

DRAFT

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: NORTHWEST CROSSINGS - 1421/1501 W. SHURE DRIVE; PC #15-007

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
27th day of May, 2015, at the hour of 7:30 o'clock p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

LATIKA BHIDE, Development Planner

DRAFT

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All right, I'd like to call to order this meeting of the public meeting of the Plan Commission. Would you join us and please rise and say the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Okay, the next item on the agenda is the approval of meeting minutes from May 13th, Christina Court Subdivision and T-Mobile.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All in favor?

(Chorus of Ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. All right, the next item on the agenda of the public hearing, Northwest Crossings. PC# 15-007. Latika, have all the Public Notices been given?

MS. BHIDE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, is the Petitioner here?

MR. HORNE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, is anybody else beside yourself going to give testimony? If you will, just come forward, raise your hand and we'll swear you in.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Okay, you can have a seat. So why don't you introduce yourselves, spell your name for the court reporter, and your address and give us a brief presentation of what you're here for.

MR. HORNE: Sure, thank you. Good evening, my name is Bob Horne, spelled H-o-r-n-e. And I'm with Torburn Partners, Torburn is the owner of the Northwest Crossings property that we're going to discuss this evening. Our address is 1033 Skokie Boulevard in Northbrook, Illinois.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. And Latika, have all the Public Notices been given?

MS. BHIDE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Please proceed.

MR. HORNE: Thank you. So, I'm here tonight on behalf of Torburn, and I'm here with several members of our team who I'll introduce as they come up in the program. To discuss, really a couple things relating to a property that we call the Northwest Crossings. For many people in Arlington Heights, they call it the Nokia campus or the former Motorola campus. It's a 66, or excuse me, 63.72 acre property that Torburn acquired in June of 2013 from Nokia. And at the time that we acquired that campus, we essentially bifurcated the campus

DRAFT

into two campuses, the North campus and the South campus.

So, to the South of what's called Cellular Drive, Nokia occupies the property and on the North campus, which is comprised of also several buildings. Torburn retained that property and we're here tonight to talk about the subdivision and the engineering and the design and the development of the North campus property.

So we've been before the Arlington Heights City Council, we've been before the Plan Commission to talk about this project in the context of our vision and our plan. And so we've previously come to Arlington Heights with requests for demolition of certain buildings on the campus. And I can start to take you through some of our chronology of what we've done. So we bought the property in June of '13 and we subsequently, here's an image of where the campus is located. Basically I call it the Southeast quadrant of Dundee and Route 53. And then, and this is the campus in its entirety, the North campus being the, obviously the large building. And then the South campus square, South of Senator Drive, which is now fully occupied by Nokia.

Subsequent to our purchase, we went ahead and divided the property and sold the South campus to Griffin Capital. And subsequent to that sale we requested and went ahead and demolished two buildings on the property. 1475 Shure Drive, and 1441 Shure Drive, the two buildings that are highlighted in orange. And that demolition was done at the time, to really pave the way for why we're here this evening.

And that is because we really kind of envisioned this, a plan that would allow the remaining buildings to be more viable in the marketplace that we're in. So, what we did with this plan is we then created, you know, real visibility for the 1421 building. The 1421 building is a three-story, it's the building to the East. It's a three-story, large floor plate office building of approximately, you know, 70,000 feet per floor.

By demolishing the building, which is shown there, it's just a vacant piece of, a vacant parcel. We really kind of created the opportunity to create what's really needed in this, today's office market, which is large floor plate buildings with very significant parking fields.

So, our current plan as it's shown here, envisions basically reconfiguring and adding a significant amount of parking. Adding a new entrance to the building and really doing very substantial upgrades to the building.

And as part of that we are now at a point where we are negotiating a very significant lease to bring a very significant company to Arlington Heights. And because of that process of that, with this lease and the needs that go with that lease as it relates to

DRAFT

financing and the, we're basically now at a point where we need to do a subdivision of the North campus property in order to kind of allow the two buildings that remain there, the 1421 building and the 1501 building to stand alone. For, from a financing perspective and just for lease purposes.

So I'm going to, so with that overview, I'm going to talk a little bit about the subdivision. I've got Dean Anthony with Kimley Horn, he is our civil engineer. Dean's a principal and owner of Kimley Horn, one of the most reputable civil engineering firms in our country, to talk about what we're doing at the engineering level of this property. We've been working closely with the Village staff and engineering department on the engineering needs of this site. And then Travis Bridges from OKW Architects is going to give an overview of the design that we're adding to these buildings, or specifically the 1421 building, and then Steve Bauer with Meltzer, Purtill & Stelle, is that right?

MR. ANTONY: Yes.

MR. HORNE: Sorry, Steve is our attorney, who's really handling the nuts and bolts of the subdivision itself and the PV that this property is a part of. So all of our consultants, myself included, are available for questions after this presentation.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Please give your name and spell it, and your address, please?

MR. ANTONY: Dean Antony, A-n-t-o-n-y, Kimley Horn and Associates, we're located at 1001 Warrenville Road in Lisle, Illinois. As Bob mentioned, we're the civil engineers for the project and also providing landscape architecture design. I'm going to review quickly the proposed improvements as it relates to the site. And Travis will cover the building. As Bob mentioned, we are subdividing the property, we provided a preliminary plat of subdivision, you may be able to see this better on your screen. But the proposed property line closely parallels the East face of the 1501 building and since the subdivision line is drawn where it is, it requires a variance from that setback.

As Bob mentioned, we are creating a new field of parking immediately South of the existing building. We're reconfiguring the parking lot to provide efficient layout and sufficient circulation. We are also including, in the parking lot islands, bioswales to handle our storm water quality requirement for the project.

In addition to that, we are removing the lakes between the two buildings, located just West of this building, and East of the 1501 building. In addition to that, we are proposing a surface loading area to service the new improvements to the existing building, 1421. And also there's an outdoor seating area North of that building which is being proposed at this time. You'll also notice in comparing

DRAFT

and contrasting the two plans, the removal of the parking lot at the very Southwest corner of the North campus. The reason for that is to increase the detention area and detention volume to bring it into conformance with the Village's ordinances.

As I mentioned, we're also providing landscaping, with a significant amount of additional trees being either transplanted and/or new trees being added. A significant amount are being added to the new and expanded detention basin.

I'm going to turn it over to Travis now to talk about the building and the entry.

MR. BRIDGES: Good evening, my name is Travis Bridges with OKW Architects, we're located at 600 West Jackson, Suite 250, in Chicago.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Bridges is spelled?

MR. BRIDGES: B-r-i-d-g-e-s.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you.

MR. BRIDGES: So, with all these new improvements on the site, we're also improving 1421 into a Class A suburban office building. We're providing a new lobby, a new entry, and a new character to the South side to help the new tenants be able to move in and have some identity.

So, on the South side of 1421 we're taking some of the precast panels off, some of the glass, cutting a double height lobby space and filling that with a kirk-wall system and a glass canopy and some proposed signage.

Also, on top of some of these improvements to the exterior, we're going to do further interior improvements by adding a cafeteria and a fitness center to help support the tenants of the building.

With that, that's our presentation for this evening.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you.

MR. HORNE: So I think, as I think back on the times that Torburn has presented to the Village of Arlington Heights, it's been really a consistent story I think, that we've tried to tell. And that is, you know, from the time of our acquisition, we've really had a vision of how we would re-purpose this corporate campus. And I think we've really been following through, I think pretty consistently with the story that we started with.

And that was this vision of the demolition of the buildings and why we did the demolition, to the point where we could position these assets properly in the marketplace to go out and secure high quality companies to really consider this for occupancy. And we put the best leasing team on the, you know, on the job. We've put a great team of consultants to position the asset, and tonight we're here

DRAFT

really to start the process, to hopefully complete at least the first phase of our execution as it relates to the 1421 building.

And that is, you know, with this process that we're now moving forward for and securing, hopefully securing the approvals of engineering. That will then allow us to really move forward and execute a lease that we're hopeful we will execute. We can't disclose anything at this juncture, in terms of a tenant, but we're confident that the Village will be very pleased with the company that we're trying to bring to Arlington Heights. And we hope with that success at 1421, we'll be back with more stories to tell and more requests to ask to complete the property of 1501, with the work we'll finish with on that property.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. Latika, I don't think anybody else is coming, do you want to do a quick role call, please?

MS. Bhide: Sure. 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?

(No response.)

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, Latika, do you want to give us a status report, please?

MS. Bhide: Good evening. The Petitioner's that you heard this evening seek an amendment to PUD Ordinances 88-060, and 14-002. They're also seeking a Preliminary Plat of Subdivision to create two lots. The properties are located at 1421 and 1501 West Shure Drive. Along with the PUD amendment and Plat of Subdivision the following variations have been identified. The first is to allow a side yard reduction from 50 feet to allow 0 feet for Lot 1, which is 1501 West Shure Drive.

From the requirement to provide a traffic study and parking analysis, and to allow parking spaces in the front yard in the M-1 District for both lots. As you can see in this area here, the

DRAFT

site is located on the North side of Cellular Drive which is a private street, and the South side of Shure Drive.

The entire site is approximately 39.6 acres in area. The former Nokia-Siemens property was purchased by Corporate Partners, and as part of the sale of the property, Nokia entered into a 12 year lease for 1455 West Shure Drive which is located on the South side of Cellular Drive. Nokia completed renovations to the building and now relocated by the Southern portion of the campus. Both buildings on the North campus are currently vacant.

With that being said, the Petitioner is actively conversing with the West Shore tenants and they're discussing various options for the property.

As the Plat of Subdivision Committee hearing earlier in the year, they presented three different options for this site. They're now going forward with this option, which is subdividing the property with two lots.

As you can see in the Plat of Subdivision, the Petitioner is proposing to subdivide the property into two lots. Lot 1, which is the West lot, 1501 West Shure Drive will be approximately 21.99 acres in area. And Lot 2, which is the East Lot, will be 1421 West Shure Drive will be 27.63 acres.

There is an atrium that connects the two buildings and that is supposed to be demolished. Additionally, the parking area on Lot 1, in the Southwest corner, which you can see on this slide, will also be removed to expand the detention area. And the Petitioner is proposing to add 428 parking spaces on Lot 2, where 1441 West Shure Drive was previously located. After completion, Lot 1 will have 792 parking spaces and Lot 2 will have 1743 parking spaces.

A Plat of Subdivision was reviewed by Plan Commission and approved by the Village Board. There is an exemption provision in Chapter 29 Subdivision Regulations, which applies to lots that are created which are more than 5 acres. However the exemption doesn't apply if they are either making new streets or access of easement. In this case the REA for Cellular Drive, which is a private drive, needs to be amended, and there are variations associated with the subdivision, which need to be approved by the Village Board and reviewed by the Plan Commission. So this is not an exempt subdivision.

As you can see from this slide here, the two lots meet the minimum lot area, and the lots fit the requirements for the M-1 District. The one variation they're seeking would be for the side yard variation for Lot 1 to reduce it from the required 50 feet to allow zero feet. The staff does not object to the variation because this is -- building.

There are no public improvements that are being required for this project.

DRAFT

Talking a little more about the traffic and parking, there are about 111 parking spaces that are located at the Southwest corner of Lot 1, as you can see on the slide here, this will be removed.

The Petitioner is also adding 428 parking spaces on Lot 2 where previously 1441 Shure Drive was located. So after the reconfiguration, as I previously said, Lot 1 would have 792 parking spaces and Lot 2 would 1743 parking spaces.

At this time, specific uses for Lot 1 are not known. And because we did not know the specific users, the entire lot was calculated for office use, which is the most restrictive parking calculation.

If calculated using the office ratio. Lot 1 would be deficient 269 parking spaces. The Petitioner had initially indicated that the Reciprocal Easement agreement between the two lots would be established that would allow for shared parking. As a result, staff recommended supporting this variation request since there's a surplus of parking spaces on Lot 2.

However, based on their lease discussions with the potential tenants, they have stated that they will not be able to provide the shared parking. Therefore staff is saying that at this time, the variation request should not be discussed or considered.

What the Petitioner has indicated to us is that going forward, they will either comply with the code required parking based on a specific user, either by adding parking, removing the leasable area or they would seek a PUD amendment on parking variation at a future date when that specific user is identified.

The other variation they are seeking is from the requirement to provide a traffic study and parking analysis. Staff does not object to this variation, basically existing buildings were traditionally used for office users and there is no tenants or reduction of those leasable area on the site, when the 1441 was demolished.

As you can see the site plan, there are two very small portions of parking area both in Lot 1 and Lot 2 which are located within the front yard setback, which is not permitted in the M-1 District. They're seeking a variation from that for the existing parking and staff has no objection to that.

The existing detention basin is located on the West side of proposed Lot 1 is designed to old NWI ordinance standards. The ordinance that would be the previous ordinances as part of their request to demolish 1441 West Shure Drive included a condition that if there was any further redevelopment on the property then the storm water management facilities will be brought up to current standards.

As I stated previously, the parking in the

DRAFT

southwest corner of Lot 1 is being removed and the detention basin is proposed to be enlarged to provide that were required.

They've provided preliminary engineering, which is acceptable and as part of Final Plat approval, final engineering any detention renovations must be submitted.

The proposed modification, a potential modification, would be adding new office entrance and a canopy for the building at 1421 West Shure Drive, the East lot, and a three-foot high wall for the building at 1501 West Shure Drive. Both of these qualify for a small parking design approval, which is illustrative approval and they've already received that.

To talk a little bit about the landscaping and -- issues, as you can see in the plan here, the trees have arrived and -- the ones that are being proposed to be removed. The original plan identified 67 trees that were proposed to be removed and looking at the replacement ratios, they needed 146 replacement trees.

We let the Petitioner know that it's reasonable that if there are any existing trees on site whether transplanting and the revised plan now provides, proposes only 38 trees to be removed. Based on where the trees that are proposed to be removed, 81 trees are being provided as replacement trees and they are providing 88 replacement trees which are four-inch caliber and are going to have add an additional 35 ornamental trees provided.

As you can see this is the landscaping plans they are providing with the new landscaping in the parking area as well as landscaping around the detention basin.

The last variation, actually the last thing to talk about with landscaping is, a three-foot high screen is required for parking areas that are on public right-of-ways. Since Cellular Drive is a private right-of-way, there are no screening requirements along Cellular Drive. Screening is provided for parking areas on Kennicott and Shure Drive and the parking area along North will be, doesn't have the required screening. However, it's set back from the street, and they're adding a lot of additional trees around the detention basin so that's why screening is not required.

I do have a few pictures of the site here, this is Cellular Drive. The bottom left-hand picture shows the atrium connection between the two buildings with the right-hand bottom shot is of the 1421 building. And then these are among the, the left picture is along Shure Drive, the right one is along Kennicott, and the bottom picture is the construction on Cellular Drive.

That being said the staff recommends approval of the amendment to PUD Ordinances 88-060 and 14-002 and the preliminary Plat of Subdivision to subdivide the property, subject to the following conditions:

DRAFT

1. That a Final Plat of Subdivision be submitted.
2. They still need to provide us with a Reciprocal Easement Agreement, an REA, which will address cross-access, shared detention and utilities in perpetuity.
3. The Petitioner can proceed at their own risk with improvements on the site, prior to Final Plat approval, whether it's the removal of the parking or the addition of the parking area. But they will be required to comply with other outside agency requirements as requested by those agencies.
4. They may divide the property in meets and bounds for financing prior to Final Plat. And will complete the Final Plat as soon as possible within the timeframe.
5. There is a requirement for a landscape compliance bond.
6. The signage that was presented as part of this does not meet the requirements of Chapter 30, the Sign Code. So it either must be revised to meet Code or a variation must be sought. And that's a separate process through the Design Commission, which then goes to the Village Board.
6. Lot 1 will comply with all zoning requirements, particularly parking.
7. And then they will comply with all Federal, State and Village Codes, regulations and policies.

That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you Latika. Do I have a motion to approve the staff report?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make a motion to approve the staff report.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All in favor?

(Chorus of Ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, quick question for the Petitioner, do you agree with the recommendations just shown?

MR. HORNE: Yes, we do.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. Okay, Jay, do you want to start questioning?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay, sure. In looking at the memorandum I see revisions around parking and I know you guys are going to walk through that a little bit. If you wouldn't mind maybe just elaborating a little bit more on that just so we fully understand. In looking at the square footage of the building and the parking ratios we end up with a pretty lopsided count. I'm just wondering if you could maybe just give us a little bit more information on that.

DRAFT

MR. HORNE: Sure, well specifically to the 1421, as you say, lopsided is a good statement. We are in the market and talking to various tenants that have very high parking needs and that was really the driver for the approach we're taking with that building and the parking that we're developing to meet that need. As it relates to the 1501 building which, you're right, it's skewed the other direction. I think our plan is really seeking, well, two strategies. One, is the strategy that would have us remove a portion or portions of that building so shrink that building and allow more parking to be constructed on that site.

And so our approach kind of is consistent with what we've discussed with staff would be, you know, we're going to shape that building size to meet the market again. Not dissimilar to demolishing the building on the other part to meet the market. So, we have some interest in the building. Some of them are from users that have less office and more of an industrial application. You know, so if that were to go in that direction then we might meet standards simply by the use. If we went in a pure office direction then we would, you know, we would have to respond with either adding parking in the form of a deck or shrinking the building to respond to that specific requirement.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Thank you.

MR. HORNE: Sure.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I had the same question that the Commissioner had. Then my other question was how did the Plat & Sub Committee meeting, I thought at that time there was some utilities that were shared by both buildings; chiller, water supply. Have those been separated now?

MR. HORNE: They have not been separated yet, but that is the intent. What we would be doing is we would have both buildings operating separate on their own.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So independent of each other?

MR. HORNE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: That was my only other question beside the parking issue which you've already answered so, thank you.

MR. HORNE: Sure.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: George?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, Latika, were there any problems in the past usage with parking?

MS. BHIDE: No, we had no problems.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And as far as the aesthetics of the parking and the landscape plan, that would be continued or improved?

MS. BHIDE: Correct, for the new parking they're adding

DRAFT

there will be landscaping within that parking area. And then the other end that's where the landscaping will be adding landscaping and trees.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Was there any consideration of overhead lines being able to put those below ground? I know it's not a requirement, but looking at the aesthetics of it.

MR. HORNE: That was something we did not consider.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Because that's one of the things we're sort of promoting in the community and neighborhoods, the overhead lines sometimes become sort of a blight and a safety issue too. Sometimes they need to repair for a continuous, uninterrupted flow of energy, utility service.

How many employees do you expect to occupy this site?

MR. HORNE: Travis, do you know that number?

MR. BRIDGES: I don't --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Would you come up to the microphone to speak so the court reporter can hear you.

MR. BRIDGES: The current we're talking to for the 1421, the three-story office building, is somewhere in the range of about 1500 employees for that building.

COMMISSIONER DROST: How does that compare to the current or past use?

MR. BRIDGES: It's right on kind of where it is.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So there won't be any significant change with the number of employees according to the traffic studies?

MR. BRIDGES: There won't. Yes, there's not going to be any additional changes to what is there.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And the hours of operation, would they be the 9:00 to 5:00 or 8:00 to 10:00, is there going to be weekend use, evening use?

MR. BRIDGES: For 1421 it's going to be an office building so there might be the occasional weekend worker but it's going to be office hours.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Is there going to be a call center for it?

MR. BRIDGES: Not that we know of.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'm just, you know, trying to get sort of a sense in what the employment and staffing would look like saying you would get this sort of kill edge tenant.

MR. BRIDGES: It's going to be a nice cross-section with an office.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So there is not a sort of a 24/7 use or activity at the site?

MR. HORNE: No, we're still, the lease negotiations we're having are preliminary so I don't know --

DRAFT

COMMISSIONER DROST: I understand.

MR. HORNE: Yes, so I wish I could answer that question in detail but we haven't been provided that information to know specifically their hours of operation yet.

COMMISSIONER DROST: But you anticipate that it's going to be business?

MR. HORNE: General office use is what the deal that we're specifically working on and intending for that space.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Of the leases that you have, the buildings are not operated during the weekend historically? I know some of the commercial or office --

MR. HORNE: Yes, historically that's correct. And then there's provisions in the lease that say if you need to run after hours of operation here's your charges. And there's different charges to run the chillers on weekends and evenings. So it creates a menu for the tenant that if the tenant has that need they can do it, but it's not, we're not building this lease with the idea that they're going to be there seven days a week.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Because usually they set temperatures down to certain levels.

MR. HORNE: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Access and security and those functions when you have larger tenants.

MR. HORNE: Right.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I just want to get a flavor.

MR. HORNE: Well, I know, it's a good question.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'm just trying to get an idea of what the neighborhood is going to look like.

MR. HORNE: Yes, I understand.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay, thanks.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Terry?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: The only question I have is, is there guaranteed to be a 14 minutes -- or a 15 minute -- you mentioned a deck for the parking garage as a possibility to add additional parking?

MR. HORNE: Yes, I only say that in the context of if a tenant came through the door and said, we want this entire building for a dense office population, how could you solve that for me, Mr. Developer. In that situation because we're deficient on parking we would explore that as an option. I can't tell you as I sit here today if that's an option that we're exploring, because we're not.

I was asked the question of how we would accommodate parking in that building and so that's an option that would only be explored if that user came through the doors with that need.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Otherwise you're looking at a

DRAFT

possibility of multi-tenant and possibly reducing the size of the building.

MR. HORNE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Lynn?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: You did a good job of narrowing down to one option from which you did at Plat & Sub so you should be commended for that. Question, I guess mainly for Latika, if they find out the usage doesn't bring them to code with parking in Lot 1, and they decide they're going to have to either reduce some of the leasable area or add a parking garage or deck, do they have to come back before the Plan Commission to get that authorized?

MS. BHIDE: They do. They have to come back and seek a new amendment if they're adding say a parking deck or if they're reducing the square footage, or if at that time they have to seek a variation.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, and you're aware of that, that's not a big deal for you?

MR. HORNE: Yes, I mean, honestly, it's one step at a time and, you know, hopefully the next time we come through with that request we'll come back with good news and keep building on the story.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And one other, this is also for Latika, going to page three of the staff report, you indicate that parkway trees are located within the Kennicott Avenue and Shure Drive right-of-way and the street lights are located along Kennicott Avenue and a portion of Shure Drive and some near drive and do not meet the requirements of the code. Whose responsibility is that to ultimately bring that up to code?

MS. BHIDE: At this time point we'll just treat it as existing non-conforming. If there were to ever be a redevelopment then there would be a redevelopment and use at that time.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: There will be a Petitioner having to do that as opposed to the builder?

MS. BHIDE: That's correct. But for those streets things are pretty dedicated so we would look any public property, private property.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, good. I think it's a good project and I certainly hope it goes forward.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: I'm curious how this is going to work. So you're going to divide, you have Lot 1 and Lot 2.

MR. HORNE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: So with Lot 1 you're going to lease out the building or sell that building to somebody else?

MR. HORNE: So Lot 1 is 1501 and Lot 2 is 1421. So our primary focus is on Lot 2 at the moment with the tenant that we're --

DRAFT

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: But are you going to rent space to them or lease it to them?

MR. HORNE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: And then you're going to do the same thing with the other lot?

MR. HORNE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: So why do we need a divider? Why don't you just do it all as one?

MR. HORNE: Well, it has a lot to do with our financing and how the banks like the division of the lots, collateral.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, you answered it. And then on the retention pond, you've got quite a large retention pond on one lot and a very small one on the other. Did it make sense at all to decrease the size of one retention pond and add parking there and increase the size of the other retention pond?

MR. HORNE: This detention pond to the west is specific to the north campus. So the detention that's serving to the east, I think, is part of the south campus piece.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, and Latika, just curious, I Item 5, condition five, talks about a landscape pond of 30 percent. I just don't remember seeing a landscape pond before. Why are we asking for bond on this landscaping?

MS. BHIDE: That is a standard requirement. I don't really think that it is a condition, it just is automatically a permanent condition, but we've always for landscaping.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. Any questions from the audience?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, if not anymore questions from the Commissioners?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: No more questions. Do we have a proposal or recommendation?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I'll make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of P.C. No. 15-007, an amendment to the PUD Ordinances 88-060 and to 14-002; a preliminary plat of subdivision to create two lots; a variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-17.7, required minimum yards to allows a side yard reduction from 50 feet to allow 0 feet for Lot 1; a variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.12, traffic engineering approval, and to waive the requirement for the traffic study and parking analysis; and a variation from Chapter 28, Section 11.2-11.2 from the requirement of an off-street parking spaces in the M-1 District not be located in the front yard to allow for the existing spaces for Lots 1 and 2 in the

DRAFT

front yard.

This approval is contingent upon the compliance with the recommendations of the Plan Commission, and the following recommendations detailed in the Staff report dated May 21, 2015:

The Staff development committee has reviewed the Petitioner's request and recommends approval of the amendment to PUD Ordinances 88-060 and 14-002 and a preliminary plat of subdivision to resubdivide the property into two lots. This approval shall be subject to the following conditions:

1. A Final Plat of Subdivision will be submitted.
2. As a condition of approval of the PUD amendment, the Petitioner shall provide a Reciprocal Easement Agreement (REA) for the two lots prior to Final Plat approval. The REA must address cross-access, shared detention and utilities in perpetuity.
3. The Petitioner can proceed at their own risk with improvements on the site, prior to Final Plat approval, and shall comply with other outside agency requirements, as requested by said agencies.
4. The Petitioner may divide the property in meets and bounds for financing prior to Final Plat approval and shall complete the Final Plat as soon as possible, within the prescribed timeframe in Chapter 29, Subdivision Regulations.
5. A landscape compliance bond in the amount of 30 percent of the landscaping costs will be required at the time of building permit along with a tree fee of \$200 per tree identified for preservation.
6. The signage as proposed does not meet the requirements of Chapter 30, Sign Regulations. The signage must be revised to meet Code or a variation must be sought.
7. Lot 1 will comply with zoning requirements, when specific users are known.
8. The Petitioner shall comply with all Federal, State, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Roll call please.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Could I just ask a question before that?

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: On recommendation two are we

DRAFT

striking out the shared parking that was in the staff recommendation here in this memorandum?

MS. Bhide: Yes, we should be striking that out.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay, so that will be amending recommendation number two in 1-8 with relationship to shared parking?

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Drost, if you could even change that recommendations detail to the staff report.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay, to comply with the staff report, good.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, is there anything else?
Roll Call vote please?

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Cherwin?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Drost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Ennes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Jensen?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MS. Bhide: COMMISSIONER Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MS. Bhide: Chairman Lorenzini?

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Yes. Okay, congratulations. This is just a recommendation to the Trustees. They have the final say-so. Is there any date that it's going to go to the Trustees?

MS. Bhide: We are aiming for June 1st, but I will confirm that information.

MR. HORNE: June 1st?

MS. Bhide: I'll have to confirm.

MR. HORNE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, thank you.

MR. HORNE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, any other business, anybody else? Okay, motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All right, thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at
8:10 p.m.)

DRAFT

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
COUNTY OF K A N E)

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

ROBERT LUTZOW

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO

BEFORE ME THIS _____ DAY OF _____

_____, A.D. 2015.

NOTARY PUBLIC

LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES
Chicago & Roselle, Illinois - Miami & Orlando, Florida
(630) 894-9389 - (800) 219-1212