

APPROVED

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: T-MOBILE - 1000 S. ARLINGTON HEIGHTS RD. - PC#15-003

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
13th day of May, 2015, at the hour of 9:30 o'clock p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO PRESENT:

LATIKA BHIDE, Development Planner

APPROVED

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: The next item on the agenda is T-Mobile at 1000 South Arlington Heights Road. Latika, have all the proper notices been given?

MS. BHADE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. The Petitioner here?

MR. STAPLETON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Is anybody else going to testify besides yourself?

MR. STAPLETON: Myself, our --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Anybody who may speak, why don't you just all come up and raise your right hand?

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Okay, would you, Petitioner, would you please state your name, spell it and give your address for the court reporter?

MR. STAPLETON: Sure thing. My name is Robert Stapleton, I'm one of the managing partners of National Wireless Ventures. Our corporate address is 505 North Lake Shore Drive, Suite 2109, Chicago, Illinois. The spelling of my last name is S-t-a-p-l-e-t-o-n, first name is Robert.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. Have you read the conditions and do you agree with them?

MR. STAPLETON: Are we talking the --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Oh, never mind, let's skip that. Let's skip that for now. Okay, why don't you give us a brief presentation of your project?

MR. STAPLETON: Sure thing. As I said, my name is Robert Stapleton, I'm a managing partner. I'm here tonight on behalf of our developer, APC Towers, and T-Mobile who is the planned tenant for the proposed site. I am the past president of the Illinois State Wireless Association and past director of the association. I've been in the wireless business since 1996.

We all grew up with a landline phone. The world is changing. We're becoming digital, we're becoming wireless, and we're becoming connected in a whole new way. Years ago, a telephone company built a building in your community which we called the central office. The central office is going away from the standpoint where of the landline carriers are conducting their business.

Currently, there is a bill in the state of Illinois right now for the carriers as of 2025 where the wire line carriers would basically become deregulated by the Illinois Commerce Commission, basically saying we will no longer be providing service based on regulated rates, because the nature is changing. Here in Cook County, only seven percent of the households are connected only by a

APPROVED

wire line phone. Over 60 percent of those households now in Cook County are connected by a wireless only phone. I'm sure all of you, depending upon your situation, you're looking at how you're connected to the world today.

When we grew up, we had one phone line in the house. Today, the average home has anywhere from four to eight connected devices within the home, your cell phone, your laptop, your iPad, your personal computer in the house. Most of the educational services now, meaning the schools, colleges and that, if you walk in to the school on your freshman year, you're being provided a wireless device, and that wireless device is now carrying the curriculum of a lot of communities. Hard copy books aren't being provided anymore, the curriculum is being provided on your laptop and loaded into wireless services.

As that changes, as we become more to a connected world, there is more need for localized wireless services. When I got in this business in 1996, we were building towers 300-foot tall, we were building then ten miles apart. It's a very simple diagram. When I talk about it, I use if you throw a big rock in some water, then we get large concentric rings. In today's world, we're throwing pebbles in the water because we're connecting those who are immediately around the site.

It's important that they stay connected. Now, we're not just talking connecting you and your car as you're walking onto the sidewalk or anything else. We're not connecting inside buildings, meaning you have a business, you want to be connected into the wireless world, you need to have solid 99.9 percent connection when you're inside your building for your connection. So, what we're now looking at is how do we achieve that in building connection? How do we achieve, enhance 9-1-1 services when you dial your phone from inside, your wireless phone from inside your building? That's what the industry is doing today.

It's a big change. I'm calling the towers in today's world, that is now the CO of the future because wireless service is carrying that connected service to your community and it's no longer the hard piece of copper or a piece of fiber. It's done wirelessly.

So, in this case, T-Mobile has gone out and looked at how they want to enhance their service, how they want to enhance their customer base, and at the same time deliver the customer quality that they're expected to maintain for their customers. And it's not just T-Mobile, it's all the other carriers that are doing the same thing. We're seeing 4G, we're hearing 5G coming down the line. You're hearing expressions LTE. These are all enhanced data services.

The world is becoming a data place. Your

APPROVED

refrigerator is now becoming connected to the wireless world. Your stove is becoming connected to the wireless.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: But what are we going to do with this project?

MR. STAPLETON: In this case, this project, we're going to provide data and lifeline service from off this site. So, initially we're proposing six antennas on this site. The site requires a special use under your ordinance. The property is properly zoned to allow a wireless site to be placed here in the form of a special use.

We are asking this on behalf of T-Mobile. The site is being designed for future carriers to go in there. The subject property is a former service station. That intersection basically at one point in time years ago must have had three service stations on the corner. We now have, when I say service stations, supplying gas and those kinds of things. You now have facilities on three corners of that intersection at Arlington Heights and Central Road that provide automobile service. We feel that it's an appropriate location based on the fact that your ordinance allows as a special use on that property for wireless services or wireless power.

So, that's why we're here tonight, and we seek your approval of that. We have demonstrated through RF why we have to be at that particular location. That's in conformance with Section 332 of the Federal Communications Code. We're required to come before you to show that there is a definite need for service. By our propagation maps that we have supplied you, we are showing that there is a definite need of service.

When we were before the Plat and Subcommittee, there was a discussion about locations alternative to the site. The RF team has reviewed those sites. One of those was on top of the roof of Northwest Community Hospital, and the other side was on top of the Moorings. At this point in time, we have service that covers the hospital, and at the same time the hospital has not been a willing landlord to allow service to go on top of the hospital. The Moorings also is low and is too close to the existing coverage that we have in the area.

The center point concern is the intersection of Arlington Heights Road and Central Road. That's the community, that's the business community that we're trying to reach, and that is the hole in the service of our network at this point in time. The reasons why APC, the tower company carriers, meaning AT&T, Sprint, T-Mobile, Verizon, have all gotten basically out of the business of owning and operating the towers themselves. They've gotten into the business of supplying spectrum and it's important that they purchase spectrum from the federal government and provide service.

So, with that in mind, companies like APC, Crown

APPROVED

Castle, American Tower, they have all purchased the assets, the tower assets for the carriers. Most recently, Verizon sold 11,000 towers to one of the tower companies. Because they are purchasing more spectrum, they just completed a spectrum --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Can we just get back to this project?

MR. STAPLETON: Sure. Well, that's what I'm talking about, just why the need, because, why the need for an independent tower company to build. They are contracted by T-Mobile to build and operate the site. T-Mobile won't be operating the site. T-Mobile will be a tenant of the tower. So, that is why we're here.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. All right, thank you. Latika, Staff report please.

MS. BHIDE: Thank you. The Petitioner that's here this evening, they are requesting a special use permit for a wireless antenna tower and along with the fact they would need a variation from Chapter 23, Section 203, from the requirement that an antenna cannot exceed 75 feet above the grade level to allow a 100-foot monopole.

The proposed site is at 1000 South Arlington Heights Road. It's approximately half acre in area. Autotech Repair is located on the property site. The Applicant, this is the overall site plan, the Applicant, T-Mobile, is interested in leasing approximately 30-foot by 30-foot area at the southwest corner of the property and locating a wireless antenna there. The antenna is proposed as a monopole design. It would be a 100-foot to the top of the tower. It is about 113 feet from Arlington Heights Road and about 168 feet from Central Road. The lease area will occupy and thus eliminate approximately four parking spaces in the southwest corner of the site. There is also a 12-foot access easement which would result in additional four spaces being lost.

Radio and telephone antenna are required to obtain a special use in the B-2 District which is what they are seeking here.

I have a few photo submissions. These are submissions that were provided by the Petitioner. This is one looking west to the site, one looking north to the site. The picture on the right-hand is where you can see the antenna. The next two are looking south, again the picture on the right shows the antenna.

The Village's Comprehensive Plan designates this property as commercial. Staff has determined that the proposed antenna does not meet the following goals of the Comprehensive Plan. One is the general planning goal to preserve and enhance the natural and existing environment, and then the two land use goals. One is to ensure that the general land use pattern and relationships of all land uses remain or become acceptable to present and future community, and that incompatible zoning be avoided. The Staff Development Committee

APPROVED

does not support locating the antenna at this location because it would be incompatible with the residential uses to the west and because of the loss of eight parking spaces on a site that has more vehicles than parking spaces.

The code requirements for the automobile service station requires three parking spaces for every service bay and one for every employee, and it results in 16 parking spaces. With the loss of four parking spaces, their parking plan shows 25 parking spaces, so that does have a surplus of nine spaces. However, Staff observed that there are 42 cars and other vehicles on site today, they went out. The parking counts that were provided by the Petitioner showed 35, 40 and 41 vehicles on the site on two weekdays and a weekend. So, there is more parking on the site than availability of parking.

Next, the parking plan, with parking along the south perimeter, a few along the west and the rest along the Central and Arlington Heights periphery. Just a picture of the site, you know, showing that this is going south to north, left to right, just showing that there were several vehicles the day we went there, you know, several vehicles also parked in tandem.

That being said, the Staff Development -- actually a couple of other things. There is no landscape screening along Central and Arlington Heights Road where there is parking, so that is nonconforming. If this was recommended for approval, then we would recommend that a condition be added that a three-foot high drought/salt tolerant screen be added. It would likely require IDOT approval, but from past experience, IDOT has been able to add in that screen.

There are also currently no landscaped islands on the site. There are a few locations that it would be possible to add landscaped islands, so that would be another recommendation.

That being said, the Staff Development Committee is not supportive of this special use request. If the Plan Commission recommends approval, then we recommend the following conditions of approval. That they submit a the landscape plan for the whole site that delineates a three-foot high drought/salt tolerant screen along Central and Arlington Heights Road to buffer the parking, delineate the landscaped islands. The arborvitae that is to be installed outside the fence area that they're proposing at that southwest corner will be five feet at planting. And then there were two additional conditions here, and I actually, oh, will go back and talk about that variation because I didn't.

The variation is from Chapter 23, Section 203 of the Village Code. The Building Code Review Board makes recommendations to the Village Board on matters relating to waivers or amendments on that Chapter 23. That is not within the purview of the Plan Commission. The Petitioner did go to the Building Code Review Board

APPROVED

last month, on April 30th to discuss this variation. The Board then asked them various questions involving locations, variables of antenna/towers, signal strength, et cetera.

At that meeting, the Petitioner did indicate that antennas could be flush mounted, but they do not prefer to do it because it reduces the number of antennas that can be mounted on a tower and the cost is higher. The Building Code Review Board determined that the Petitioner did not prove a hardship that needed a relief to allow that 100-foot monopole. So, that is the recommendation that will be forwarded to the Village Board. They unanimously recommended denial of that variation.

So, one of the recommended conditions is that if approved, the number of platforms or carriers be limited to two. The installation of additional platforms or additional carriers will require a special use permit amendment. However, if a stealth application for antennas mounted inside the pole, in that case, you know, additional carriers would be allowed in compliance with the Village's special use waiver process, and that they comply with all federal, state, and Village codes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, Latika, thank you. Do I have a motion to include the Staff report in the public record?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So moved.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Second?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. We'll go to questions now from the Plan Commissioners. Commissioner Cherwin, would you like to start?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: You know, we had looked at this in the subcommittee and I had, you know, expressed my reservations about it, you know, in terms of exceeding what's currently permitted. I think the comments I made were along the lines of not wanting to set precedent on something that's, you know, technology is changing, I don't know how much thought the Village has put into it, but it seems to me like introducing 100-foot structures is something that we probably wouldn't do. To the extent we do it, we'd do it on a more planned basis in terms of any guidelines or understanding, at least giving the citizens an opportunity to understand, okay, well, if we're going to allow structures like this, it's going to increase bandwidth, it's going to increase your ability to use your devices but you know, potentially the downside is aesthetics and everything else.

So, I just, my reservation was, you know, I don't

APPROVED

think as a Village we probably thought through this type of tower in this type of place. I think this is for the most part a residential area with some very thin commercial along Arlington Heights and Central. But the true nature of this area is residential. So, I am not supportive of this.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I have a question. How does the, I don't know, the radio frequency waves affect the local, the residences within the area, the businesses and so forth?

MR. STAPLETON: I have an RF gentleman here, but from my standpoint, because we operate at a spectrum designed by the federal government, we cannot interfere with television, radio, any of those items. There is no interference and these are protected spectrums that have been purchased from the federal government. That's why we are governed by Section 332 of the FCC code. So, there should be no issue of interference and we're mandated by the federal law that we cannot interfere. An interference has to be corrected within a 24-hour basis if there is identified interference.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'm only asking the question from direct experience. My daughter has a condominium in Timer Courts, and right adjacent to Timber Courts is a cell tower. She has no radio reception. You could drive your car past there and my radio cuts out.

MR. STAPLETON: It shouldn't be caused by the cell tower.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay. Next question I have is regarding the parking. I saw on the parking counts that they have approximately 40 cars there which is over, much over what was provided, that they have 25 parking spaces there now. They're going to lose eight parking spaces so that brings them down to 17 parking spaces. Where are these cars going to go?

MR. STAPLETON: Okay. We've had a direct conversation with the landlord on this situation explaining that he only has the X number of parking spaces. Under our agreement, he will have to remove all those other cars from that spacing. In most of the cases, you rent spaces out for people to park antique vehicles, whatever else, he rents spaces out. So, under the agreement, we directed him that he will have to be in accordance with the Village parking regulation.

Four of the spaces that you referred to that are being lost basically is our, we have to have a designed access. But at the same time, that access, parking can continue in that access. That access basically is there for construction purposes and when we can service the site. But it does not call for the removal of those parking spaces. It's our access, it's not a permanent access and it's not an independent access. That is rented to us.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: The other comment here is at

APPROVED

Plat and Sub we suggested and it sounds like you've looked into the Northwest Community Hospital or the Moorings. You stated Northwest Community Hospital, they haven't been very agreeable. Is that because they want their rental rate, that it was just too high?

MR. STAPLETON: No, it's just they, from what we understand based on the comments that they've given us, they're not interested because they have future designs for their rooftop and things like that. But at the same time, as I mentioned, based on our RF propagation, we have a site nearby that serves that area. So, in turn, by putting additional antennas on that facility, that in turns causes our own internal interference or we're overlapping signal within our own site. So, that's why we have to move to the east. We're somewhat confined to the area where we can move to in the east and we can't keep moving like towards the Moorings because there again we have overlapping services or we would have overlapping service there.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: My last comment is at the Plat and Sub I was not in favor of this location for this tower. In going through this proposal again and seeing that the Village Building Code Review Board has denied it, it's not compatible with the Comprehensive Plan, the Planning Staff is not in favor of it, I'm not going to be in favor of this project.

MR. STAPLETON: I understand what you're saying. I think through our RF plan and everything else, we have provided you sufficient documentation under Section 332 of the FCC code which we are required to do. So, in turn, you know, under that situation, if the situation is where we come to an impasse of getting a location in that area, the federal courts have deemed since the spectrum has been purchased from the federal government, we do have the right for an expedited hearing through the federal courts.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, let's not go there yet.

MR. STAPLETON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Let's finish our questions.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'm finished now.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Latika, are there any other stand-alone cell structures like this in Arlington Heights?

MS. BHIDE: There are.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Where are they located? Are there 100-foot cell towers?

MS. BHIDE: You know, I should have had that information but I don't know how tall they are. But I know there are other structures. There's one in the Annex of Arlington Heights behind the Barnes and Nobel there, there's a tower there. There's one, as Commissioner Sigalos was saying, on Arlington Heights Road at Dundee, around that intersection. So, there are also other stand-alone towers.

APPROVED

MR. STAPLETON: Yes, there's a stand-alone tower at 1610 West Central Road. There is one at 1700 West Central Road, now that happens to be in Mount Prospect. We are in the steeple at 1903 Euclid. We have done our --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'm not done asking questions.

MR. STAPLETON: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right. So, it would be helpful for me to know, you know, where they are. I'm less concerned with the cell tower in this area than maybe some of the other Commissioners are because I do agree that times are changing and this is going to become a fact that we have to address, that there will be more cell towers. But I also feel that the Village hasn't yet sat down and thought through that concept and come up with a plan for what locations are appropriate, when we will do that.

I don't, I'm hesitant because it's gone to the Building Code Review Board and Staff has already looked at it. I'm hesitant to start giving isolated approvals. Once we start giving approvals without a plan in place, we create precedent, and then we don't have a Village-wide plan for the adoption of, or for the allowance of these cell tower structures.

So, in and of itself in its location, I frankly don't have a whole lot of problems with the location. I'm very familiar with that area. But I can't support it until I have a better understanding of how the Village is going to approach cell tower structures comprehensively. That's my main concern.

That aside, I'm very concerned about this property site that has 42 cars, and what are we going to do about that? That's ridiculous, you know. Whether or not the cell tower structure is allowed to be placed there, the owner cannot exceed his parking allotment.

MR. HALLORAN: It looks like a junkyard actually.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay, I know, I'm sure you're upset. But, so, aside from whether or not a cell tower is going there, the Staff now needs to go address this parking problem, absolutely. But that's, you know, that's where I'm at right now.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Commissioner Drost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I think those are good points, Susan. My concern is that I think from the Comprehensive Plan for the Village, that when you saw those pictures, we want to go underground with the wires, with the telephone poles, with the electrical. There's a, this is going in the opposite direction, it's going up. Basically, it's a matter of eye clutter.

MR. STAPLETON: Yes, just to give you an idea of the --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: That's okay. Let's --

COMMISSIONER DROST: No, it's just a comment that I'm

APPROVED

making and, you know, we need technology as you know, gosh, and I like it, you know. It's not to beat you up on it but it just doesn't fit within sort of the plan. You know, we're not Luddites.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Anything else?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'm done.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Jensen?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes. It seems to me we're being asked to balance aesthetics against utility. I think you've made a, it seems to me you've made a good case that, and Commissioner Dawson made the same point, we're going to actually be moving in the direction where we have to deal with the utility of having these relays, these microwave towers that actually meet the needs of the residents. They may be even coming back to the Village Board saying you haven't taken care of our needs because of what you stood in the way of in the nature of wanting something that's aesthetic.

I'd like to ask, Latika, how was that 75-foot standard set? And when was it set?

MS. BHIDE: I did try to research that a little bit more. That 75-foot requirement is a local amendment to the International Building Code. So, the unamended IBC does not have that requirement. You know, whether it's for aesthetic or other reasons, I was not able to find out why we have that local amendment, but it has been there for a number of years.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, when it was approved is what's really important to me because it may be that it was approved at a time where it may or may not have made any sense but today it may make no sense whatsoever. So, I would turn and ask the question, is a 100-foot the norm nowadays? You said earlier it was 300 feet, you had a different model of how things worked. Is 100 feet the ideal thing at this point?

MR. STAPLETON: Basically, 100 to 125 is becoming the new norm. We're coming down because we're coming into town. We're not broadcasting out the 10 square miles around the site. Because of the demand, the customer demand and the spectrum use that they are, we have to become more localized. So, in becoming more localized, we're becoming just above the tree height.

To give you an idea, your utility poles that are immediately adjoining that site, there's probably 45 within very close proximity of that site that are in excess of 70-foot tall. So, what we're talking about is this is the way things are going because we have to be, we're mandated by the federal government that when someone dials 9-1-1, we have to connect them within 150 meters where they're at. So, 90 percent of the calls in Cook County that's documented by Cook County government and everything else are coming off of wireless devices. So, it's that connection factor.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I have another question. Is it feasible for any village to lay out a map of where the towers ought to go and create for you a comprehensive plan and present to you and say these are the places we designate that the towers can go? Is that something that a village can do?

MR. STAPLETON: It's depending upon where, like someone can say, well, you can only go in an industrial lot. Well, the industrial lots are only on the north side of town, and so we're lacking coverage on the south side. We went through this the other night. The M-1 and the M-2 Districts where they want us to be are on the north side of town, no coverage on the south end of town.

You should have a propagation map that's been provided to you, correct? And you can see on your propagation map how the towers are situated around this hole. So, what we're trying to do is we're trying to cover this hole, and that's what the federal government requires us to do, to demonstrate why we have to be there.

We're not going to spend, \$400,000-\$500,000 to throw on the ground to throw a tower in the hole. We're, you know, we don't have appropriate high structures. I mean we'd rather go on a tall building versus a tower. This is an expensive proposition. But when you don't have that, we've got to fill the hole.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I may have misinterpreted what some of my other Commissioners have said. But I had the vision of our actually laying out and pinpointing for you where the towers need to go and that would be the Comprehensive Plan. And I'm having a little trouble seeing whether that would be possible for a village to do that.

MR. STAPLETON: It's all because you have, right now you have four operating carriers. You have the federal government now jumping it with FirstNet which is going to be next big carrier because that's going to be the connective device between your local services and the federal government, meaning FEMA, the FBI, and that quick story, Washington, DC, they're chasing a woman in a car. You have three branches of federal government services and local Washington, DC police. They could not communicate within a mile-and-a-half chase of this woman and she ended up being shot because nobody understood what was going on. That's because there was lack of communication.

The federal government mandated after 2001 that connection device come about. FirstNet has been made. The federal government just put ten billion dollars to FirstNet to be connected. So, they're going to be the fifth carrier, and then Push-to-Talk is coming back, that's going to be the sixth.

As I said, the landlines are going away very quickly. Verizon just sold off four states because they could no longer maintain those dollars. AT&T, Verizon and Sprint have all come

APPROVED

to Springfield and said we can't be regulated anymore because we can't guarantee wire line service to the community anymore. The tower is the new CO.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I guess my last comment is I'm like Commissioner Dawson although probably I'm even more supportive because I don't think that the aesthetics ought to dominate the practicality of having something that we're going to increasingly rely on. So, I'm more supportive of allowing this. I'm encouraged when you talk about the parking and you indicate we've got a landlord who is actually violating the agreement that he struck with the Village and he's renting out spaces. And thankfully, if we approve this, it sounds like you will be able to bring that to an end better than our own Village Staff were able to do. I don't know exactly how this will work to have the four parking spaces returned to use when you're not using it for access to build or whatever, but I'm going to take you at face value that you can do that.

So, at this point, I'm reasonably supportive of this proposal.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Commissioner Warskow?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Can I just, just before you go, I want to explain what I meant by a comprehensive plan. I didn't mean that there would be a map where we would pinpoint. I don't think we can do that because it's property owners, we can't tell them they have to put it.

What I meant was, similar to, what was it, two years ago or what have you, that we were talking about windmills, okay, and should private residences be allowed to have windmills in their backyard if they wanted to. It was a new concept. So, we had a meeting where we were taught about windmills and what the impact is and all that. What I mean is I don't think that the Village, because they have lots and lots of things to do, is up to date on what cell phone tower needs are, what reasonable cell towers are, you know, what you said, why is it 75 feet, who knows?

What I was suggesting is that the Village needs to do kind of more of a deep dive in understanding what current technology requirements are, current regulations are, and come back to us with an understanding of what is a reasonable cell tower height, how far apart. You know, we don't want him to build a cell tower and then someone right behind him to build another cell tower, you know. To some degree, how many should be allowed in a certain area and what's reasonable? That's all I meant.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Are you suggesting though we let this, that we stop this project from going forward while the Village does this?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right now, I'm concerned with

APPROVED

approving it before I have a better understanding of it because I don't understand what 100 feet versus 75 feet is, okay. I'm not necessarily against it. I'm not opposed to the location. And from previous cell towers that have come before us, we cannot speak to or address any health concerns. So, if there's anyone who has questions about health concerns, we're not even allowed to bring that into consideration. The only thing we can think about is whether or not it's properly located at the time in our Comprehensive Plan.

So, I don't know what your time frame is. I would like for my own self to have a little bit more understanding of cell towers and what's the proper height and all that. I don't know where I stand on whether or not we should make it wait. But if we approve this, then we better put something in place before the next one comes is I guess what I'm saying.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Warskow?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes. I'm more along the lines of Commissioners Jensen and Dawson. You know, we can't be 'not in my backyard' over everything and still utilize those services every minute of the day. Somebody has to go. And if we're counting on it based on an area and this is the area that needs to be covered, then this is where it needs to go.

I'm not in love with this corner as it is, I live very close to it, and the cars are not adding aesthetics. So, if there is anything that can be done between this project and Staff following up with them to minimize the number of cars on that site that would be very helpful. So, I'm tentatively supportive of this project.

MR. STAPLETON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Ennes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes, I do have three questions. I presume that your proposed landlord is the property owner?

MR. STAPLETON: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: And is he here tonight? I have a question for you. I noticed you did swear in earlier.

MR. DISCEPOLO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Would you state your name and spell it and give your address please?

MR. DISCEPOLO: My name is Anthony Discepolo, D-i-s-c-e-p-o-l-o, and I live at 2725 West Glen Lake in Chicago.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Mr. Discepolo, you've heard that you're over-parked on the property?

MR. DISCEPOLO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: And are you also aware that you, if we were to approve this, that you would have to bring your property up to code as far as, you know, if you look at this, you have paving going right up to the sidewalk. You have no curbing. You have no

APPROVED

islands for trees. You're going to have to, if we so decide this, that you're going to have to upgrade your property, put curbing in around the parking lot to separate it from the sidewalks and you're going to have to put in islands with trees around there because you're not a conforming use. Do you understand that?

MR. DISCEPOLO: I understand that. Of course I'd have to see the extent of what I need to do. I will address the car issue. I'm not quite sure at what point there were that many cars. We have begun to remove many cars. We had a boat stored there, I've had it removed.

I have a partner who manages that site, I'm never there. We have another site in Chicago, so a lot of the cars could be moved to the other site. So, moving the cars is not a problem. We have another property they can be moved to. Maybe that was a specially busy day. Removing my personal cars that are stored there, removing the rental that I wasn't even aware that we were renting spaces, so I'll speak to my partner --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Good thing you came today.

MR. DISCEPOLO: I'll speak to my partner when he comes out of the hospital. Unfortunately, he was supposed to be here tonight but he's in the hospital. Because I did not approve that practice. Yes, reducing the number of cars is something that we will do effectively, efficiently and quickly.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Latika, I thought I saw a requirement that the Petitioner provide a landscape plan?

MS. BHIDE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Has that been done?

MS. BHIDE: No.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: No, okay. Thank you for promise on that.

MR. STAPLETON: We have --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I have two other questions for the Petitioner. Yes, thank you. Why can't you do a 75-foot? And why do you need four antennas instead of two?

MR. STAPLETON: Okay. I have, RF can explain the 75-foot but I'll explain from the standpoint of just your code without talking about an RF standpoint. Your code likes collocation.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Likes what?

MR. STAPLETON: Collocation. That's meaning on the same post you have T-Mobile, you have AT&T.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right.

MR. STAPLETON: You have someone else. We call it collocation in the industry. Most communities today want collocation. So, instead of us building two towers, we build one, we put everybody on the same post.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right.

MR. STAPLETON: So, 75 feet, we get into a limited situation from a standpoint because at 75 feet we're just above the tree line. We come below that tree line, then the problem is signal penetration. RF?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: What's his name?

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: State your name, spell it and give your address please.

MR. NAJEEB: I'm Suhaib Najeeb, S-u-h-a-i-b N-a-j-e-e-b, 9275 Church Street, Des Plaines, Illinois.

As Mr. Stapleton had mentioned, you know, the difference between the 100-foot tower and the 75-foot tower, the real matter is like the collocation because no one really wants to be, if the city has given me a choice to select like 55-foot monopoles, then unlikely I would select it because that would not, the signal would not penetrate with all the trees. We have to be at a certain height so that the signal can penetrate easily. The more trees and more things in between, the signal would get lost. That's the nature of the RF signal.

The more height, for example, if you are having a 100 to 135-foot monopole, then another concern you're having is every carrier is operating in their own frequencies but we should have a certain difference between our antennas. So, for example, if we are at 110-foot, then AT&T will be at 100-foot, and Verizon will be at 90-foot. So, we will maintain a center to center antenna. For example, this is the antenna, the center to center line, there will be a 10-foot difference. So, that's what we maintain here in order to avoid the interference between the other carriers.

So, if we are at 100-foot, then the other carriers would be 90, 80 and 70. So, if we have selected a 75-foot tower, the other carrier will be at 65, no one wants to take 55. So, it's like no one really wants to --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, you're technically way above my head. So, why can't you have a 75-foot tower? You could do it, right?

MR. STAPLETON: We could do it, but the thing is under your ordinance it limits that site to one carrier. That's the issue. And the other question is regarding the talk about stealth. Stealth is where we put the antennas inside the pipe itself. There again we're limited because we only have, in the tower, you have three antennas that go in the first canister, second canister is three more antennas. So, what happens is if we're at 75 feet, we have three antennas at 75-foot level batch height. The bottom of that antenna is approximately 70 or 68 feet, we have a separation that's required so there is no interference of about three to four feet. So, here again we're now at

APPROVED

the bottom of that antenna that is in the neighborhood of 60 feet.

So, it can be done. We've talked about it. We --

MR. NAJEEB: Another concern I want to bring about the 75-foot is like we have on the second and third page of this presentation, you can see the difference between the 100-foot and 75-foot. The 100-foot, pretty much you are covering the entire hole, coverage hole. So, even at the edge of the coverage hole, we are almost covered with a 100-foot. Whereas if you can see the 75-foot, then there is still the coverage gap where our building cover is not to the level. So, that's the difference between the 75 and the 100.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, within this area, you said that you talked to the hospital and the hospital is a high building.

MR. STAPLETON: It's a high building but it's outside the coverage area, and we have those --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Then you'd be a couple of hundred feet up, right?

MR. NAJEEB: Right. But we are like 0.37 miles away from the existing tower. So, if you see the existing tower CH --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Which page are you talking about?

MR. NAJEEB: If you can see --

MR. STAPLETON: Page one.

MR. NAJEEB: Page one, the CH43371A, that is our on-air site, which is currently operating and the customers are using that site. So, we cannot build at any other site, which is really close to the other site. If you see these directions of this, you know, it shows the site location and it shows which direction it is pointing. So, CH43371, it is pointing at 0 degrees, 120 and 240. What that means is it's covering the area in 0 degree, you know, that north side of the area. The hospital is immediately 0.3 some miles from that on-air site.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, that would --

MR. NAJEEB: If I select that location, then I should not shoot anything on the west, I'll put all my antenna shooting toward the east. So, that itself, you know, our separation between the sectors, when I say sector, it's like 0, 120, 240, the difference would be very less. So, that creates the interference between our own sites and you're not covering much area from there.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I mean I agree, we need the devices. However, I need to look to the Village technically as to what height we want and how many antennas. At this point, I'm not pro making this big variance now unless we get some direction. If I was going to be supportive at this point in time, I would want the site improvements to make this property compliant as part of that.

MR. STAPLETON: We understand that, and one of the directions was the IDOT and we have approached, we've been approaching

APPROVED

IDOT. They have protections on that interchange, as you know, from the standpoint of traffic. So, from the standpoint of vegetation and within the right-of-way, you know, they're going to limit us to, you know, minor height adjacent to the curb so that it doesn't interfere with any, from a safety standpoint.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Sure.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: In the Plat and Sub meeting, I had reservations and I still do. That's item one. Item two, the owner of this property is going to do something with these cars no matter what happens on the site. It doesn't have to be improved to take care of a violation to the parking spots. So, that's item number two.

Then I have an obvious question, and please don't take it the wrong way, Mr. Stapleton. When you say T-Mobile existing coverage, do other carriers have better coverage in these areas and is it just you that doesn't have the coverage?

MR. STAPLETON: No, it's --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It's everybody?

MR. STAPLETON: It's everybody that's facing this issue because --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, no, no, in this area that you're proposing.

MR. STAPLETON: Yes, yes. As part president of the association, I can attest that everybody is having problems. We've gone from outside --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, I understand that.

MR. STAPLETON: It's the in-building and the data issue that all the carriers are facing in that area. So, that's why we're proposing collocation.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: This would be the same coverage problem if this was Sprint or somebody else?

MR. STAPLETON: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It would be the same --

MR. STAPLETON: It might not be exact based on power but it's going to be close.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay. So, the next question since I, you know, barely understand how it works anyway, if you lived in these areas where there is no coverage, are you telling me that you get zero cell phone?

MR. STAPLETON: You don't get zero, but if you're out walking in the street you're going to get outdoor coverage. But when you're in your home office or you're in your basement or whatever else, your coverage is --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, it's a weaker signal and it has trouble going through the wall?

APPROVED

MR. STAPLETON: Right. It's --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I got you, I got you. I just had to get that clear in my own head. It's anybody's problem.

MR. STAPLETON: And because data now is operating at frequency level much higher, correct? Am I right?

MR. NAJEEB: Yes.

MR. STAPLETON: Because data is operating at a higher level of frequency, it has a problem with penetration.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, I got it, I got it. I just wanted to --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All right, Bruce, thank you.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Latika, I only have one comment. On page one, on the north side, it does not show anymore. I have no other questions.

Let's go to the comments from the public. Anybody on my right, your left side of the room? Yes, sir, come forward, state your name, spell it for the court reporter, give your address.

MR. LOVICK: Thank you for having me. My name is Glenn, G-l-e-n-n, Lovick, L-o-v-i-c-k. I live at 1020 South Evergreen, Arlington Heights. I will probably be approximately 170 feet from where this tower will go because I'm on Evergreen, they will go right basically across the street.

The photo simulation picture that was up there, very impressive from the perspective. You can make a small person look big or a big person look small through photo perspective. If you're looking at this picture, I will be probably 70 feet or 100 feet from this tower. When I'm sitting in my front yard, I'm going to be looking up at this huge tower with six antennas on it, and possibly in the future there's going to be more.

I have absolutely zero problem with my cell phone carrier in my house. I live with my brother who has a different carrier. We have absolutely no problems. So, signal strength I don't think is a very valid issue.

I'm very concerned that this is going to hurt my property values because do you want to have a house where you like to sit out in your front yard and be staring at a 100-foot tower that's looming way above my trees? I am very opposed to this. Also, I agree with the parking and stuff in that corner. So, that's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Thank you very much. No, no, sir, please no. Anybody else in that row? Yes, ma'am.

MS. GIANPETRO: My name is Gail Gianpetro, G-a-i-l G-i-a-n-p-e-t-r-o. I live at 1024 South Evergreen. I'm opposing it based on aesthetics also. The surrounding community is one and two-story

APPROVED

homes, some professional buildings, limited professional buildings also one and two stories. Even the trees in that area are probably about 50 feet tall, so this will tower and loom 50 feet above even the vegetation that's there.

So, I think it will be unsightly. I, too, have not experienced any problems with my cell phone carrier. I have Verizon. I don't know what the other people in the community have but I have Verizon. I have not experienced any problems in my home. So, I oppose it based on the aesthetics of it.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Anybody else on this side of the room? Yes, sir, would you come forward? State your name, spell it, and address please.

MR. HALLORAN: My name is Fred Halloran, and I own the property at 1009 South Evergreen and 1015 South Evergreen. I've been there in Arlington Heights for 25 years and this proposed cell tower is right up against my property. I'm asking the Committee to deny this request for a variation for the following reasons.

I believe firmly that the property value will decrease considerably on Evergreen Street if this tower is present. I mean I can only imagine someone coming trying to buy two lots, and the first thing out of their mouths would be I'd love to give you your asking price but I can only pay you half because that 100-foot cell tower is looking right at me.

South Evergreen Avenue is 90 percent residential. I own the majority of the professional buildings that's on Evergreen Street. We have a privacy fence on South Evergreen. There are bushes on our property. Some are 20 feet, some are almost 60 feet tall, and when I look over into the property on the southwest corner of Arlington Heights Road, all I see are trucks and boats and piles of abandoned tires. To think that a 100-foot cell tower would go there, it would make that corner look not just like a junkyard, but I would say it would look like the worst corner in Arlington Heights. I mean the only corner in the northwest suburbs that I think looks anywhere near as bad is probably on Route 12 as you go through the old section of Des Plaines. I think that's just not in the interest of the Village of Arlington Heights.

Additionally, on a personal note, myself and the other doctor on South Evergreen have a plan and we've actually started talking to the Village about this to actually take down our commercial building and to build a condominium building on that site. It's almost a three-acre site, with the hopes of turning Evergreen Avenue into a completely residential area. It would almost be impossible to build a four or five-story condominium building on that site with hopes of selling condominium units if the potential buyers have to look out their window and look at a 100-foot cell tower.

APPROVED

You know, it's not just the ugliness of it but it's the potential exposure to this non-ionizing radiation that these towers emit. I know there's a lot of debate about whether that radiation is harmful or not, but I know if I were going to buy a home and there was a cell tower there, I would look elsewhere.

I guess to conclude, all I would ask each of you on this Committee is what would you vote if this cell tower was going to be put in your neighbor's yard? Thanks for your time.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Anybody else on this side of the room who want to comment? Statements? Okay. If not, we'll go back to the Commissioners for final deliberation. Let's start --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Just a -- hold on one second.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Just a follow-up question. People have indicated they don't really have any cell phone issues. Is data a different matter?

MR. STAPLETON: Yes, data is becoming a very important matter. That's why the federal government is releasing additional spectra to cover data, and that's part of what the long-term use of this site would be in addition to voice and the data that's being handled now is that future need for data.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, these people could be getting good telephone service but at some point may not be able to get the full range of data service? Is that possible?

MR. NAJEEB: That is correct, that's exactly what's happening now as well as in the future it will be both. As someone had just mentioned, you are planning to convert to a condominium, that means that, you know, a lot more users in the area. What that means is you might see the signal, when we say there is no signal, it does not mean that you don't see a signal in your phone. You might see full bars as well sometimes, but you cannot access to the network because you exceeded the limit and no user can access the network. That's what it means.

For voice it's a different thing, and for data it's totally different. When it comes to data, you don't want to, when you do video and it keeps on browsing it, you'll just quit it. So, that's what happens when signal is weak, then your speed will be decreased.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, we've had some speculation, this is not really a question, it's more of a comment. We've had some speculation that property values would decline because we have this big tower there. But it seems to me that it's equally likely that if you wanted to buy a place and you couldn't get any data services, you might find that your property values drop.

APPROVED

MR. NAJEEB: Exactly, that's what I was about to say, that if I go to a house, the first thing I would check is if the signal is coming on. And the next thing, I would download something and check what is the speed I'm getting. That's what the next generation is going to look at. If they are not getting the signal, for example, if I'm staying in a room and if I'm not able to download, I don't want to come outside my house and download a movie and go back in and watch it. That's not practically possible.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, I live in this area and I must admit that it's a very ugly corner. I don't live very far from that corner. That corner needs some help, and I don't know how many decades it will take for the Village to get around to straightening out the strip malls and other strange things that are on this corner and down Arlington Heights Road, and you live in that area as well. But I'm having a little trouble standing in the way of this project when it looks like we're asking people to wait decades.

I do agree with Commissioner Dawson. I think the Village needs to put together some kind of a committee of Staff and experts and set some standards and work through this issue as promptly as possible. I know that's going to take some time, and I can't see voting against this project just because we are unprepared to deal with the present let alone the future. So, I guess I'm more strongly in favor of voting for this project at this point, but I would urge the Village to, you know, take it upon itself to resolve this issue and set better standards based on the reality of today rather than whenever that 75-foot standard was set.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Warskow?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I'm supportive that we need to make sure that all the residences are covered with data, and we can't just say, you know, not in my backyard. But I would like to see what the other mobile carriers' coverage is in this area before we go ahead and set a precedence and, you know, not have all the information. So, you know, I am taking the residents' word for it that they're getting coverage in their homes. You're only representing one carrier here. I'm supportive but I would like to reserve voting on this until we have more information about other carriers' coverage.

MR. STAPLETON: I would just like to --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: No. Commissioner Ennes? That was just a statement she made, she didn't have a question.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay. While I'm leaning in this direction, I would like more input from Staff in regard to what our goal here is, whether it's 75-foot or 100, whether 100 is the way things are going and we might need to adjust our code. But my other concern is before I would in any way vote positively on this, we need to have this other part of this plan which is the landscaping plan for

APPROVED

curbs, for parking islands. We need to have that be part of this proposal and I wouldn't support it until we have that.

MR. STAPLETON: In your drawings that you should have in front of you, you do have a landscaping plan around it. It's LE2.1.

MS. BHIDE: That is just the plan for around the site.

MR. STAPLETON: That's for around the site.

MS. BHIDE: We're looking for an overall landscape plan for the site.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: We're talking about the property, and talking about the owner.

MR. STAPLETON: Okay. That, we can do that. Just as another point --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: No, enough said.

MR. STAPLETON: Well, it was a question that was brought up and there's a question that --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: No, it's not a question. That's a comment.

MR. STAPLETON: No, but can I address the questions that the residents brought up? They made some statements that are false.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, go ahead.

MR. STAPLETON: A resident brought up that he's 170 feet from the tower. The nearest home in that district to the tower is 249.1-foot, that's to the nearest site. Regarding the fence that's adjacent to the property that was brought up, that there's a fence between our property and the adjoining property, the Village had asked us to improve that fence because that fence is deteriorating and it hasn't been taken care of. That's one of the other requirements that we have been asked to do, was presented, was to take care of that fence. Am I correct in that statement? Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, very well.

MR. STAPLETON: So, I mean, we're just trying to, we're willing to do that.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I am not supporting this project at this time. There is missing information, I agree with Commissioner Ennes here. If we were to have a positive vote on this, we have to see what the improvements to the site would be, the landscape, the parking stalls and everything else that go along with it. So, at this point, I agree we need more information, we need more of a plan than just one carrier to tell us what we think we should have. So, I am not in favor of this project at this time.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Commissioner Cherwin?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'm not in favor of it as well.

APPROVED

I'll just reiterate my statements from earlier which is I think that we need to come up with a more comprehensive guide to how we're going to approach these. As I think you can tell by this hearing, there's a lot of uncertainty. There's great reasons for putting a tower in this area and there's also big concerns for putting a tower in this area. I'm not against necessarily towers here, I'm not necessarily against towers near residential areas. I'm just against making decisions without enough information to be prudent. So I do not support it.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I agree, I can't support it unless we have further information. So, at this particular point in time, I'm going to vote against it.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Well, I wouldn't suggest that we come to a vote. I will suggest that we continue it because one of the requirements was a proper layout plan for the property. So, I would say that it needs to be continued until you finish your discussions with IDOT and we have, and the owner has investigated costs associated with the revisions that Staff is requiring. So, in that time, I would hope that while those things are going on, Staff can come back to us next time with more of an idea and maybe we use one of our meetings like we did with the windmills, for example, to get a better understanding of what is required.

Like Commissioner Warskow stated, I thought, my recollection when we did the antenna tower on Euclid, I could be wrong, we had more data on what the cell phone coverage was in the area from various providers. There's a lot more data, and I feel like Staff needs to come up with suggestions to petitioners on what kind of data needs to be brought before us, because I don't feel, just like we stated before, we have a comprehensive understanding of what the need is in this area.

So, like I stated before, I'm not against it, I think we need to continue it. You've got some work you've got to do, Staff has some work they've got to do, and then we'll all meet back here and go through this again because, you know, it's just been fun.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Drost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I think the tower is in the wrong place, at least from the Comprehensive Plan that we have been working on and developing and it goes contrary to what we've been trying to do for that neighborhood. The encouragement that I would give you would be to try to work something out with Northwest Community Hospital. I know you've said no, but you know, never say never. That just seems to be the more logical place to aggregate the antennas rather than in some sort of haphazard way.

MR. STAPLETON: As I said, we're 0.3 mile just from the

APPROVED

hospital now.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Excuse me, sir, it's not your turn.

COMMISSIONER DROST: But I mean I'm just looking for aggregation, you know, where you have to have like kind items, you know. It's tough.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Can I just quickly, one thing I forgot. Could we get more of an understanding later, not tonight, of what a stealth tower looks like? Because I just tried to do a quick little Google search and it's not, there's like a whole different kind of stealth tower.

MS. BHIDE: We'll get you more information.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I think we need to understand what that is.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. My comment I think is a lot simpler than everybody else's. I just don't think a 100-foot tall in a residential area belongs there. I agree with the Staff that it shouldn't be approved. That's my comment. Any motions at this point?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: One question or clarification. We've got a proposal before us but we want to make the landlord who's been sort of grandfathered in without the right kind of landscaping and so forth upgrade his property. Do we have the authority to do that when we're looking at a small part of that property?

MS. BHIDE: Right, but it is a special use. They are leasing a 30 by 30 foot area, but it is a special use on that property. So, yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, we could then have the authority to have the entire piece of property basically upgraded in terms of landscaping as Commissioner Ennes and Commissioner Green asked for. So, this could be a way to get that done.

MS. BHIDE: That is my understanding, yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I certainly would support what Commissioner Dawson has suggested. I wouldn't want to vote this down. I would want to have the folks come back and take another pass through this when we have a lot more information.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Any motion?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'll make a motion to continue.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'll second.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I don't know if what that motion needs to state though. I need some help, Latika. Do I just need to state that I make a motion to continue until Petitioner has complied with all the requirements of Staff relative to the information of the site plan?

MS. BHIDE: Sure. Do we need a date? I mean does

APPROVED

there have to be a date, specific date?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I don't think we can because they have to talk to IDOT. They have to put together a plan. They have to do costs. I mean I think we just say when Petitioner has all the information, they come back.

MS. Bhide: Okay.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Do we take a roll call or any further discussion? Any other comments? Then we take a roll call on the continuance.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MS. Bhide: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: No.

MS. Bhide: Chairman Lorenzini.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: No.

MS. Bhide: The motion carries.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Motion carries, okay. So, I guess we'll notify them about the continuance.

MS. Bhide: Yes, I will communicate with them.

MR. STAPLETON: Okay, thank you. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. That's it. Any other business? Can you take the rest of, excuse me, could you take your discussions outside? Out in the hall please.

Any other business, Latika?

MS. Bhide: No.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: No? Anybody else? Do we have a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

APPROVED

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: We're adjourned. Good night,
thank you.

(Whereupon, the public hearing on the above-
mentioned petition was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.)