

DRAFT

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: 909 W. CAMPBELL ST. SUBDIVISION - PC#14-019
PRELIMINARY PLAT OF SUBDIVISION

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
12th day of November, 2014, at the hour of 7:33 o'clock p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

JOE LORENZINI, Chairman
LYNN JENSEN
TERRY ENNES
BRUCE GREEN
GEORGE DROST
JOHN SIGALOS
JAY CHERWIN

ALSO PRESENT:

LATIKA BHIDE, Development Planner

DRAFT

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: I would like to call to order this meeting of the Plan Commission. Would you all please stand and recite the pledge of allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Roll call please.

MS. BHIDE: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here.

MS. BHIDE: Commissioner Dawson.

(No response.)

MS. BHIDE: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

MS. BHIDE: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Here.

MS. BHIDE: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MS. BHIDE: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

MS. BHIDE: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MS. BHIDE: Commissioner Warskow.

(No response.)

MS. BHIDE: Chairman Lorenzini.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Here. Okay. The next item on the agenda is approval of the last meeting minutes, Savory Salad and I-Cubed Foods.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make the motion to approve those minutes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: And do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Voice vote, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Opposed?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, I was not there.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I wasn't there either.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I was not there either.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Commissioners Cherwin, Green and Jensen were not at the last meeting.

First item on the agenda, just so everybody knows how this works in case this is your first time here, there's two items on the agenda. What we do at each one, the petitioner comes up, gives a little description of his project. Then the representative, Latika, from the Planning Department does a summary of the project. Then each of the Commissioners ask questions, and then we go to the audience for their input. Then we come back to the Commissioners for final deliberation. So, that's how this works.

So, the first petition on the agenda is PC#14-019,

DRAFT

909 West Campbell Street Subdivision. Is the Petitioner here? Or have all the proper notices been --

MS. BHIDE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Is the Petitioner here?

MR. SALVATORE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: I want to swear you in. Anybody else going to testify for you?

MR. SALVATORE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Would you all come forward? And raise your right hand.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. You may have a seat except for whoever wants to talk first. Please state your name, spell it, and give your address for the court reporter.

MR. SALVATORE: My name is Mark Salvatore, M-a-r-k, Salvatore is S-a-l-v-a-t-o-r-e. My address is 132 Sumac Lane, Schaumburg, Illinois 60193.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. And have you read all the conditions put out by the Planning Department? Do you agree with them?

MR. SALVATORE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Why don't you give us a brief description of your project, your proposal?

MR. SALVATORE: Briefly, I just would like to say good evening, Plan Commission members. My name is Mark Salvatore and who I brought before you as well is Tony Van Dijk and Keith Wisniewski, and we represent D.R. Horton/Cambridge Homes. And we are the project purchaser or property purchaser, contract purchaser of the six-lot, proposed six-lot subdivision at 909 West Campbell.

And in working with Village Staff, we have addressed a majority of the comments. Basically, we have brought some boards that I want to show the Plan Commission. This is the preliminary engineering plan.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Could you speak into the mic please?

MR. SALVATORE: Oh, sorry. We brought the preliminary engineering plans and also the preliminary plat to review. And we have made some comments, or made some changes to those plans based on the comments from the Village Staff. And I'll let Latika go from here, I think, because I've prepared a little bit of stuff but I think those topics will come up as we go and work through this stuff.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Latika, are you using the slides on the screen?

MS. BHIDE: They should all be on slides, yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay.

MS. BHIDE: Which ones are you looking for?

MR. SALVATORE: These are the latest preliminary plat

DRAFT

and preliminary engineering, both of these. This will show kind of the --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: If you want to describe the first slide that's up there?

MR. SALVATORE: Yes. This shows our preliminary plat of subdivision. It shows the six lots and, the six buildable lots. The seventh lot in the northeast corner is the detention basin. And that is the lot that Latika describes in the comments they need some variations on. The intention of that lot is strictly detention, not buildable. No home won't be built there and it will actually be the dry detention basin that will be turned over to the Village.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: We'll move to another slide now?

MR. SALVATORE: Yes, this shows the preliminary engineering of the six-lot subdivision. And as described, it shows the detention basin in that northeast corner. This actually shows some finished grades of the proposed lots and how the grading would work out with the existing roadways on the surrounding properties, which would be Kaspar and Campbell, and then also shows the Kennicott extension terminating at the property limits at the southwest corner there.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All right, keep going.

MR. SALVATORE: Some of the details on this plan are that it shows some trees that, some trees that are shown on that plan. Some of the trees along Kaspar are intended to be preserved. Then also, some of the trees, we have since eliminated some of the storm sewer on that west, I'm sorry, east side of Kaspar -- west side of Kaspar but east side of this project. The Village Staff had suggested we try and preserve more of the trees and we have eliminated some of that storm sewer there and then also have added some storm sewer extension onto Campbell to try and pick up additional detention volume or surface area by eliminating some of the storm sewer along Kaspar.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: If I can just stop you here for a second? I know you've made this presentation to the Subcommittee, but not everybody on this Commission is on the Subcommittee. So, could you briefly describe the project, what's there now, what you intend to do?

MR. SALVATORE: Okay. What is there now is there is a large, there was a large single-family home on the eight lots, and that's the plat of survey that's shown there. That home has since been demolished, and pretty much the property is vacant besides a number of, I think it's 111 trees that are over 3 inches in diameter on the property. So, really what exists there now I think is just the asphalt driveway. And then the home has been demolished and the eight subdivided lots will be consolidated into seven essentially, and then with one being a detention basin.

Any other questions?

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Well, no, if you're done then, we'll go to Latika and she'll present the summary from the Village's viewpoint.

DRAFT

MR. SALVATORE: Okay, sure.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All done?

MR. SALVATORE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Latika?

MS. BHIDE: Good evening. The Petitioner is here this evening and they are requesting a preliminary plat of subdivision to re-subdivide eight previously platted substandard lots into six single-family lots and one outlot for detention. Along with this subdivision, the Petitioner is also requesting some variations. The variations are from Chapter 28 Zoning Regulations and Chapter 29 Subdivision Regulations for lots in the R-2 District to allow the outlot for detention to be smaller in area and width than is required by the ordinances. The other variation that they would be requesting would be that a cul de sac be provided at the closed end with a turnaround for a street.

As you can see from the location map, the property is located at 909 West Campbell Street. And it is approximately 1.6 acres in area. It's bounded by Campbell Street to the north, Kaspar Avenue to the east, and there is an unimproved partial right of way for Kennicott Avenue on the west. To the south is vacant land.

From the plat of survey, you can see there are eight platted lots here that do not meet the current R-2 standards. These lots were platted as part of the Arlington Manor Subdivision in 1924, so it's been a few years. The lots lack adequate width and lot area to meet the standards of the R-2 District.

Earlier this year, the Petitioner asked for relief from the Zoning Board of Appeals to allow these eight lots to be eight buildable lots, but that request was denied by the Zoning Board of Appeals. As you can see from the plat of subdivision here, they are requesting to create six residential lots and one outlot for detention. And I'm going to zoom in a little bit here to look at those lots here. From the standpoint of lot area and lot width, the ordinance requires both corner and interior lots to be 10,000 square feet in the area, and the corner lot to be 90 feet in width and the interior lots to be 75 feet in width. All the lots except the outlot meet that requirement.

Some of the site related issues. As I mentioned before, the property is bound by the unimproved Kennicott Avenue right of way on the west. Per Chapter 29 which is Subdivision Regulations, half streets are prohibited except where the Plan Commission finds that the adjoining half is unsubdivided and it's practicable to require dedication at a later date, which is the case here, the property to the west consists of two lots between Campbell and Sigwalt. If you look at these plans, the Petitioner has shown plans that show for the half right of way for Kennicott Avenue to be improved to the south end of this subject property with a 20-foot pavement, a 5-foot sidewalk, curb and gutter as well as parkway trees.

The Engineering and Fire Departments'

DRAFT

recommendation is that the street be extended all the way to Sigwalt to provide adequate access for emergency vehicles, and the Petitioner has indicated that that is not something that they can do with this project. So, in a sense, there are three options that we see with Kennicott Avenue. The first is that per Engineering and Fire Departments' recommendation, that the street be extended to Sigwalt, a contribution ordinance can be adopted for recapturing the cost of that southern half of Kennicott Avenue.

The second option would be to provide a cul de sac. There is also a possibility of doing a temporary cul de sac where the Petitioner, you know, any area outside of the right of way could be in an easement. If that's the route the Petitioner goes, then the Petitioner would have to post a letter of credit to remove that cul de sac after the full extension was made.

The third option would be for the Plan Commission to recommend and the Village Board to concur with the Petitioner's request for a dead end street. So, those are the three options.

Tree preservation. I apologize for the quality of this image, but there are 111 trees of trunk caliper 3 inches or greater that are present on this site. As proposed, only the 6 trees along Kaspar now are indicated on the plans to be preserved, and they are within this city right of way for Kaspar Avenue. So, those have to be preserved. But Staff has identified 42 additional trees that could be saved on site. We've discussed it with the Petitioner and they have indicated that they will work with their engineer to see what additional trees can be preserved. But at this time, we have not seen any plans and we would like to see those plans before we recommend.

They have presented a landscape plan which shows street trees along Campbell, Kennicott, and the ones that are on Kaspar will be preserved. And there is landscaping proposed around the detention basin.

A couple of pictures of the site. And at this point, the Staff Development Committee recommends that the Plan Commission actually continue this petition so that they can adequately address the Kennicott Avenue issue and the tree preservation related issues.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Thank you, Latika. Do we have a motion to move the Staff report into the public record?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So moved.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make the motion to accept the Plan Commission report.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Second?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Opposed?

(No response.)

DRAFT

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. All right, let's start with the intuitive questions from the Plan Commissioners. Mr. Green, would you like to start?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Sure. Thank you, Joe. Latika, I just have a question. I'm looking at this aerial photograph. Is that an existing right of way drawn in between these lots going from Campbell down to Sigwalt?

MS. BHIDE: That's correct. It's an existing half right of way.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, that's 33 feet?

MS. BHIDE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay. So, if you took, to the west of that, if you took another 33 feet for a standard 66-foot, what is left of those two lots that are to the west? In other words, if you take that away, are they, it looks like they would be considerably smaller than what we're proposing here today.

MS. BHIDE: You know, I don't think you would achieve two depth-wise, but one depth-wise would probably be okay.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Well, that's what I'm thinking. Is going in this direction off into the street, would it give us a, it looks like it's close to, if you keep going on Patton there, the depth of the lot that it backs up to, would we achieve that same dimension?

MS. BHIDE: No, it would be smaller than that. It would be lesser than that.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Do you know what it would be, Mark?

MR. SALVATORE: No, I don't, sir. No.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: You don't, okay. So, if we took and we put a full street in there, they would be hurting as far as who is going to develop those lots if they're shallow. Unless they want one front and one back or something, you know, one north, one south. Okay, I'm just trying to get a handle on this half street thing.

Mark, do you have any interest in the property to the south, the eight lots to the south?

MR. SALVATORE: Yes, we do. Now, we clearly do not have anything under contract. We do have an interest in it but I think it's been tied up in court with some other issues. We can't figure out who actually owns that property.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, if we were to grant this half street, Latika, obviously the property to the west or the property to the south, if it were to develop, would we, let's say the properties to the south, if they were to develop, would we allow a half street to go all the way through then at that point?

MS. BHIDE: At that point, yes. At that point --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: And so, we'd have to wait to get a proper street for two lots that may never develop?

MS. BHIDE: That is true.

DRAFT

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, I'm just trying to get a handle on this. On my own block, I have one of these situations, down just to the north of me where a half street was allowed to go in next to what looks like a single lot. And I know the people that bought that single lot and there was a house there before and it was granted many, many years ago. And it came up a few years back, development in that area, and this individual would have to give up part of his property to make that street happen. And so, the wonderment was why did we ever allow this half street to go in ever to begin with.

And so, I'm looking at these two lots, and you're harder pressed to develop those two lots than you are the eight lots to the south. And so, I'm just questioning out loud I guess my concern over this half street that we're allowing to go in here. And that's all I have for the moment.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Mark, would you mind setting those exhibits down on the floor so we can see the audience or see the public? Thank you. Just on the floor is fine, that's fine. All right, Commissioner Ennes? Any questions?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I do, I have a couple of questions about the detention pond. And Latika, if you can answer, what type of, has there been a flooding problem in the area with storm water?

MS. BHIDE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Do you, are you familiar with the nature of that, or the extent?

MS. BHIDE: You know, I do not know too many details. I do know that there have been flooding issues in this area.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay. Is it, I looked at the topography and I really can't tell from it, is it that this lot is graded away to the street?

MS. BHIDE: I don't know if Mark can answer this question better than me, but where the detention is located, that is the natural low point for this property.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: There's the detention, what you're proposing is in this spot?

MR. SALVATORE: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: And is that naturally, has water naturally found its way to that in the past?

MR. SALVATORE: That I can't answer.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay. All right, you're going to enhance, did one of your --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Come up and state your name and address and spell it please.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Keith Wisniewski.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: And Keith, what are you for the project?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: What am I for the project?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Architect? Owner?

DRAFT

MR. WISNIEWSKI: With D.R. Horton/Emerald Homes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: We are, both Tony and myself are involved with, and Mark, planning and working with this project and we can take you through this process.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Just spell your name and give your address please.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Sure. Keith, K-e-i-t-h, Wisniewski, W-i-s-n-i-e-w-s-k-i. 11622 Emily Court, Spring Grove, Illinois.

To answer your question, from the grading that we have, we don't carry our, the topography that was performed does not carry all the way south to Sigwalt. But from the engineering that we have, there is a, and Mark, we can confirm this, we were looking at how we were doing the drainage, there is a portion where, on our site, the site that's proposed for the six lots doesn't actually flow to that northeast corner. That's why the detention basin was chosen to be in that location. There is on that southern portion the natural flow and the grade, the topography does bring that water down towards Sigwalt.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay. How deep, with your plans, how deep will that detention pond be?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Mark?

MR. SALVATORE: Right now, what we show the detention basin elevation at, approximately the bottom of the basin is at elevation 694. And then you'll see some of the finished grade elevations around, some of the houses are around 703, 705, 706, near that range.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, it could be as much as 9 feet?

MR. SALVATORE: Yes. So, what we would try to do is we'll try to put it below, you know, basement elevation so we won't have concerns with, you know, basement flooding or just the water traveling into the, you know, drain tile of basements.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: And so, will the storm drains from the subdivision, they'll go into that? They will be able to flow out into the Village storm sewers when that clears up?

MR. SALVATORE: Yes, correct. We'll detain our detention and have a release rate into the Village storm sewer system. So, we have a storm sewer that's designed for inside the subdivision, inside the six lots. And then we also pick up some of the storm detention or storm water runoff along Campbell.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Is this currently a wet area?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: That I can't, where the six lots are, I don't believe it's an issue. I think the bigger issue is on the southern portion of this property in front of this location, closer to Sigwalt, on those eight platted lots that we are not under contract on.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: But the way you're engineering this, this will be normally dry unless there is heavy rain --

DRAFT

MR. SALVATORE: Yes, it will be a dry detention basin.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay.

MR. SALVATORE: And then when we have a storm event, it will detain that water until, you know, until it will release that at a certain percentage or a certain release rate that won't exceed the capacity of the storm sewer.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: And one last question for you. When did you acquire the property? I shouldn't one, two. When did you acquire it?

MR. SALVATORE: We have not acquired it, we have it under contract.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Oh, okay. And did you demolish the house or did the current owner demolish it?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: The current owner demolished the home and we are under contract, and we have been since March when we went before the Zoning Board.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: So, it's been sometime since we --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Commissioner Jensen?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: When you went before the Zoning Board, it didn't seem that you had thought through very well the finances of this project because you had difficulty, your representatives had difficulty answering questions. One of the things that this Commission looks at is can you yield a reasonable return with the configuration that now you have? Earlier, you came in and you wanted eight lots and there was a lot of testimony against having as many as eight. So, you've restructured it to six.

Have you sufficiently worked through the finances and economics to know you can actually make the return, a reasonable return from this property with this new configuration?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: With the new configuration and with the engineering that we have submitted, inclusive of some of the changes that have been requested from Village Staff, yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Good. And I did note that you've really taken a lot of the things that came out of the testimony from the public as well as from the Zoning Board and you'd incorporated them into what you're bringing before us, and I think that's great.

I do need to ask Latika about option one for the street. I'm not, it's not clear to me who pays for this front end if you go all the way through from Campbell to Sigwalt. It mentions a, you know, an arrangement, I'm not totally familiar with this contribution ordinance. So, maybe you can explain how this option one would work, who would pay for what, and how it would affect the Petitioners?

DRAFT

MS. BHIDE: The developer would have to pay for the entire street. The contribution ordinance is basically setting up a recapture, so the benefitting properties, when they develop or when that reconfigures or happens, these folks could benefit from recapturing the cost of putting that street in. But it would be their cost up front.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Do we have a right to do that since they don't own the property south and west of --

MS. BHIDE: There is an existing half right of way there, so that right of way exists right now. So, they could put the street in within the half right of way. But you're absolutely right, they do not own the property to the west or the south.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Do you have any idea what kind of cost we would be imposing on them to do the rest of the, or does anybody have a handle on the cost?

MR. SALVATORE: I have estimated it at \$80,000 additional cost just to extend the road. And our concern is the same as just you brought up where we don't own either side of the half right of way. We're not sure we can make the grading work, and it may create a pocket or a ponding issue onto those lots. So --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, is that a bigger issue than the finances, the \$80,000 that you'd have to front end put up to do this and then you'd only recapture it if it were developed at some point in the future?

MR. SALVATORE: Yes, it's a big concern for us. And that's why we have, we're opposed to really doing that for this development.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Are you, do you find the cul de sac arrangement a better option?

MR. SALVATORE: No, we don't think it will fit. It will impact the lot, that lot 5 on the southwest corner negatively.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: What will happen, I think per your ordinance, it's 87 feet. 87 feet is what's required for a cul de sac. With a 33-foot right of way, we come in, what was it, Mark? 47?

MR. SALVATORE: 47 feet.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: 47 feet into the lot. That lot 5, it's only 132 feet. One of the things that we have to consider is the alignment of the homes, the neighboring homes on either side, and what would be the result of putting something in a cul de sac would force the front setback of that home to be pushed back farther and taken out of alignment with the rest of the homes on the block.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Latika, isn't the Engineering Department of the Village equally concerned about what we might do with lot 5 under option two?

MS. BHIDE: They are. Their concern was access for emergency vehicles, both the Engineering and Fire, and they would prefer the street to go through.

DRAFT

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sure. Sure. And your, what you'd like to do is just build the street along the property that you have because you have some engineering concerns, you don't know what it's going to do to the property if you go ahead and do that. Do you think there would be liability or what's your concern? You'd have some liability for this?

MR. SALVATORE: No, just mainly engineering concerns really. And we feel our obligation is along our property limits, not anything beyond that.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: The objection, Latika, by the Village to doing what they would like to do which is essentially a private, almost like a private road and you've got entrances into the lots off of that private road, Kennicott, that half of Kennicott, what's the objection to that?

MS. BHIDE: I think it's basically access for emergency vehicles. And you know, there is no mechanism, the code requires that you either put a cul de sac or you extend the street through.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, the option of doing what they ask really is, I mean is it even possible? Is that something the Commission can actually say yes, that's a good idea?

MS. BHIDE: I think you can, that is one of the options. We've listed it as one of the options. It would be up to the Commission to recommend and the Village Board to approve or deny it.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: But the big stumbling block would be the emergency vehicles primarily?

MS. BHIDE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: They would not be able to go in there, turn around and get back out?

MS. BHIDE: Right, there is no turnaround and, you know, if the street stops, I mean the other option would be to back out the vehicle which is not a preferable option for them.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Total depth of that is I believe like 250 feet from Campbell to the southern boundary of lot 5.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, then I've got to come back and ask you, Latika, I don't know what continuing this is going to do. I mean we've got three options that aren't very good from an engineering point of view. So, if we continue it, what are we going to know down the road that we don't know now? Either we've got to distort what happens on lot 5 or we've got to take, you know, take a chance that we have some engineering issues with continuing it all the way through, and we're imposing another \$80,000 cost on them which they may or may not ever recover. Or we say we don't really, you know, we're going to look the other way with respect to the emergency vehicles.

So, I'm not sure, is there anything in the future that's going to resolve that issue?

MS. BHIDE: Right, so the continuation also is to address the tree preservation issues on site. You know, Staff has

DRAFT

indicated our preferred option is. Our preferred option is to extend that street to Sigwalt, but they have the right to go before the Plan Commission and the Board with their request. They are requesting that they do not want to do that. But we also have concerns with tree preservation and, you know, they've said they'll make a good faith effort but we haven't seen anything and we'd like to address that before this goes forward.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Is there any way we can determine whether there truly are some engineering issues with going all the way through, you know, the lot, completing that all the way between Campbell and Sigwalt?

MS. BHIDE: We can get you whatever information they need before they come back again.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Because, I mean you do impose an \$80,000 cost on them, but it sounds like equally important is we need to resolve the issue which we should be able to resolve technically, are we going to be able to make that go all the way through without creating some engineering issues and causing some problems with water runoff and other things.

MS. BHIDE: We could definitely resolve that and get those answers for you.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Well, Lynn, if I can jump in a little bit?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sure.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: If, no matter what for the, it's a catch 22. If you have a half street, the only way to go with a half street is if there is any future development. If there's future development, the engineering problem has to be solved. So, there is not an engineering problem that can't be solved here. So, if there is any hope for future development, it will be solved. It's just that simple.

So, it may be something they don't want to deal with, but it will be solved one way or the other for this thing to ever go forward beyond this point.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sure.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, I think the question here is whether we're going to force them to put a half street in all the way down. The cul de sac thing --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And incur the \$80,000 cost.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, right. But the other thing is the cul de sac would have to be on their property. So, the turnaround, what they're saying, will come in, it's not centered on that right of way, it's on that last lot. So, that is one of the worst options.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sure.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Is that it destroys that lot to the southwest.

DRAFT

MR. SALVATORE: I have a fourth option that maybe we want to throw out, too. We have not really talked to the Village Staff about this but we thought about it after the fact is potentially installing a driveway that would be supportive of a fire truck on lot 5 where the Fire Department could use it as a turnaround, most essentially a hammerhead type of application. And if it's got to be thicker pavement or concrete or whatever the Fire Department requires, we could discuss that and see if it's feasible.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, you're suggesting a workaroud that allows what, them to back in or drive in and then back out and be able to make a turn at some point?

MR. SALVATORE: Yes, exactly. Exactly.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: How much --

MR. SALVATORE: And we don't impact lot 5 with a cul de sac and we don't have to install the street all the way down to Sigwalt.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: When you do that, it would only affect lot 5 or you'd spread, you'd have it affect the other lot north of that, lot 6 as well or just lot 5?

MR. SALVATORE: No, just lot 5. It would actually be the driveway for the whole on lot 5, and we would provide let's say a temporary access for the Fire Department if it were on private property.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, if it were the driveway and the owner had cars in the driveway, would that impose some problems? I would think, wouldn't you? I mean it's not a great solution, not a perfect solution.

Well, I think I'll reserve other questions until we hear both from the audience and so forth. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you, Lynn. Commissioner Drost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: D.R. Horton, can you tell us a little bit about what activities D.R. Horton has had in the community? You're a publicly traded company and you have been developing in this area. What do you have here currently? And then how are you going to market these properties? And I'm sort of horrified by the fact that you'd have an arrangement to have a turnaround on lot 5 because that would have to impact the marketability of that property.

MR. SALVATORE: Sure. I'll let Tony speak about that. Tony Van Dijk has built --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay. Mr. Van Dijk?

MR. SALVATORE: He's built a few homes in the area in Arlington Heights.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I'd just like to know what, you know, the overall plan and sort of the idea of the price points on the homes that you're proposing or you think you propose and what you've done, if you've got any boards.

DRAFT

MR. VAN DIJK: My name is Tony Van Dijk, it's T-o-n-y
V-a-n D-i-j-k.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Address please? Address?

MR. VAN DIJK: 1101 Mink Trail, Cary, Illinois.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could he use the microphone so we can
hear him?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

MR. VAN DIJK: Okay. I have been, we've been building
homes in Arlington Heights now for about approximately three years
under the Emerald Homes name, which is our custom home division. These
are some of the houses that we've built. This one is in Arlington
Heights. I think three or four of these are in Arlington Heights that
I've built. This one is. These are the types of houses that we would
build in this neighborhood as well.

We're looking for, this neighborhood, these six
lots, we expect these houses to sell for somewhere around 725.

COMMISSIONER DROST: 725, okay. And the square footage
of the 10,000 square foot lot, it's going to be about 3,500? In that
range?

MR. VAN DIJK: We'll have a series of houses that we
want to propose once we get that far, but probably between 2,800 and
3,300 square feet.

COMMISSIONER DROST: 3,300. And how are they going to
be positioned? One of the, if we're, you know, you still have this
Rubik's Cube type situation of a faux cul de sac on lot 5. And I know
you haven't really thought it out maybe thoroughly, but to me it would
be a challenge to get something for 7 and a quarter on a more limited
basis on lot 5.

MR. VAN DIJK: Possibly. Our market research that
we've done in the area and I'm currently building in the area, we
believe that 725 is a good number for these lots. So, two of them
would face Kaspar, two of them would face Campbell, and then two of
them would face the Kennicott right of way.

COMMISSIONER DROST: How is business?

MR. VAN DIJK: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Is it okay?

MR. VAN DIJK: Not bad. I've got, I believe right now
six houses that I'm building in Arlington Heights.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So, they come out to about what,
\$300 a square foot? In that range?

MR. VAN DIJK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, okay. So, they're going to
be premium homes then.

MR. VAN DIJK: Absolutely. Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay, good. I am going to defer,
as Commissioner Jensen will, to hear comments from the audience. But

DRAFT

again, it's this issue of the Kennicott 20-foot street, cul de sac or dead end.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you, George. Commissioner Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Thank you. I was going back, I really came to the Plat & Sub meeting in August of 2013. And my recollection was at that time you had a similar request for the six lots plus the one corner lot for the storm water retention. Then you went to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a different plan for eight lots and they turned you down.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: No, we, back, we actually went before the Zoning Board of Appeals in April. It was April. The parcel that we went under contract with was originally platted for eight lots.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Correct.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: And so, we went in for zoning, a variance request allowing us the ability to build on those eight lots which were in non-conformance of the R-2 zoning code.

MR. VAN DIJK: We did not have this property under contract in August of 2013.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Yes, that's correct, we did not.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, but you came to the Plat and Sub though.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: No.

MR. VAN DIJK: It wasn't us.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: No, it was not us. It was not us.

MS. BHIDE: It was August of 2014.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: This all happened this year for us. So, then in April, when the Zoning Board of Appeals denied our request, we then looked at the plan, worked with our engineer, and tried to address all of the concerns and issues that were brought up from the neighbors, from the Zoning Board. And that's where we developed this plan and we came before you in August with this plan.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: You're correct. I brought a copy of the Plat and Subcommittee report and there was a, I guess a mistype on there that says 2013. But you're correct, it was 2014.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay. So, I understand that now. The property to, the eight lots to the south, you would like to acquire but it's tied up in court or whatever, you don't know who the owner is. And so, you can't do that at this time. And the two lots to the west, it looks like there's one home on the one that's off of Campbell, but there is not anything on the southernmost property off of Sigwalt.

MS. BHIDE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Is that available?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: From our understanding of the history, and when Mark says we have interest, yes, of course we have interest.

DRAFT

It was eight platted lots, when we first looked at this, we saw, wow, there's eight platted lots to the north that we can go under contract with, with the potential of eight additional lots to the south. We do know that this was all part of a single owner at one time. We do not know who currently owns the two, what we believe is it's the same ownership for these two individual parcels and the eight parcels, the platted parcels to the south of this site. We do believe it's an individual owner, we don't know who that is. Our interest is simply if it becomes available down the road, if that even is a possibility, we would, yes, we would be interested in pursuing that for future development.

Whether that happens or not, it's an unknown at this point in time. We don't even know who owns the property.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Well, isn't it public record who owns the property?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: It was in a trust from my understanding, and then we don't know if it's now owned by a financial institution. I don't have the history, we don't know where that's at at this point.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, okay, so right now what you're proposing is to extend this half road to service these two southwest lots, I don't know what numbers those are but the two southwest lots?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Who would maintain and service that road?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: As partial right of way, that would be, and dedicated to the Village, that would be Village responsibility.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: The Village would have to plow the snow on that road, but they have no cul de sac to turn their plow around.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I have to say it, I mean this seems to be an incomplete plan. If the whole property was developed and you don't know who the owner is so you can't offer to purchase the other properties, that's one thing. But to say that, well, we're going to have a partial road and the Village is going to have to maintain it and where they put the snow, who knows where they're going to put the snow because there is no cul de sac to turn their plows around and push the snow back out, emergency vehicles can't go down that road unless they want to back out, it just seems like an ill-conceived partial plan right now and I really question it. That's all I have to say right now.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you, John. Commissioner Cherwin?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, thanks. You know, I have

DRAFT

some of the same, you know, same concerns that my colleagues are expressing here, the road in particular. I mean I look at it, I think they're right, I mean we've got some tough options here. For me, you know, I look at it and I think, you know, Bruce made the point earlier, at some point when this gets developed, it has to be engineered, you know, to be, you know, an access road. So, the way I look at it is, I mean creeping into the lot 5 doesn't seem very viable to me. It would seem like taking this road all the way to Kennicott and having to deal with the recapture and building and the construction and engineering costs into the recapture with, I'm sure there's provisions for, you know, interest adjustment, cost adjustment over time. You know, it's not a great option for you but, you know, the point John was making earlier, we got snow plows, we got emergency vehicle trucks, I think, you know, it's almost unavoidable in my mind.

But that's my concern in addition to the concerns that Latika has expressed that the Department has in the tree preservation, some of the unresolved issues. Otherwise, I'll defer my comments to after the public has spoken, thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All right, thanks, Jay. I've got a couple of questions. Latika, the drainage or the retention basin, or maybe the developers, one of you guys can answer this, that detention is designed to drain just this area for these lots, these six lots?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Any drainage outside of that area?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: No, the detention pond is designed to not further impact the current situation that exists today.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, but what happens if you're getting flow from the property to the south? Do you know, I mean I think you said it flows the other way, but do you know that for sure?

MR. SALVATORE: Yes, we have a topography that actually it flows to the south, the actual --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: So, the south end of your development is like the high point you're saying?

MR. SALVATORE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: And everything is from that flow, so, okay.

MR. SALVATORE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Based on your, and has the Engineering Department confirmed that, Latika?

MS. BHIDE: They have looked at the engineering.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: They're okay with it? All right.

MS. BHIDE: They have not expressed a concern.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. And is the entire area around here R-2?

MS. BHIDE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. And turning --

MS. BHIDE: I actually take that back. The properties

DRAFT

to the north are zoned R-3.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, which are smaller?

MS. BHIDE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. And turning this basin over to the city, that's normal? That's typical?

MS. BHIDE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. So, as far as the basin is concerned, the city is okay with it?

MS. BHIDE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Now, with the road, so what's, basically a dead end road that's only, how wide is it as proposed now?

MR. SALVATORE: It's 20 feet wide proposed.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: It is 20 feet wide.

MR. SALVATORE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: So, right now the city won't accept that?

MS. BHIDE: No, I mean we have expressed concerns with it unless the Village Board decides to, you know, grant their request.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. So, you have a problem with it, the city has a problem with it but the Trustees could override that?

MS. BHIDE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. All right. And putting a cul de sac in would really chop up lot 5. And going all the way through would cost them, going all the way through for 80 grand, but that would be 20 feet? 20-foot width, the whole road?

MR. SALVATORE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: So, how could they go all the way through if they don't own the property to the south?

MS. BHIDE: Because the right of way exists.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Oh, it is a right of way, okay.

MS. BHIDE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay.

MR. SALVATORE: Yes, and I want to stress again, it's only half a right of way. We only are granted, the city only owns half of that right of way which --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: So, if the other half needed to do a full road, it is owned by whoever owned the property to the west?

MR. SALVATORE: Correct, correct. And we understand that it is, we're trying to work through these problems with a solution. But again, the city only owns half of a right of way here.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. All right, that's all the questions I have.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Mr. Chair, before we go to the audience, just to follow-up on the point you made, what do you see is the impact of the \$80,000 that you might have to do if we take the

DRAFT

option of going all the way through and you have to recapture over some indefinite period of time or perhaps never? Is that going to allow you to still do the project? Is it still feasible and viable?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: We, it's questionable. It's not just a road extension. If we put that in, I guess the question is will we be required to also extend the storm sewer, the sanitary main and the water main? We already know that the Village has requested that the water main be extended to loop the system, so we'll have to extend the water main from Campbell all the way to Sigwalt. If we have to add in the other underground utilities, it's going to increase that number, that \$80,000 number. And we will have to, being that it's not designed, these are all working off of estimates in our past experience, but that would increase the cost.

Our biggest concern is, if we put this road in, is what is it going to do? You're basically in its essence creating a dike or potentially separating the two parcels. You're only at a 20-foot pavement, how do you grade outside of that right of way on both sides of that road when you don't own the property? That's our biggest concern is what happens and how do you properly grade that. And then how do you address a storm water drainage issue.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. One other question. So, your original proposal, a 20-foot road, dead end road at the southern part of the property, how did you intend to address some of the concerns about the snow plowing for the snow, getting the vehicles, emergency vehicles, a large fire truck in and out of there? What was your thought on that?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: It was considered, basically viewed as a private driveway in essence. You're servicing two homes. We were also told in several meetings that this application has been approved in previous circumstances here within the Village. We went off the basis that being that this is two parcels, that this is something that, being that it has been accepted before, could also apply in this situation, being that the property to the south is not owned by us, we don't know what's happening with it.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Thank you, why don't you have a seat? We'll go to the, for public comment now, go to the audience. Why don't we start on my right, your left side of the room? We'll start in the first front row and then we'll work our way back. So, anybody who wants to speak, just raise your hand. So, we'll start in the first row, anybody in the first row want to speak?

Yes, come forward. State your name, spell it, and your address please.

MS. KEEFER: My name is Zaya Keefer, Z-a-y-a, last name Keefer, K-e-e-f-e-r, 1017 West Wing Street.

I just have, the solution for the street is, as I think of it, when I look at this as a resident here, I look at the totality of the whole lot, not just what they own. And I think we as a

DRAFT

Village, and seeing the inevitable of that wonderful lot being divided up and developed on, they're starting it, eventually these other ones, whether it be now, five years down the line, ten years down the line, is going to get developed. And I'd rather see my Village looking at this and saying how is it going to be developed in the totality. So, are we going to have one developer doing their houses this way and other developer doing their houses that way?

A half street? I don't know, I look at, I think the street is called Campbell Place. It's just a long driveway, it's a dead end. It only services I think one house behind the house that's on Campbell. I don't like the house half street, I'd rather see the Village take the initiative and just build Kennicott all the way through, even if that means taking partially back the land that was deeded to the Henry family on the south to complete the road.

Your retention pond, if I understand it right, the flow is going towards Sigwalt. So, is that even going to be beneficial if the water is all flowing to Sigwalt, is it even going to get into that retention pond? I love the idea of the retention pond, but is that actually the place for it?

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Well, I think what they said, if I could just speak, the center of the property, the southern portion of their development, that's like the high point.

MS. KEEFER: Right.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: So, everything from their south goes south, and everything from their north goes north to Campbell Street.

MS. KEEFER: That's the way it is? Okay. Yes, and my concern is that we look at this in the totality. It's eventually all going to get developed and I'd rather not see it piecemealed and have hundreds more of these meetings on what we're going to do, similar variances for this. I would like to see the Village just take an initiative and say, okay, in generalities we're going to end up having Kennicott going all the way through and bite the bullet and put it all the way through as a full street, even if that means taking eminent domain and taking back the south part that was deeded to the Henry family back and putting in a wider street.

I mean there's a lot of things we can do if you think a little bit further and if you look at it as this is a part of our Village. I'm sad to see it go. I know it's going to have to be developed, but I'd rather see it done right and in a uniform way, and with, you know, you have four corners of different types of homes. So, thanks for listening.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. Anybody else in the first row? Okay, how about the next row, anybody want to speak? Yes, ma'am. Your name, spell it, and the address please.

MS. SHEEHY: My name is Elizabeth Sheehy, E-l-i-z-a-b-e-t-h S-h-e-e-h-y. Address is 21 South Kaspar.

DRAFT

You can tell by our address, we live directly across the street from this property to the east and have resided there for 35 years. So, I think we are, at least within our particular block, the senior residents so to speak. And I really wanted to comment and try to carry over a couple of things that I took from the discussion at the Zoning meeting in May which was that one of the reasons that the request at that time was turned down was to preserve the character of the neighborhood. And so, I definitely endorse and would repeat if it were necessary what the other neighbor has already said about trying to consider that and consider the property in totality, at least as to what direction it might ultimately take.

Now, I'm particularly concerned about the detention facility. I spent a lot of time speaking with Latika and she referred me to the Engineering Department. I had a lengthy discussion there, and I posited to them what is going to happen if the balance of the property is sold in pieces, so the property not owned at this time by whoever you are purchasing from. And I said, for example, what if only one lot is sold? What will be done in terms of the storm water? And I was told that that might require its own detention facility, and ultimately there might be a multiple of detention facilities on this area, which to me is approximately a block and-a-half of the city.

It's also in a prime location. I mean that's, I assume, why they feel they can get a prime dollar. I mean you can walk to the library, you can walk to the post office, you can walk to town. It's a lovely street. And currently, this detention facility is being placed according to what is the topographical character of that specific piece of the property. But having lived there 35 years through all of the major storms, I can tell you that's not where we get flood water. The flood water goes to the south, to Sigwalt. And in fact, at the meeting last time in May, a neighbor took a snap of the standing water on the way to the meeting.

Okay. So, that suggests that again if this property is developed in parcels, we're going to have many detention facilities within a block and-a-half of the main part of Arlington Heights. I don't think it desirable. We have many people who are walking their children to school, bicycles going by, strollers going by, and we're going to have a 9-foot detention facility abutting almost the sidewalk with I guess a few bushes around?

We have never had problems with animals for 33 of the 35 years. But since this property has gone basically to seed, I mean currently if you drive down Sigwalt, there are large trees where the wood fall is almost as big as my living room that are lying on their side. And the Village says they can't do a thing about it. The fence is all falling down, torn down, kids have pulled it off and whacked each other according to some neighbors. So, again, we have a property that I can't imagine buying a \$750,000 house looking at this.

So, I know it's not the issue of the Village, nor

DRAFT

these folks who have come to petition for this, but I still think and would endorse her thought that we have to think about this property as a whole and what the implication is for the area. It is certainly going to change the character of the area if it's developed in all manner of pieces with all these various requirements duplicated throughout the property. And it's not convincing me that the storm water will be carried away properly in any event.

And then I just heard in the presentation that suddenly it may affect the storm sewer on our street. Well, they certainly needed our storm sewer on the street in January when the entire basement of this house that was there flooded, and it took the Village about 14 hours to pump it out. It all went into that storm sewer. So, you know, it disturbs me that we're changing arrangements that have worked for 35 years without again any notice to us and then any understanding of how that's going to improve things.

So, I have grave concerns about, really it's not their design or their property so much as the requirements that are associated with it as only a piece of this entire block.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Anybody in the next row would like to speak? Anybody else on this side of the room? Okay. If nobody else, we'll go to this side of the room. Yes, ma'am, you want to come up? State your name, spell it please and then give your address.

MS. ROYAL: Good evening. My name is Judith Royal, and I apologize if I'm not real smooth because I wasn't prepared to speak tonight. I live at 110 South Kaspar, I've lived there one quarter of a century. Did you want to say something?

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: I was going to say spell your name please.

MS. ROYAL: R-o-y-a-l, Royal.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you.

MS. ROYAL: Like gelatin, vacuum cleaners. My main concern is water. On my street, there are eight houses facing South Kaspar, three of which have had renovations and additions. When a new basement is dug out, it floods. It floods during the building process and it floods afterwards until the homeowner spends a great deal of money to build an underground drainage system.

My backyard is a bit higher than my house, so I have a water problem. It's not major but it's an annoyance. I am concerned about this property. That southwest corner where there is no house currently is a swamp when it rains. A weeping willow there has come down. Ducks do like to go there.

So, I think special attention has to be paid to the water flow in this property. I think it would be best if the houses were built two or three steps above ground level. When my house first flooded in '87, if you remember, we had rain all night, the transformer was knocked out, so none of the sump pumps worked. The

DRAFT

next morning, we had 10 inches I believe in 50 minutes after my basement had emptied, then all the new water came in. And I called the Village and I said, you know, my house was built maybe 1962-1965, if the Village had required it to be 2 feet higher, I probably wouldn't have had water. And they said, huh, but buyers wanted it that way. The developers wanted to build them all ground level. Well, who cares what they want? There is nothing existing there now, so I'm hoping that you all take into consideration that water is a major issue and houses should be above, so when it rains, as the water creeps from the street, it doesn't reach the house.

I'm also concerned about this retention pond. I think it's the wrong approach to rainwater. I think it's kind of like 19th century technology maybe. What we need to do is have a rain garden, maybe not just one but rain gardens around each house. What we should be doing is preventing the rainwater from getting into the sewage system. Rainwater is very usable, it's very good. Once it goes into the sewer system, it becomes black water, dirty water. So, we want to keep it as gray water and get it into the ground.

I'm not sure that a pond or a hole 9 feet below the surface is the best way to collect rainwater. And if it is, we don't want it to go into the sewer system anymore and add to the burden that that community already experiences. A lot of those homes, I believe their sump pumps might go into the sewer system because of the elevation. If they went out into the grass, the water would just keep circulating through the sump back out to the yard.

So, I think water is a major issue and I appreciate the attention you give to it. Maybe it is best for this street to come through, but the water is a greater issue to me than the street. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you, Ms. Royal. Anybody else on that side of the room? Yes, ma'am. State your name, spell it please, and your address.

MS. SWIDERSKI: My name is Leanne Swiderski, S-w-i-d-e-r-s-k-i. I live at 28 South Salem, so I am the next block to the east of Kaspar.

I've been there 22 years, I live out the middle of the block. If you stand on Campbell and look south towards Sigwalt, it's downhill. So, I don't, I'm not an engineer but I don't understand the retention up at Campbell when all the water on Salem heads down towards Sigwalt. And when there's a big storm, the puddling and the lake effect is at the Sigwalt end of our street where there's two manhole covers, if they're blocked, that's where the water is at the Sigwalt end, not at the Campbell end.

Ridge of course is the high point, so everything goes down from Ridge to the west. So, I don't understand why the retention is at that corner. Again, I understand the woman and I agree that the wet spot is off of Sigwalt on the west corner of that property

DRAFT

which is not part of the plan, it was always a wet area. And again, like everyone else, I'd like to see the street go through as a regular sized street. And that's all I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Anybody else on that side of the room? Okay. If not, we'll close the public comment portion of the meeting and we'll go back to the Commissioners for further comments or questions or deliberation. Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I think I personally have a problem with the street ending at the south end of this project. Unfortunately, we can't force people to give up right of way so we can build the street all the way through and we surely wouldn't expect this developer to put in a full compliant street from one end to the other. I just think that, at this point, the safety issue is large on my mind here, and I think that as a minimum I'd like to see that street go through.

To be a 20-foot street, I understand the problem. Maybe we can have an open culvert situation there or something to relieve the problem. I don't expect the developer to solve all the problems for the neighborhood. I do want to say that as an architect, I know that the Engineering Department here, whatever they have on that plan, it will work. Their water will not run in the other direction, it will go to the northeast corner because they will engineer it that way. It will work, otherwise they won't be able to do it.

So, their water will be detained and retained on their property. So, don't, you know, the water that may be around the neighborhood is not going to be coming from these six lots. That I can tell you, the Village will make sure it doesn't happen. So, that's all I've got to say for now.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Ennes, anything further?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I agree, I really don't like the idea of a stub street or a cul de sac there. I think it should go all the way through. If you want to spread the cost of the street further, maybe you need to try to tie up those other lots. Because otherwise, eventually when they're developed, they're getting the benefit of the street that you're putting in. But I agree with Commissioner Green, I think that for safety, the street should go through.

And just, I am not an engineer, but for some of the comments that we had about the water and where it's flowing, these detention ponds serve to hold water in neighborhoods until it settles so that it isn't running into the adjoining neighborhoods. So, there's a lot of benefit if you have these types of ponds. I don't think it's really 18th century technology, I think it's a modern way of looking at it to hold those water within specific areas, and then it flows out as the storm water abates. That's probably a pretty poor description of that but --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: But it's accurate.

DRAFT

COMMISSIONER ENNES: It's the way it works.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It's time to hold the water for a give time until the storm sewer can take it.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Until there's room for it to go somewhere, right. So, it's better to hold it in little areas --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: That's why they call it detention pond and not retention pond.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right, right.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Jensen?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, I think there were some interesting comments from the public, and I guess I'd come back and ask our Staff. You've been asked by the public, can we take a look at something broader than just what is right before us so that we make sure that what they develop actually fits into a larger context that makes sense for the development? We do this in areas where there's a commercial interest. I mean we did that for the Hickory Kensington. And so, is there anything we can do, and maybe not immediately but just start taking a look at development in a broader sense for this area because I think the public comments are useful here. Now, I think we don't want to hold up the Petitioner forever to do that, so the question is can we make sure that what they're going to do basically fits into a larger scheme of things and make some sense for that particular area?

I would agree with the other Commissioners. I can't see any option other than having a road go all the way through. I don't know how you deal with the snow, the emergency vehicles and so forth. And I'm not sure whether more timing is to be given to take a look at those other engineering issues because you mentioned the water main and those other utilities and so forth. And so, do you know an answer at this point, Latika, as to do they have responsibility for other utilities and things that would need to, that might be affected by the road going all the way through?

MS. BHIDE: No, I mean as far as the road, they would, you know, it would have to be sidewalk, curb and gutter, and street trees. As far as the water looping, they had mentioned that, yes, looping is required but I mean that's just a requirement. You can't have dead end water main, it's a safety issue. You know, I'd be more than happy to coordinate with both Public Works and Engineering to firm up what if any might change because of the road going through.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Drost, anything further?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I think to one of the residents about the totality of the development, I think it's going to get developed, it will have to be developed just by the nature of its location. And my concerns are really sort of from an aesthetics standpoint. You know, we see some of the homes that D.R. Horton has

DRAFT

built in Arlington Heights. I think they're attractive and I think they'd be welcome to the neighborhood. But that lot to the northeast, the detention pond, if there was an alternative to switch it out in some way because it would, to kind of bury it more in the interior of the development, but that's just a comment.

And do we, Latika, have anything, another petitioner mentioned these small ponds, you know, for individual homes, what's the, or how do you, where are we as a Village in that kind of a concept?

MS. BHIDE: So, you know, when this went before the Zoning Board of Appeals to have the eight lots recreated as buildable lots, there was no detention proposed. And the reason was that because it wasn't the plat of subdivision --

COMMISSIONER DROST: A little bit closer to the mic for the folks.

MS. BHIDE: Sorry. When this went before the Zoning Board of Appeals to recreate the eight lots, there was no separate detention basin that was required. Now, that is a requirement of a plat of subdivision because they are platting the property. Again, they are required to meet, you know, they are required to provide a detention basin to manage the storm water. I mean, you know, if these lots were individually developed, they would still have to manage their storm water. I don't necessarily envision those as, I mean I'm not an engineer either, but I don't see those as basins. They are typically handled, and I've seen them handled in other places, as French drains, you know, depressions in the back.

Rain garden is an entirely different concept. I mean, you know, there are several communities that promote rain gardens. You have your downspouts connected to create, you know, natural areas.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, but we're not there at all. We don't have that ability.

MS. BHIDE: I don't believe the rain garden would be a solution to manage storm water.

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, okay. I mean that's more of an engineering, so above my pay scale here. And as far as the road, I think it has to be a road that goes all the way through. And it seems to be, it would be tight for even the concerns that we've got for public safety issues and the snow and snow removal, because we've seen that a lot, these narrow ones in the Pulte development at the Village Crossing. But, well, I have no further comments or questions at this time.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Commissioner Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'd just like to reiterate, I share the opinion of a couple of the residents. I think this property has to be viewed as a totality of a development. I'm all for developing and not looking to hold up D.R. Horton or anybody else, but

DRAFT

this looks like a partially conceived plan. And to think that we would approve something with this road being a life safety hazard, I can't go along with that. So, I mean I think somehow this whole property has to be looked as a totality and developed, and this road problem goes away.

I'm even reviewing a memorandum here in our packet from Paul Butt, Fire Safety Plan Reviewer. And he quotes from the International Fire Code that we have to have a fire hydrant mid block along Kennicott there, and any road that is served by a fire apparatus must be of minimum width of 26 feet. So, this partial road is only 20 feet, so it doesn't even comply with the International Fire Code. So, how could we, I can't see how we could possibly agree to something like that. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Cherwin?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, I mean my comments from before stand. I agree with what my colleagues here have said, and I appreciate the comments of the public as well. I would just be repeating at this point so I'll let those comments stand.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. My comments at this point is I appreciate everything the residents have said. It would be nice to have a total development plan so we know exactly what we're getting here in the future. Rain gardens and whatnot are great ideas, too. But we've got, in my opinion, we've got a developer here willing to do something where there is nothing right now. And to look for something that may not happen for another ten years I think wouldn't be a wise decision for the Village.

So, Latika, let me ask you, the road they're going to put in, is it curb and gutter and sidewalk did you say?

MS. BHIDE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: And is there any fire hydrants or water mains with that?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: So, it's basically a half fully developed street. My opinion is we should go ahead with this development, and at the maximum we should make them do is maybe put the street through but only a minimum. No curb, gutter, just a paved surface like we have in Scarsdale and some of the other neighborhoods, a substandard street until somebody comes through and develops the rest of the property. That's my opinion. But I think it would be a mistake to let this project, this development go.

So, any motions?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Could I ask, I'd like to ask Latika, the Staff recommendation is a continuance?

MS. BHIDE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: What's the period of time we're talking about? And what are we going to fully resolve that we haven't already hashed through here at this point? What are we likely to get out of a continuance and how long is it going to take?

DRAFT

MS. BHIDE: Sure. The next meeting would be, the earliest meeting would be December 10th at this point. That would give them about a month. What we are hoping to resolve is, you know, if they can come to terms with the street going through, firming up some, you know, working with Engineering to ensure, you know, their concerns and see what those are, but also to address the tree preservation issues on site.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: To move forward, it's obvious that the Board would like to see some form of a street whether it's a partially paved substandard street, you know, curb, gutter, water main, fire hydrants to our south boundary, and then a paved road through, we can work with Engineering and I think that could be addressed on final engineering plans.

When it comes to tree preservation, we had a meeting with Village Staff a week and-a-half ago. Originally, this site was designed for us to clear cut the trees. We were going to strip the black dirt and stock pile it while we built the detention basin, overlay the fill generated from the basin onto the lots, and then respread the black dirt and then build individually as we move along. Because of the issue with the tree preservation, we told Staff that we would change our way of developing this site. We would just take down the trees that we need to take down to develop or to build the detention basin. And for any trees that would fall in line with any underground utilities, there's storm sewer mains that run through the property that capture storm water for all the lots, minimally invasive, and then we would handle it like we do in every home that we build on individual lots throughout the Village currently is only take down the trees that need to come down where the house sits.

We work on that on a regular basis here within the Village. We've been doing so for three years. This way it will preserve as many trees as possible.

The other issue was with the trees along Kaspar. We had originally had a, we added the sidewalk that was requested by Village Staff. We were originally concerned, and still are, that the distance between the parkway trees and the current row of trees that are on the lot line and the grade issue by putting in that public walk would also over time kill the trees that are along Kaspar. We'll put the sidewalk in per Village request, we won't take down the trees and we'll see what happens.

We are on board with preserving as many trees as possible. And taking this different approach than what we originally planned I think can all be dealt with in the final engineering plans.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, I hear you saying you'd actually prefer that we approve this but make it contingent upon your working through these issues. You'd even accept extending the road all the way through, developing it up to -- on your half, the part that deals with your half of the road, and do as the Chair suggested which

DRAFT

is basically a paved road going forward but not totally up to code.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Correct.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: That would be your preference at this point?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Correct.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So, what would be the value then of continuing this if we can basically identify the issues of tree preservation, some of the detention, the road pass through, give those recommendations really and let the Village Board decide that and to expedite the process --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I would agree.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And identify the salient issues?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: If I can jump in, I think when you give a, when you dedicate a street to a village, you have to have a certain standard that's met. And that standard includes at least curbs, so, and the base of the street and everything else. This street would be modified in the future because it would be made wider. But I think that it's going to be a hard sell to the Engineering Department to have any street that is just asphalt on gravel. Living on a street that has that, that is a mess. And I think the street, I don't care so much about the sidewalks because who's going to walk down the street? There's two houses that are served by this now.

So, whether the sidewalks are in an escrow account or however that's going to work, I would say whatever street you put in, I would like to see at least a curb on to meet the standard for the Village on that curb which would be an easier sell.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Are you saying on both sides or just on the --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I would do both sides but because you have to, to make the street work and as far as water and everything else.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, but I think, you know, that's really not, it's really up to the Petitioner to come up with a proposal. I don't want to, you know, take away from your expertise here.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Right, but I would like to see it go through and I'm just telling you you're going to have a hard time selling it to the Engineering Department without --

COMMISSIONER DROST: But you need to, you know, I don't think we should be designing the project as what I'm saying.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I think following what Commissioner Drost said, it makes sense not to continue this but basically let the Engineering Department work it out with the Petitioner. And we know what the issues are, we've isolated them and so forth. I don't see any advantage to dragging this out another month and come back and wrestle with those same issues.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I agree with that totally. I'm

DRAFT

just, I guess I'm warning you of what you're going to run into with the engineers. Continue the street through, we don't have to say anything, we just would like to see the street continue through.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: In conformance with what the Engineering Department would like to see.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: And let them input what they're going to input.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, Latika, help us craft something that lets us do what we've sort of developed a consensus in. We can't work off of the blue sheet because the blue sheet --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: How does Engineering deal with this 26-foot requirement by International Fire Code versus --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: They'll deal with it.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: They're going to have to deal with it, they'll deal with it better than we can.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Right.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: We're never going to resolve it here at this Commission. We need to craft something other than what's on the blue sheet that takes into account what we just said which is basically we want to approve it but they have to work with Engineering to resolve those issues of having a street go all the way through. And they've actually laid out an alternative plan for the tree preservation which --

MS. BHIDE: I just, I do want to say that, you know, while we understand that they've said they will, you know, make a good faith effort to save all the trees, we have not seen anything.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay.

MS. BHIDE: And I just want to say that we do not feel comfortable --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, so you need to have a plan, this could be approved contingent on your seeing a plan and Engineering working out the details of the street going all the way through.

COMMISSIONER DROST: The street going through and tree preservation.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Contingent upon those two issues, the street and the trees.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: They could be recommendations.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Could I ask a question? And this may be off the wall a little bit, but the 26-foot, is that, is there a lesser standard for a one-way street, potentially to make it a one-way just for the time being until maybe the rest of that property is developed in order to accommodate that? Is that something we, I don't know if there's a lesser standard for a one-way street in width.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Well, I think the 26 feet includes parking and things. So, if there was a problem, they can work this out, they can say there's no parking on the street or something, you know, to get whatever the dimension has to be.

DRAFT

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: I just feel a fully developed street is overly burdensome on this developer, to take it all the way like that.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I agree. And let me point out that the Planning Department gave us three options. If you look on to page 5 of 5, under Recommendations, they listed the three options. And I think the third option looks exactly what we're talking about. Does everybody have that? I'll read it.

"Approve the Petitioner's request with the following conditions: (a) The Petitioner shall provide a revised Preliminary Plat of Subdivision document incorporating the changes listed above prior to the submittal of the project to the Village Board." And we could reference the Kennicott Street right of way and tree preservation related issues. And "(b) The Petitioner shall continue to work with Staff to preserve as many trees as possible on the site."

I mean, does that cover it?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, I think that would cover it.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Does anybody want to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC#14-019, a Preliminary Plat of Subdivision to re-subdivide eight substandard platted parcels into six single-family lots and one lot for detention, and the following variations:

- a. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-2.5, *Minimum Lot Size*, from the requirement that corner lots in the R-2 District are required to be 10,000 square feet to allow Outlot A, detention facility to be 8,782 square feet;
- b. Variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-2.6, *Minimum Lot Width at Building Line*, from the requirement that corner lots in the R-2 District are required to be 90 feet to allow Outlot A, detention facility to be 76.32 feet;
- c. Variation from Chapter 29, Section 29-307, *Residential Lot Standards*, from the requirement that corner lots be 9,900 square feet to allow Outlot A, detention facility to be 8,782 square feet;
- d. Variation from Chapter 29, Section 29-307, *Residential Lot Standards*, from the requirement that the minimum lot width for corner lots be 90 feet at the building setback line to allow Outlot A, detention facility to be 76.32 feet; and
- e. Variation from Chapter 29, Section 304, *Street Layout and Design*, from the requirement that cul de sacs shall be provided at the closed end with a turnaround.

This approval is contingent upon compliance with the recommendations of

DRAFT

the Plan Commission and the following recommendations detailed in the Staff Development Committee report dated November 6, 2014:

1. The Petitioner shall provide a revised Preliminary Plat of Subdivision document incorporating the changes in reference to the Kennicott Street right of way and the tree preservation related issues prior to the submittal of the project to the Village Board.
2. The Petitioner shall continue to work with Staff to preserve as many trees as possible on the site.
3. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state and Village codes, regulations and policies.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Before we get a second, does the Petitioner agree? Yes?

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: But this motion says they're going to have a cul de sac with a turnaround.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: No.

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, it's a variation from.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, thank you. Thank you for clarifying.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Which means that it does not require.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Ennes, are you done?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I would second that.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. We have a motion from Commissioner Ennes and a second from Commissioner Green. Roll call vote please.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, with comment.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, with comment.

MS. Bhide: Chairman Lorenzini.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Comment is I guess I'm not as concerned about aesthetics. I think it's going to be market that will

DRAFT

control how the detention lot is going to be developed and how the homes are going to be developed, but that the individual testimony that was provided by the residents and their concerns, that they be used in the development of these three remaining conditions.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Other comments?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, I'm voting yes only on the stipulation that this Kennicott Road issue is developed to the satisfaction of the Engineering Department and the Fire Department, and we don't have any life safety issues there that the Village could be liable for in the future.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: This vote is advisory only to the Board of Trustees. They take the final vote. Is there a date yet for this?

MS. BHIDE: Not at this time.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. And how can they find out when it is?

MS. BHIDE: The information will be on the Village website the Friday before a hearing.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, Latika, thank you. Okay, that concludes this portion of the meeting. We're going to move on to the next public hearing. Thank you.

MR. SALVATORE: Thank you.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 9:03 p.m.)