi-family buffer surrounding the downtown area but preserved certain areas for R-6 and multi-family zoning, which was meant to serve as a transition between the more intense B-5 downtown-related uses and the less intense single-family uses farther outside of the fringe. So, these multi-family R-6 areas were to serve as kind of a buffer or transition between those two high intensity and low intensity uses. Additionally, one of the purposes of the buffer was to provide moderate density multi-family housing in close proximity to the downtown core which would help to provide support for some of those commercial areas and uses within the Downtown Central Business District. So, the current R-6 zoning on the properties today is reflective of these historical plans.

You can see here, the areas bounded in red are where the subject properties currently lie today.

VICE CHAIR WARSKOW: Sam, could I just interrupt for a moment to notify that Chair Dawson has arrived.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes. Let the record note that Chair Dawson is now present and running the meeting.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you all for giving me a little space and grace as I deal with an emergency that was not planned for this evening, but I'm here now, thank you.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you.

All right, so specifically, here are the subject properties of this application bounded in red. The properties bounded in yellow are proposed for rezoning.

I want to talk a little bit about the property on the corner which will remain R-6. One of the requirements in the R-6 District is to limit areas of R-6 Zoning to areas of one acre or more. Once this R-3 rezoning is approved, assuming it is, then this R-6 District will

not, the corner property, the remaining R-6 area will not meet that minimum one acre requirement. This requirement is in the code really to restrict spot zoning. For example, one or two off-properties that maybe are acquired by a developer where they want to tear it down and build a more intense multi-family development there, this restriction on having that at least be one acre in size is meant to prevent that type of spot zoning.

So, this application really results in kind of like a reverse spot zoning for this one R-6 property, and I'll go ahead and show how the resulting zoning would look upon rezoning. So, that R-6 portion would not meet the minimum one-acre size, and therefore a variation is required. We are supportive of that variation given that the property is already zoned R-6. In light of that, we are supportive of the variation. Additionally, the maintenance of R-6 Zoning on the corner property would allow the continuation of the existing use as a two-family for that property. So, it will help reserve the existing character of the neighborhood by allowing that use to continue.

I want to talk briefly about some of the impacts of the R-3 Rezoning here. First and foremost, it would make it difficult for any developer to acquire one or more of these properties currently zoned R-6 and redevelop them with multi-family uses. The R-3 District does not allow multi-family uses by-right, so upon rezoning into the R-3 District, it will be much more difficult for anyone to assemble, rezone and redevelop them with anything other than single-family homes in the future.

Additionally, the R-6 District allows building heights of up to 50 feet, and the R-3 District allows maximum building heights of up to 25 feet. So, that's another change that would occur here should the rezoning be approved. Then finally, the R-3 District would allow redevelopment of these lots with single-family uses without the requirement to receive variations for lot size and lot width, which is an allowance in the R-3 District which is not afforded within the R-6 District.

Additionally, hand in hand with the rezoning, the Petitioner is requesting an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to reclassify six of these lots from the single-family attached classification to the single-family detached classification. If you pay attention to the screen, that's going to show shortly, so that's what the resulting Comprehensive Plan would look like assuming this application is approved. Staff is supportive of the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. It aligns with the future likely uses of these lots as continuing to be single family and it aligns with the rezoning as well.

I do want to briefly discuss one of the other impacts of this rezoning on the properties to the south which are currently in the B-5 Zoning District. Specifically, this rezoning would just impact this one property to the south here. This property is currently developed with the Village Bank & Trust building, and the B-5 District allows zero lot line developments meaning no setback would be required along this northern border of the site if it were to redevelop. However, if the majority of the properties directly across the street are reclassified into the R-3 District, then the B-5 District would require a minimum setback on the north side of at least 20 feet. So, this rezoning would require now a 20-foot setback on the Village Bank & Trust property to the south if it is approved.

The Plan Commission and members of the audience will certainly recall a development proposal of the two vacant office buildings just to the east of the Village Bank & Trust site. That development and project would not be impacted by this rezoning because the majority of the land directly across the street would not fall within the R-3 District. I think that roughly 55 to 60 percent would fall within the P-L District. So, this rezoning would have

no impact on the proposed development to the south known as the Eastman Redevelopment.

That being said, the Staff Development Committee is supportive of the application, the rezoning, amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and two variations. These lots have been zoned as R-6 for close to half a century and have not redeveloped with multi-family uses. So, the potential that they would redevelop with multi-family uses in the future seems slim. Staff and the Village should always be cognizant of down-zoning areas which could ultimately, you know, hurt or threaten other goals that the Village may have, but we do have a thriving downtown already that's successful without the support of these particular properties being multi-family here.

So, given that this is just a small area of remaining single-family residences that will remain and be reclassified as within the R-3 Single-Family Zoning District, we think this proposal is acceptable and we are recommending approval. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you, Sam.

Commissioners, do I have a motion to include the Staff report into the public record?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So moved.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you, Commissioner Jensen, and seconded by Commissioner Warskow.

All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any abstain?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, great. Thank you.

Commissioners, do I have any initial questions for the Petitioner? I will look, Commissioner Sigalos, I'll start with you.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I don't have any questions right now.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, Commissioner Ennes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I do, I have one. I'm concerned about the negative impact on the Village Bank property, that they would be restricted in the future on how that property could be developed.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, it would now require a 20-foot setback along that northern property line.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, has anybody talked to them to see if they care about that?

MR. HUBBARD: We did make them aware of the proposal. We have not heard back from them. I don't know if they're in the audience this evening, but I have not heard any correspondence from them at this time.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Well, personally, I'd really have a problem making a zoning change that negatively affects an adjoining property. That's all I've got for now.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I agree with that, but I think that if they were to come in to redevelop, they could ask for a variance and we could discuss it at great length then.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes, good.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'm sure we would. That's it.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: No, I agree with what the two Commissioners just said. But who knows, none of us could be here a year from now. So, I'm wondering if there's any way we could make that part of this hearing, to relieve them of that?

MR. HUBBARD: No, we couldn't make it part of this proposal. It would require a variation to be granted and that property is not a part of this petition.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Commissioner Warskow?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I don't have any questions at this time.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Commissioner Jensen?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: No, I don't have any.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, so at this time we'll open up for public commentary. I'm going to start over here because it's easier, because there's only a couple of you. So, anyone on this side of the room that wants to speak up and talk, public commentary?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: No, okay. All right, then I'm going to go over here. So, with the number of you that are in the audience, I'll just go row by row. We ask that you try, you know, you come up, state your name. We ask for your address but if you're not willing to give it we can't require it, but it does help us to understand where you are in relation to the development. Then we ask also that you limit your commentary to three minutes and be aware of what other people have already said.

So, anyway, anyone in the front row who would like to come up and speak? No. How about the second row, anyone? Yes, thank you. Come on up. Again, state your name, spell your last name for the recorder, and then if you're willing to give us your address we appreciate it.

PUBLIC COMMENTARY FOR PC #23-005

MS. MENZIES: My name is Vivian Menzies, last name is M-e-n-z-i-e-s. I live at 212 West Fremont with my husband. We've been there 46 years, I think.

Just one comment is that when HANA started in the, well, 1980, it was because of some houses on St. James that were going to be torn down. We didn't think that was a good thing. We wanted to keep the neighborhood in tact. But at that time, the founders of HANA had talked about this down-zoning of those houses and we have been living under the impression that that had happened. I don't know if it was proposed and then the ball was just dropped or what, but you know, until very recently we just thought, oh, yes, we're all good, we've got R-3 and we're fine because of HANA doing this.

So, I just hope that we can follow through now and finish that job that we thought was already done. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, thank you so much.

All right, anybody else in that row who wishes to come up? Yes, thank you so much again. State your first name and last name, spell it for the record, and then address if you're willing.

MR. GAVIGAN: Yes, my name is Ryan Gavigan, G-a-v-i-g-a-n. I live at 407 North Chestnut.

I just want to say I moved into this neighborhood three years ago with

my wife and my two daughters, and I'm incredibly proud of my neighbors for bringing this to my attention and getting everyone involved. My family has been a single, or my house has been a single-family home for over 100 years and I would love to keep it that way. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, thank you so much.

All right, anybody else in that row? All right, then moving to the row behind, anybody there who wants to come up and speak? Okay, how about the last row there? Anybody wanting to come up and speak?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay. All right, so with that, just to be clear, we're closing public commentary which means we might have discussions, we might ask questions of Staff, but there is no more commentary from the public. You can't shout out, you can't ask for additional questions. So, we're going to go ahead and close that.

Okay, so with that, with public commentary closed, are there any further questions or comments coming from the Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I have another comment.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I think this is a great project. I can understand why you want to do it. I think this is a great part of our town, the historical homes in it. My daughter lives just south of it, I mean, just north of where you guys are. But I really, before I could support this, I really think that you need to approach Village Bank and see if they're okay with this. Now, you've mentioned it, I don't know who it was mentioned to or anything, but this would negatively impact the value of their land. Not that I think they're going to sell, I mean, or anything in the near future, but this would limit the value of their property as the down-zoning limits the value of these seven lots, I believe.

But that's a decision you've made to preserve the neighborhood. That's where I'm coming from is I just, without some kind of communication from the bank, a bank officer that is part of the ownership of that property, I can't support this even though I think it's a great idea.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, any other comments? Do I have a motion?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: One comment. Sam, so you said the Village contacted the bank, but you didn't have any --

MR. HUBBARD: Yes. So, as a neighboring property owner, the Petitioners not only sent out a letter notifying them of the public hearing, but Village staff reached out to a contact in their business office and we e-mailed them the Staff report to explain, you know, what the rezoning was and how it would impact their property, but we have not heard back.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, I fully agree with what Commissioner Ennes was saying, but they're a business that had been notified and if they haven't taken any action, I'm not so sure there's much more we can do for them.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: We are just a recommending body, so they can approach the Trustees.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes, correct.

Commissioner, yes, Jensen, yes?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: From the practical point of view, does this really limit what the Village Bank can do? I mean, Commissioner Green raised the fact or the point that they can come and ask for a variance and most likely they would probably get it. So, in

my point of view, I don't know if this, in fact, would limit anything about that property if we go ahead and approve or recommend approval of this. Is there anything you see in the, the question is, is there anything you see that that variance would be difficult for them to get in the future?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, they would have to justify it based on the criteria for variation approval. I mean, I would almost think the opposite. I think we saw a development right next door on the Eastman project very recently where that 20-foot setback was not required by code, but I think a lot of members of the public and maybe even some members on the Plan Commission felt that it should respect the code requirement and provide a 20-foot setback, or at least more of a setback on that north side. So, regardless of the fact that it may not be technically required now, it seems like moving forward, if a redevelopment of the bank property proposed something at a zero-lot line setback as is currently allowed per code, I think it would probably not be well received. But they could certainly request a variation.

The minutes will reflect this discussion and if a project there ever moves forward, these minutes could be referenced as part of that discussion.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, from the practical point of view, I don't really see that that's an issue.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right. I generally agree. I agree with the concern, but if they're not present and they've been notified, we cannot take that into consideration, in my opinion, I would not take that into consideration. They have had the opportunity to be here and object, and they'll have another opportunity at the Village Board meeting.

So, with that, any additional comments, questions? Do I have a motion, anyone?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I would like to make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #23-005, a Rezoning from the R-6 Multiple-Family Dwelling District to the R-3 One-Family Dwelling District for certain portions of the subject property, and an Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to reclassify certain portions of the subject property from the Single-Family Attached classification to the Single-Family Detached classification, and the following Variations:

- 1. A Variation to Section 5.1-6.1 to allow an area of R-6 Zoning of approximately 15,150 square feet (0.35 acres) where the minimum size of R-6 Zoning is to be no less than one acre.**
- 2. A Variation to Section 6.12-1.3 to waive the requirement for a traffic and parking study.**

This recommendation is subject to the following condition:

- 1. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations and policies.**

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thanks, Commissioner Jensen.

All right, up for a vote.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: No.

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, so with that, the Petitioner does have approval of this Board. As we've stated, just a recommending body, and I like to always remind everyone in the audience that the purview of this Commission is very small. If you do have concerns and objections, please feel free. It will go to the Village Board for a final vote and there you should attend and voice your approval, support, objections or concerns, but again, as a Plan Commission, what we look at is a very small piece of this project.

So, it does have approval. I would assume we don't have a date for the Village Board? No, I'm seeing a no. It will be up in public record and a notice will be formed. If you have any questions though, contact Village Staff. They will be happy to let you know when that meeting is going to happen, and I encourage you to come and voice your concerns and your questions before the Village Board. All right, thank you.

Okay, so with that, this agenda item is closed. We are now opening up for general public commentary, I believe.

Sam, is there anything else that I missed?

MR. HUBBARD: No.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, do we have any general public comments for the Plan Commission at this time? I'm opening up for public commentary.

All right, yes, come on up, please. Thank you.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTARY

MR. GAYNOR: Again, this is Tom Gaynor. I just want to comment on my impression of the professionalism of this Commission and the Staff. It has just been amazing. It makes me proud to be a part of this community. So, thank you very much for everything you're doing.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you so much, we do appreciate that.

kay, any other public commentary at this time?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, so I'm going to go ahead and close the public comment section just of the general public comments.

Sam, do we have any other matters to address with this

Commission?

MR. HUBBARD: We do not.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, do I have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you so much.

All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

you so much.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, with that, we are adjourned. Thank

(Whereupon, at 8:06 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)