

PLAN

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

COMMISSION

RE:     COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE - PC# 14-020

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  
26th day of August, 2015 at the hour of 7:30 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
- BILL ENRIGHT, Deputy Director

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: I'd like to call to order this meeting of the Plan Commission. Would you please all rise and repeat the pledge of allegiance with us?

(Pledge of allegiance.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: So, Bill, can we have the roll call please?

MR. ENRIGHT: Let me get my glasses on. Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Chairman Lorenzini.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Here. Thank you. The first or next item on the agenda is approval of the meeting minutes from July 22nd, T-Mobile and Verizon Wireless. Do you have any comments or a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Good. The next item on the agenda is the public hearing for the Comprehensive Plan Update, PC# 14-020. Just so the audience knows, Mr. Enright from the Planning Department will make a presentation, Commissioners will ask questions, and then we'll open it up to the audience for questions. With that, Bill, why don't you start?

MR. ENRIGHT: Chairman, the Comprehensive Plan update really consists of three components; the Subcommittee of the Plan Commission which consists of several members that's on the dais tonight, those include Commissioner Warskow, Ennes, Chairman Lorenzini, George Drost, Commissioner Drost who is the chairman of the

Subcommittee, Commissioner Sigalos as well, and Trustee Jim Tinaglia.

Since September of 2014, the Subcommittee has been reviewing an update to our 1997 Master Plan for the Village which is a booklet which includes various sections including the land use map for future land uses in the Village. They are recommending approval to the Plan Commission of the update to the Master Plan Booklet, which we'll get into a little bit later, also recommending approval of several changes to the land use map called the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map.

With respect to park site reservations, the Subcommittee did not recommend the request of the Park District at the point in time that they held their last meeting in July because they wanted to hear from the property owners. We have since that time receive, and we did serve notice to all the property owners impacted by not only the park site reservation request but the land use map amendments. We've heard from several, mostly those related to the park site reservations. We have three letters that were uploaded on our Novus system, which is the public records system that anybody from the public can view the docket materials as well as obviously the Plan Commission and eventually the Village Board. Those three letters were in opposition to have the reservation on their site. That included St. Viator, High School District 214, and Christian Liberty Academy. I believe they have representatives here tonight.

What I'd like to do is start with, since most of the people here I think are for the reservation request, to start with that versus the Comprehensive Plan booklet because that will take a little bit longer. We need a little more thorough review of that, and the people here may not want to stay for that. So, as a courtesy to everybody, we figured we'd start with the site reservations.

What I first --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Bill, if I could just jump in here, so one of the questions I should have asked is have all proper notices been given. So, obviously we haven't given it to the whole Village. Who got notices for this meeting?

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, we're only required by state law to publish notice in the Daily Herald 15 days prior to tonight's meeting which we did. As a courtesy though, whenever we have amendments to our Comprehensive Plan, which includes the land use map and the reservation request from the Park District, we do send a notice to those property owners. So, the reservations, there were seven or eight property owners, and then the Comprehensive Plan changes, there were probably 40 owners, most of whom are down in that STAR Line area south of Algonquin, just east of Arlington Heights Road. So, we sent notice to all those individuals to make them aware of the proposed changes and have the ability to participate in the process.

Having said that, the Park District has requested

several reservations. I mean, to be, you know, it's a little complicated so I'm just going to give an example of what a park site reservation is and what it is not. It's not the right of first refusal for the Park District to come in and buy property. It is not getting in the way of any private property owner from selling their property. It is a bit of a cloud over the property because it will show up on those title searches if the title company does what they're supposed to do, it will show as a park site reservation which might cause some concern for a potential buyer of a property.

What they really mean though is when there is a reservation on a site, it only comes into employ if there is a residential subdivision being proposed before the Plan Commission and ultimately the Village Board. For instance, when we had a subdivision in 1997, which was the last time since it came up, there was a subdivision for 12 lots adjacent to an existing park. The Park District had a reservation on the site, so we informed the Park District of that. Then they indicated to us within a short time period frame, it didn't slow down the process, that they would rather have the land versus the fee in lieu of.

Now, in most developments, residential developments in the Village, the Park District and the school districts and the Library District just elect to get the impact fee. I mean we call it a contribution, it's an impact fee, I think everybody knows what that is. It's basically the impact of a residential development on these services, and it has to have a rational nexus so it can't be just any number, and it's spelled out in our Village Code in Chapter 29, Subdivision Regulations.

So, in this particular instance, the Park District said they wanted the land. So, the Village Staff calculated the amount of land that would be required pursuant to our Land Dedication Ordinance. The Park District then agreed with that, and the developer had to then modify their subdivision to include a portion of the subdivision for the park site reservation in lieu of each property having to pay a fee when they came in for building permit. It's an equal basis, the money equals the land value, and that's spelled out in our Chapter 29, the Subdivision Regulations.

I think where there is concern is that the state law says that if there is a reservation, the Park District has up until one year to buy the property. That's true if the Village didn't have a Land Dedication Ordinance. The reason I say that is if we did not have land dedication or impact fees in the Village, then what would happen in that same scenario that I put forth with a subdivision, we would inform the Park District of the subdivision, the subdivider would then have to include the portion of land for the Park District that was reserved in their subdivision but not the whole thing, a portion of.

The Park District would then have a year to make a decision on whether or not to buy that land, but the subdivision could go forward with the other properties that are subdivided. It would just be the park that would be set aside for the Park District.

If the Park District after one year decided, or within that year decided that they didn't want to buy that land from the developer, then that land could be used by the developer within the proper zoning district. But since we have a Land Dedication Ordinance, they have to give the land up and that's an impact fee and it's perfectly legal as long as there is a nexus between how much they have to give up and the population created by the particular subdivision.

So, I think there's a little bit, you know, the opposition is understood. But it only really comes into play, and it only really gives us, the reason it helps the process planners is that it tells us whether the Park District thinks they're going to want land so we can work with developers on planning that. But it's not all encompassing. It doesn't stop a developer from coming in and moving forward.

So, if a Park District has a large reservation for a large site like they're requesting on some of these sites tonight, it doesn't mean they have dibs on the whole thing. It does not mean they have right of first refusal. What it means is, per our Land Dedication Ordinance, they can request a portion of that to be dedicated to them for a park as part of our normal subdivision process.

So, if the Park District wanted to buy the whole thing, they would have to be like everybody else, they would have to go out there and make their best offer, and a landowner would have to decide if they want to sell to the Park District for that offer or this developer for this offer. So, you know, with all due respect to the legal opinions we've received, our attorneys don't completely agree with everything in it, but there are certainly valid concerns from the property owners because it does have somewhat of a negative impact on property in terms of perception and that can sometimes, you know, make it difficult to sell property.

So, having said that, there are several reservations that are being requested by the Park District; John Hersey High School; University Drive, there are some industrial property which Staff does not support because at this point we don't feel it's appropriate for a park to be in this industrial park because we have very little industrial land left. Having said that, if the Park District in the future ever has a defined plan for using this acreage and they are able to get it under contract with the property owner, we would certainly be amenable to looking at the possibility down the road.

A reservation is also being requested for St.

Peter's Lutheran Church and School; Forest View Educational Center which is part of District 214's property, their administrative offices; Christian Liberty Academy; there's a property on Rockwell Street, a single-family residential property; St. Viator High School and the Viatorian Novitiate; and 406 East Northwest Highway which is Grandt's Shell which is adjacent to Rec Park.

Having said that, you know, it may be a good idea now to open it up to hear some of the concerns from these property owners, because I know several are represented here, as well as the Park District. We may want to, I don't know if we want to start with that and ask them for their rationale behind their request. But I know there are several property owners represented here and I'll leave it up to the Chairman, you know, how you want to proceed with this portion of the request.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: That sounds reasonable, to open it up to the public. But do the Commissioners agree or do we want to ask questions first?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I just have a couple of clarifications, I think this might help in the discussion as the public comes forward. How does a reservation compare to the condemnation powers that the Park District might have? That's number one question. And have we had any studies that analyze the valuation of properties before and after a reservation? Is there anything that we've got that could, you know, demonstration that reservations don't affect property values or do affect property values?

MR. ENRIGHT: We don't because it's been so rare that a reservation has even come into play. In my 26 years, I can only think of a couple of times where we've had a subdivision where this has come up. So, no, we don't have the evidence.

Regarding the first question, you know, you're going to have to ask the Park District about their perspective on eminent domain. It's my understanding that the Park District does not use eminent domain to acquire property. I think that's a policy decision. Honestly, that could change depending upon who's on their board. But it's my understanding that they haven't used it as far as I know since I've been around.

So, as far as eminent domain, I don't think it's directly related to it, but my understanding is that when we, the Village, put reservations on land for future Village facilities like fire stations, police stations, our attorneys have said that that in and of itself does not give us the right to exercise eminent domain. However, if we do have to file a lawsuit in court to acquire property by eminent domain, it certainly helps that we would have put a property owner on notice in advance that we were interested in a property. It doesn't make or break the case, it's not necessary to use eminent

domain, but it certainly is something that's, you know, something that's positive for us if we move forward with eminent domain.

I don't know if the Park District would look upon it the same way. They're a different taxing government agency. Their attorneys may look at it differently.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Do any other Commissioners want to ask questions at this time?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, I have a clarifying question. Some of the literature, the language you've got up on that screen and regarding the third bullet, if we look at St. Peter Lutheran Church and School, I guess it's the phrasing there, I want to make sure that I understand what you said, Bill. It says, "This 10 acre site could be developed into a neighborhood park." That suggested to me when I read this that the whole 10 acres could be developed, and there's language like that throughout most of this request. What I understand you to be saying is not the full 10 acres but some portion of it, probably not even, I mean really a significantly smaller amount than the 10 acres that would be developed into a park if that were --

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, that's a good question. I mean, what the Park District is asking for is a lot more than what would be required of a developer in terms of land dedication. Your example here, if for instance, just hypothetically, St. Peter was to sell their property or a portion of it to a single-family developer who wanted to build 40 homes, the Park District could elect to get some of that land but it would be, you know, a 40-lot subdivision might equate to three or four of those lots being set aside but not the whole property. It's really not the whole campus.

So, the Park District's request is more than what would actually be required by the Village during a subdivision process as part of our, as it relates to the Land Dedication Ordinance.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Very specifically, do you take that to mean they want the entire 10 acres?

MR. ENRIGHT: That's what they're saying but, you know, again I think what the Park District is doing here really is saying, hey, you know, we have an interest in park land in this area and if it ever became available, they might be interested in buying it, they may not. There's a lot of things that go into that like funds, for one, and need. So, I think they're just kind of showing an idealistic view of the future, but it's not something that the Village could require of a developer.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Certainly.

MR. ENRIGHT: The Park District would have to make an offer to buy the 10 acres and the church would have to say, okay, and accept.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, your explanations notwithstanding, it sounds like the Park District much bigger pieces of land set aside for the parks, if I read this letter correctly. So, they're really asking for something that would be of real concern to the folks we're going to hear from shortly after.

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, again, you know, unless the Park District used eminent domain to acquire the land, the amount of acres that they're asking for is irrelevant with respect to the Village's processes for subdivision because we go by the way of dedication ordinance which says you have to allocate a certain amount of land but not anywhere near all of it. The example that I talked about earlier for 1997 was a 12-lot subdivision and they had to aside the equivalent of one-and-a-half lots. So, it could have been almost 14 lots and it ended up being 12.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay. So, thank you for the explanation, I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: So, just to follow up on that, Bill, so let's say, let's stick with your example and make it 40 lots on this but three have to go for park. But the owner still gets paid for those three lots, right?

MR. ENRIGHT: No. Well, they get paid from the developer who buys it from them, but the developer has to give that land as an impact fee to the Park District.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: But he would have to --

MR. ENRIGHT: That's something we do already.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, got you. Okay, all right.

MR. ENRIGHT: Any residential development that goes through the Village has to pay the impact fee, and that impact fee is based on the population of that development and the Village's value of land per acre which is outlined in the subdivision regulations, as well as the desired park acreage in the case of parks for the community. So, it's a mathematical formula laid out in Chapter 29.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, this fee in lieu of or partial taking would only, the only time that this would occur would be in the property was going to a residential developer?

MR. ENRIGHT: For a residential subdivision. Usually, I mean the only time that Parks have ever asked for the land is when it's, as far as I can recall, I think it's only been twice in my 26 years here, is when it was adjacent to an existing park, because then it's logical to just add on a little bit of land. If it wasn't adjacent to an existing park, it would be kind of pointless to, you know, unless they did a little tot lot or something, it wouldn't make sense to just take a little bit of acreage unless it's adjacent to an existing park.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Any other questions from the



Commissioners, comments? Okay, maybe just for further explanation, I guess the Park District is here. Would you mind, you don't have to, do you want to shed any more light on this discussion?

MR. SCHOLTEN: Good evening, and thank you. My name is Steve Scholten and I am the executive director of the Park District. I think Mr. Enright has done an outstanding job of laying out the issues and has also talked about the reasons why the Park District is interested in this. Obviously, one of our main responsibilities is to preserve and protect open space in the community. We aggressively seek more land when we can. We certainly are interested in land that's adjacent to property that we currently own, and we view large parcels as opportunities to protect open space for many years to come.

So, that's kind of the basis of our request tonight, and I would be happy to answer any questions or come back at a time that's convenient for you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, we'll open it up to the rest of the public now and if anybody has any questions, you can, for now you can sit and come back. Okay, let's go to the public now. Let's start on this side of the room. Anybody in the first row, just stand.

#### **QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE**

DR. WEIR: Do I have to come up to the microphone?

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Yes, come up to the microphone.

MR. BAKER: I'm the attorney, so I'll start and then some of the members can then come up.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Please state your name and spell it for the court reporter, and your address.

MR. BAKER: My name is Rich Baker, fortunately that's an easy one, B-a-k-e-r. I'm with the firm of Mauck & Baker and I do represent Christian Liberty Academy, which is also a part of Christian Liberty Church.

We come before you with an objection, and before we do I'd like to say thanks, which I've appeared before many village and city boards and I usually don't say thanks. But I will say thanks for three reasons. Number one, Mr. Enright has been extremely helpful in working through this process with me, and I really appreciate the openness and the clarity that he has brought to what at one point was a fairly unclear process. Secondly, the Subcommittee held or reserved their decision to allow the public to speak. They didn't have to do that and I really appreciate that you're letting us up here to speak tonight. Finally, as Mr. Enright pointed out, you didn't have to give us notice, and you did.

So, for those three reasons, I really commend Arlington Heights. This is unusual in my practice, and so in starting

out, rather than antagonistic, I'm very grateful to be here.

It seems to me that the issues have been laid out. Mr. Enright has clarified, both in my letter and in the other letters, I said it was tantamount to a right of first refusal. I think Mr. Enright has clarified this, no, that's not true because they don't have a right to the entire property. So, it's not a right of first refusal in that regard.

But Mr. Enright also pointed out that, yes, it does put a cloud on the property. In the previous Subcommittee hearings, we said a black mark or teeth on it. I think that's perhaps the best way to say it, which is the basis for the objection not only of my clients but also the others is we're going to do a balancing act here. If you're going to affect the value of my property and my ability to sell, what is the interest that you have in doing that? In my letter, I went into great detail to kind of explore what the Park District's interests would be. As I looked at it, I think that even the director tonight had said it, whenever we see a big piece of open land, we try to lock it up in that sense of putting up a site request on it. But is that really necessary given the impact that that will have on the various property owners?

I listed a number of things that I was concerned about. Number one, the Park District's request for land is 10 acres per -- am I right? I'm sorry, 10 acres per 1,000 people. The Village Ordinance requires nine. So, then when they say we have a requirement, I believe it was 815 acres, we only have 716, or I think they said 810 and we have 716. If I do my math, they don't, based on the Village Ordinance at nine, they need 746 to meet their need, not 810. Then I also did the math and we saw that they had over 400 acres already reserved.

So, we see a policy here that's not based on actual need but really on essentially locking up all the open space that we can find in the Village right now. There is some logic in that because if there's large open spaces they're vanishing, we all know that. But then let's look at the next issue that comes up in this, and that issue is really one of not just harm but also necessity and need.

When I talked to Mr. Enright, he indicated that this property that we own is already on the map for the Park District. We've already identified it on their own map. The whole purpose as I understand it, Mr. Enright, please correct me if I'm wrong, but the whole purpose of this is to give notice to the Subdivision Committee so that if a property comes up, they can talk to the Park District, and the Park District can say, yes, we are or we are not interested.

But frankly, that can be done without any harm to the property owners simply by looking on the map, because as I understand it, it's already there. Or simply as a matter of course

when a new property, a large property comes on, calling the Park District and saying this one is coming up, do you have an interest. Rather than putting a cloud on the title which means that my buyer is coming in, if I were to sell and in our letter I indicated that we have no intention at this point of selling, we love Arlington Heights and are very pleased with our location, so if you weigh the potential impact to the property owner versus the good that will come and the necessity that the Park District is requesting, I don't think they balance out. I think there's a clear balance in favor of the property owner and against the real need or necessity to burden the property of these things.

We also noticed that this is actually in your code, it's written and I cited the provisions in there. This is an extraordinary measure, not the norm, and yet we see the Park District using this as a norm whenever they see a piece of property. How many times has it actually come up in the years Mr. Enright has been working for the Village?

MR. ENRIGHT: Twice.

MR. SCHOLTEN: So, when we see, when we factored in all those kinds of factors with the potential harm that it has on the property owner, I don't think it's necessary. For that reason, we would ask you to oppose these particular site reservations. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Anybody else from the first row?

PASTOR LINDSTROM: I'm sorry?

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Anybody else from the first row want to speak?

PASTOR LINDSTROM: I'll just speak briefly.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, your name, spell it, and the address please.

PASTOR LINDSTROM: Yes. Pastor Calvin Lindstrom, and I serve at the Church Christian Liberty and Christian Liberty Academy. I'm thankful for, again, Mr. Enright's letter, and I would just express as the pastor of the church and a role also in the school that we would echo obviously our attorney's comments. We have worked with Arlington Heights for many years on a number of projects so I think we have a good working relationship with the Village, with the community.

We are here to serve. Obviously, our chief goal is to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ, but part of that is being good neighbors. I think this would negatively affect that relationship, or could, and I would recommend not placing our site and other sites on that park site reservation because we want to be good neighbors and we think that could even cloud that. It becomes in a sense a public relations problem for us if we try to explain what this means and not try to over-exaggerate what it might mean, but it puts an extra burden

on us even just in dealing with these things that we would rather not have to continue to deal with to focus on our work and business. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Anybody else on this side of the room? Yes, ma'am.

DR. WEIR: Do I go to the microphone?

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Yes, come up to the mic, state your name, spell it please, and give your address.

DR. WEIR: Sandy Weir, 816 West St. James, Apartment 2NE.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Could you spell your last name please?

DR. WEIR: W-e-i-r, it's Dr. Weir, Ph.D. I do a lot of research and I am familiar with the expansion of open green space. I'm familiar with the term. I'm not saying, I'm not implying anything but I'll tell you what, this to me looks like a land grab. I pay my taxes, too. The people that, I pay your salaries, all of you. This to me looks like a land grab. You've got 100 acres right there that is for Park District.

Okay, I'm going to tell you what, I'm talking the separation of church and state right here. You have no right to take over my church. You have no, and I'm speaking just as a taxpayer and a person that is paying your salaries, and I do voting and I'm a loyal citizen, I pay my taxes and I'm a good payer, all right. I'm a public school teacher. I teach biology in Lake County, okay, but I'm telling you this to me sounds and looks like a land grab. 100 acres for parks?

Now, about eight years ago, I was doing some research online, and that's when President Bush was talking about Agenda 21. Nobody knew what that was. I went online, I opened that stuff up, I saw what they were doing. This is sustainable environment, sustainable communities. I know what that means, I read Agenda 21. I went to the UN website, I went to the original document because I'm a researcher. They talked about exactly what this looks like to me, take over green space, land grab, put it in the power of the government, this little government here, Arlington Heights government.

Look, look, I mean you want to take 100 acres and you're going to call it for the community parks? How many community parks do we have now? I just, I live right on St. James, right by the post office. We have a beautiful park that you guys, we paid tax, we voted yes, and it's a beautiful park. We need 100 more acres of parks? I say it's a land grab. That's what I see, that's what I talk about.

Okay, I don't mean to keep you awake here, sir, but, I mean I don't mean to be so boring that you're falling asleep but you'll have to be forgive me. I'm not as fun. Okay, so to me it's a land grab. I don't know what you're doing but I know Agenda 21. Are

any of you familiar with that? Because if you're not, go to it, you should know. I know that you do because it's all about sustainable development which is exactly what this is, centralizing people. I know, I read it in the UN thing, we go by it. We voted it in.

So, to me that's what's going on. There is no way in my mind that you're going to step on my church. There is no way because there is a separation. God is higher. Okay, I'm a freeborn American citizen and I claim common law jurisdiction without prejudice. That's higher than statutory law. That's God's law.

That's how I feel and I'm very vocal. I'm not afraid to stand up. With all due respect, I respect God.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER DROST: You know, for the record, why don't we reveal our salaries? For the record.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: It's about three dollars an hour. Anybody else on this side of the room who wants to speak? Okay, on this side of the room, anybody want to speak? Anybody have questions? Yes, sir. Please state your name, spell it for the court reporter and give your address.

MR. GRANDT: My name is Craig Grandt, G-r-a-n-d-t. I live at 302 South Prindle in Arlington here. I own Grandt's Shell, which is your 406 East Northwest Highway properties.

I've been to three of these meetings in about 19 years. Never once at any of these meetings has a Park District board member come to one of the owners of the property and said, you know, we're talking about putting a restriction on the property or anything. Twice when I've been in the meetings, the Board has asked the Park District why they have not done that and maybe they might consider doing that so that you don't have to have citizens at your meetings concerned about keeping their own property. A phone call or just a stop into my business and saying, hi, Craig, we're the Park District and we'd like to talk to you about the future plans of your property. It would be all it would take, not to have something put on my property so that if somebody goes through a title search, there is a little cloud over it.

In my business, we have enough clouds over our property when it comes to the EPA and everything else. We don't need to have something like this and I would prefer not to have it. I would talk to the Park District if I were selling my property and they would want it. I would consider their offer. But I don't believe that we need to do this to get property in Arlington Heights. Thank you very much for your time.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Anybody else from the audience who want to speak? Anybody else from the public? Okay, if

not, we'll close the public portion of this and go back to the Commissioners for further questions. Jay, do you want to start? Any questions?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Sure, thanks. Just for clarification, looking through the Comp Plan draft, if you wouldn't mind, Mr. Enright, clarifying for the Commissioners and the public, what is presented on these nine properties that we have. Those are properties that are simply outside of what the Village has requested and what the Park specifically has requested. There are additional properties that appear in the Comp Plan that are, are they already reserved? Because I see a note on page 48 that says Arlington Heights Park District, approved by Village Board, June 16th, 1997, and then a whole list, two pages worth of properties.

So, am I to understand, am I reading this correct to say those properties have already been put on the list that presumably these properties are now being asked to be put on that same list?

MR. ENRIGHT: That's correct. This request by the Park District was also discussed at that same time 17 years ago, and the Village Board at that time approved only the ones which you're referring to that appear on the draft plan that we have now, that those have existed since '97. The request that you're seeing tonight were not approved by the Village Board in 1997 for a lot of the same reasons we're hearing tonight from the property owners.

The Park District has made a request to the Village, now that we're updating our Comprehensive Plan, to reconsider this request.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: So, if we look at the list, what was the, and maybe we don't have minutes or I don't want you to presume, but if a distinction was made between those properties and the properties on the list, because we also have on this list things like, you know, basically every school, just about every school that's on the new list is on this existing list, Christian United Methodist, Our Lady of the Wayside, you know, I guess, do we know what the distinguishing factor is between those properties that were apparently sufficient to go through the process and these properties that the Board decided not to put on? What is it about the properties that made it on the list that's different than the properties that were initially rejected in '97 and are now being asked to be included? Do we know that?

MR. ENRIGHT: All I can say is that it's my recollection that those that were not included were those who came to the meeting in opposition, or wrote a letter in opposition. There may have been other reasons stated at the meeting, but that was 18 years ago, we'd have to look at the minutes. But I do recall that the ones who were left off, I do remember getting either letters in opposition

or testimony at meetings in opposition as we are hearing tonight.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: That's it for now, thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: John, any questions?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Well, I'm still a little confused with this park site reservation. I understood you, Bill, to say that, you used the example of St. Peter Lutheran Church, the way this is letter by, the letter here from the Park District is that they want the entire 10-acre site. But let's say a developer wished to come in and buy the St. Peter Lutheran Church, the full 10 acres, and develop so many homes on this property, they are required to deed to the Park District X number of acres of park based on the size of that entire development, correct?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, that's exactly correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, what does this park site reservation do that's not already in place that require the developer to deed over X number of acres for a park?

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, one thing it does is it alerts Staff and a potential buyer of land that there is a desire for the possibility of land instead of paying a fee in lieu of. But Mr. Baker makes a great point as well that, it is my understanding, and Mr. Scholten, the Park District director, could correct me, but I believe all these reservations are on the Park District Comprehensive Plan. We took or referred to our own documents when, you know, going through the public process. I don't know of any legal distinction on requiring land versus fee in lieu of that would require a reservation. I don't believe that we necessarily have to have a reservation in order to effectuate the land dedication versus cash. Certainly one or the other has to be done because we do have a code that requires that.

So, you know, Mr. Baker is correct, when you add up the total reservations that are existing in addition to this request, it certainly exceeds the acres that the Park District would really want as articulated in their master plan because they're pretty close to that number anyway. We don't know what our population is going to be like 20, 25 years from now, and it's probably not going to be decidedly different from now. You know, we're not going to double or anything. So, but the Park District I don't believe intends on, you know, trying to buy all these properties either.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: All right. So, that was my only question for now.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Susan?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I was going to ask, Mr. Scholten, if you could come back up and explain and maybe address that, or maybe you want to have an opportunity to address that concern. It seems to me that much of the concern is that the letter seems to imply you want the entire parcel, which to me, I read this letter as just to explain

why you might want the reservation, not saying that you want the whole thing. Could you maybe expand for the audience a little bit more your thought process?

MR. SCHOLTEN: Sure. There are certain parcels that, depending on the size and location, that we would like to have the whole parcel. We're well aware that if this adds up to 100 acres, we cannot afford to buy 100 acres. There are certain parcels up here that if they became available to us, we would not be able to buy today anyway. So, a big portion of what we're doing is trying to just advise potential developers that we do like what the Land Cash Donation Ordinance gives to the Park District in terms of land.

We do need more land. Just because we have some 116 acres doesn't mean that it's accomplishing all of the goals that we would like to accomplish with the acres that we have. We do have a need for some larger sites that can handle more athletic fields. So, it's not just numbers, it's where it's at in the community and the ability to program or to develop that land to what we would like to have.

So, some of these are wonderful pieces of property that if they ever became available, we would like to consider purchasing, or would at least like to have the opportunity to be part of that Land Cash Donation Ordinance. Just as an example, within the last 18 months, there was a parcel that was reserved. The owner contacted the Park District and told us what the developer wanted to do, gave us the price of what they were going to get, asked us if we would be interested, if we would meet that price. We did jointly conduct an appraisal of that property and it was just too expensive for us to buy. So, we told the owner tell the developer thank you very much, it's not something that we can afford to buy right now in comparison to what they could gain in programming the open space for the community, so do with it what you will. They have since done that.

So, this is really just a vehicle for us to be able to engage in the conversation of potential for the whole piece of property, if it's in the right place and the right price, or be engaged in the conversation relative to land cash donation.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: One of the things that I think you said that may be is interesting, maybe people need to understand is that you said that the developer named their price and you couldn't meet that price and, therefore, did not purchase the property. It wasn't that you were able to reduce the property or say we want the property at a reduced price. It was the developer's price.

MR. SCHOLTEN: We're speaking with, to my recollection, we were speaking with the owner who had a developer who had a price set. We have no legal authority and I don't believe the Village has any legal authority to say you must sell to the Park District at X



price. We do have condemnation ability. I don't believe in the 90-year history of the Park District that we have ever condemned property to acquire it for a public use. So, if an owner has a potential buyer and developer and they offer a price and we can't meet it, there is nothing that obligates that owner to take a lesser amount of money from the Park District.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay. The other thought I had is I know you've had some difficulty in some of the existing sites, I'm biased with my Rec Park as I'm very vocal about it, can't wait until Rec Park gets redone, but the difficulty there is the expense because of the new facilities that have to be put in place. Whereas I look at this list and your reasoning behind much of it is that you wouldn't have the problems that you'd be faced with a recreation park. There's existing facilities there that would allow you to renovate and put the facilities in that the community needs and it's currently lacking because there's existing buildings in place.

So, that to me, when I was reading the letter, was what I was seeing. That's the reasoning I was seeing behind your descriptions, not that you were trying to take all 100 acres but that you were trying to show your reasoning and logic behind the request.

MR. SCHOLTEN: That's correct. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay. I just have one more comment, which is not really a question. But I don't know that we know any of this, but there has been a lot of focus on the impact of the reservation to property value. However, there is just something else to consider which is that, I'm an attorney and I do real estate deals. When a purchaser comes in with the purchase price, there is due diligence. Sometimes, very frequently, things are discovered during due diligence which causes the property value or the purchase price to drop. So, a reservation, there is a concern that it might cause a property drop, but without the reservation, you're going to have a buyer come in, find out whoops, the Park District wants the property or a portion of the property. The next thing you know, the purchase price drops anyway.

So, to some degree, I understand what's being said is that this is just simply a notice. I'm not going to try to say that every developer and every person out there will understand this. There is clearly confusion, there's clearly lots of people that have not understood this. So, there is something to be weighed there, but with or without the reservation, if the Park District decided they wanted a parcel or a piece of the, a portion of it, your purchase price could very well drop regardless. It was just something I wanted to raise.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Drost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I'm still sensitive about salaries and I want to address that issue. First of all, I think we

had Mr. Enright's explanation of what the Comprehensive Plan Committee did. But we go back about a year and a half when we actually started this process. Guess what, at those meetings, nobody gets paid. It's a volunteer organization, and we do get paid here at \$15 a meeting. Chairman Lorenzini of course gets a premium because of his high task, but I just want to clarify that, that this is essentially a volunteer board and we do the work that we do because we have a passion for this community, maybe in the same vein as others who have come forward today.

That being said, this process that we've gone through, this reservation process, I generally don't like it. I feel that it does impair the marketability of a property. I think there's other tools that the Park District has and I think we all love the Park District. This week in the Tribune, we saw parks generate communities. This is the 606 Trail through Chicago, and parks become anchors for community building and they are very important. But I think the availability of other ways to acquire property and not defeat the interest of the current owners, there can be other avenues that can be found.

One thing that I noticed in the objections that came to this board, they were pretty ecumenical. They came from St. Viator, they came from Liberty Academy, they came from District 214. So, I weigh those very importantly in my decision making and sort of the negativity that I hold with the idea of a reservation just seems like, well, we may do it, we may not, and it just doesn't serve the interest of the owners to be able to deal with their property in an unbridled way. That's it.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Thank God for George Drost because he just explained what I was struggling to explain. Mr. Baker, you had a very convincing argument, for me, and I know more about how things happened here tonight with the information from Bill Enright. So, I agree with George, I think that this is sort of a burden on the property owners and that's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Commissioner Ennes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Mr. Enright, I have one additional question to clear in my mind. The fee in lieu of the land dedication, whichever one of those would come up will only come up if one of these properties on the reservation was developed as a residential property?

MR. ENRIGHT: Was subdivided for a residential property.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: For a residential property. So, right now the Park District has reservations on about 470 acres of which, if none of them were subdivided for residential, they wouldn't get anything?

MR. ENRIGHT: That's right. They'd only get those if there is subdivision, and then the Park District elects to receive the land instead of the fees.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: From what we heard from Mr. Scholten, this is something that very rarely has occurred. Yet we're talking about adding another 100 acres to 500 acres, which hardly ever occurs, and yet if a residential development where there is a subdivision for residential development, the Park District, the Village would still have the ability to collect a fee in lieu of.

MR. ENRIGHT: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, we're putting a pretty heavy, with a background in valuation, I see this as a cloud on the property. That and putting it on all, we're talking about putting it on all these different properties with very little incidence of anything coming up, even though if the situation arises where there is a subdivision for residential development, the Park District would still have its ability to go in and get on the property and/or collect fee in lieu of. So, I agree with a number of my fellow Commissioners, that I really don't see the need for doing this.

I love the park districts, I think we have phenomenal park districts in town. I just think it's an awful lot of weight to put on a property owner. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you, Terry. Commissioner Warskow?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes. I don't have any questions, but similar to some of the other Commissioners I have a comment. I am very for open spaces. To address comments made, I think there are reasons for having open spaces in order to preserve health in a community. So, I don't think it's a negative thing to have the decision to want more open space. However, I do agree that this does put a burden on the property owners, and that if there were some other way to accommodate this, to have conversations between all the parties for the Park District still to have the ability to pursue those pieces of property, that's the way that I would agree to go.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you, Mary Jo. Commissioner Jensen?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes. Just a question. Who decides whether it's land or a fee that is paid? There isn't this kind of an arrangement, but let's suppose one of these properties that doesn't have a reservation on it becomes available and it's going to be subdivided for residential purposes. Who decides whether it's land that the Park District gets or a fee?

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, the Village Board makes that decision. However, we do consult with the Park District. We inform them in writing of the subdivision, and they have to respond in writing

what they are requesting and that response is forwarded to the Village Board. So, when the plat of subdivision goes before the Village Board, they will have the advice, the recommendation from the Park District board on land or fee, and it's up to our Village Board to determine which.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay. So, they actually can get, the Village and the Park District could get land if they wanted land. They don't have to take the fees from what I hear you say, if that were the decision of the buy?

MR. ENRIGHT: Right.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay. My other question is somewhat hypothetical and I'm not sure whether I'm addressing it to you or to Mr. Scholten. If there were no reservations on any site, even the ones in the Comprehensive Plan that are listed there or these nine, what would that do to the Park District's ability to, you know, get the open space that they would like to have? I'm trying to understand what happens if this whole process doesn't exist.

MR. ENRIGHT: You know, we still have the ability to have the land dedicated when there is a subdivision. The Park District certainly has the ability, even without a reservation I would assume, to attempt to buy property by making offers to landowners. I mean I believe, I don't think the Park District necessarily has to have a reservation in order to take that action. Mr. Scholten may be getting different advice from their attorneys, but I don't think there is anything that the Village needs to do to allow the Park District to go ahead and try and buy property on the free market.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And from what I understand, it doesn't really give the Park District necessarily an edge. It's mainly a communication tool to say, hey, we might have an interest in this property should it be subdivided for residential purposes. It doesn't give them any real benefit beyond that?

MR. ENRIGHT: You know, I don't know how the Park District views this. They don't use eminent domain in the Village of Arlington Heights. If we were to acquire a property for a new police station or a fire station or what, you know, a public facility, you know, we can use eminent domain. We don't need a reservation to do that, but it does help us if we have a reservation on a site, if we ever had to go to court. So, there could be some legal aspect to a reservation, but it's not necessary to exercise those powers. As Mr. Scholten said, it's his understanding and certainly in the 26 years I've been here, I don't work for the Park District but it's my understanding they have never used it.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I'm kind of in the same thought as most of the Commissioners here, I don't see any material benefit that the community gets, and it looks like we've got some

potential damage that can be done to the people who own these properties. So, I don't, the balance does not seem reasonable. The Park District can get most of what they want without this entire mechanism being in place. It's been my understanding being in public policy that you don't make public policy based on rare events. You try to do it on the basis of what typically happens.

So, I would agree with Mr. Drost but I think I even have a stronger view. I'm not sure this entire mechanism needs to exist. So, I would not be in favor of adding these nine additional pieces of property.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you, Lynn. Bill, I'm probably going to ask the same question in a little different way. Let's go back to the example of the 40 lots. You've got 40 lots and by some calculation three of them would have to go to the park. So, they would be donated, those three lots would be donated by the developer? Or the Park District has to pay for those lots?

MR. ENRIGHT: They're donated because we have a Land Contribution Ordinance that requires --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Now, what if this property wasn't on the list? They still have to donate the three lots, right? They still have to donate the three lots?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. So, really what this is doing is, what this process does is it puts it on the title a notice that some land has to be given to the Park District. It puts it right on the title. Where, in Susan's case, if it wasn't on the title, it's still the requirement that when you do the investigation it would come up anyways. So, we're putting a cloud on the title but it really doesn't give the Park District any additional benefit. They've got the right anyways. Those three lots would go to the Park anyways whether or not this happens. Am I right?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes.

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

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Just one clarification, just so everyone knows the process of purchasing real estate. People don't run title until you got a contract in place. So, I'm not saying that I'm generally in favor of or opposed. I just want to make sure everyone understands, everyone is talking about this cloud on title. You get an offer, you get an acceptance, you get a contract. Then at some point thereafter, titles are run during due diligence. So, they would discover it on title at the same time they would discover it in any other situation.

So, the only other time that this would be an impact would be if you're refinancing or doing something else that

would generate or run title. In a purchase scenario, they would discover both of these at the same time. I mean, George, you might disagree with me.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, no. The other point is that if you're refinancing for instance, that may impair the value.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: That could be a concern.

COMMISSIONER DROST: It would hurt the credit facility.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'm agreeing with you there if it was refinance, yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: There's all kinds of little implications, you know, I'm going to go and borrow money but it's not as bankable with that reservation.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: It depends on how the bank would view the reservation.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: The main concern I have is that people don't seem to understand what this is. So, if it was a fairly understood type of thing placed on title that a banker or anyone would understand what it meant, I would be less concerned. But there seems to be so much confusion as to what this even is that I could see a refinance or such a situation, but I want to make sure that everyone understands. In a purchase scenario, this isn't, it's not like you walk in and first when you put an offer on the table is you run title. We're going to find this out at the same time we're running due diligence and we check with the Village and we check with zoning, and the Village is going to say, oh, this might be, check with the Park District.

This will all happen at the same time and it will impact the purchase price at that time. Believe me, whether or not this is on there, when the purchaser finds out, if they didn't know they would have to give part of it to the Park District, it's going to impact the purchase price most likely, which is always part of it when you find issues on title or you find that the Village might have some sort of reservation on a property, in a commercial deal it can impact the purchase price. So, whether or not this is on the title, to me it doesn't seem to be as much of an impact as everyone else seems to have the concern.

But my feeling is if the property owner doesn't want it on their title, fine. The people that are here that said no, fine, because the Park District still has its rights. The Park District hasn't lost anything by not getting this. But many people on this list didn't come and object, don't seem to be bothered by it. Why are we saying or some of you thinking no to the whole thing when we only have a few objectors in front of us?

So, you mentioned earlier, Bill, that in the last

round, the ones that were objected to were not approved. So, it would seem to me if we could split out, I would be comfortable in saying anyone who is not, who isn't opposed to it, I don't see any problem with it being on or not being on because I don't see it as an impact. But the ones who are opposing, I'm fine with it if you don't want it on your title. Park District doesn't need it, doesn't have to have it. Maybe not everybody feels that way, that's fine.

In full disclosure, I was raised by a park director, so I at the dinner table had discussions since childhood of condemnation, eminent domain, site reservations, park usage, you know.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And when you were done, were you listening with your brothers?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, but I'm well indoctrinated into the world of park districts. So, anyway, that's just kind of my thought is I feel that there is this feeling that we're doing these horrible things to the title. I quite frankly don't think that we are. But if people don't want them on title, Park District still has its right, I don't think we should put it on the title.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Bill, let me ask one more question. If this was on the title, if this was recorded as was being recommended, and the land is sold, the Park District, let me finish now, if the land is sold, the Park District gets that notification because they're on the list. But if this is not on the list and the land is sold, the Park District necessarily doesn't get notified? Is that the only difference?

MR. ENRIGHT: That's not, none of that is correct. If the land has a reservation on it and it gets sold from the property owner who owns it now to someone else, we know nothing about it. We only become involved, meaning the Village, if a developer comes in and presents a subdivision plan. That's when we notify the Park District.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: If it's on the list.

MR. ENRIGHT: Even if it's --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Whether it's on the list or not?

MR. ENRIGHT: If there's a reservation there, we will notify the Park District. If it's not, we typically don't, but there are other ways for us to monitor that.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: But that's my point. If it's not on the list, they don't get that notification. That seems to be the only difference.

MR. ENRIGHT: That's how these have proceeded in the past. But you know, we do have access to Park District's plans, too, to know whether or not they are interested in a site. But that could change over time, I mean people come and go. But you know, it's just a notice to everyone involved, developers, property owners, that the Park District has an interest in either making a fair market value offer for

the whole site or receiving land dedication as part of a subdivision project.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Let me ask one other question. Are we at a point in your presentation where we can take a motion or do you need to make further presentations?

MR. ENRIGHT: No, I think it's okay to split tonight's into three different categories. I think you can make a motion on this one element of your motion sheet, it's the last sentence, to recommend either approval or denial of the park site reservations. I think you can just separate that out so that everybody don't have to stick around if they don't want to for the other two elements.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Any further questions?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Can I just clarify what you just said?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: This whole evening I thought that I understood that regardless of whether or not there is a reservation, the Park District will get noticed if there is a development. But now what you just said is no, they won't get noticed. They might get notice, we might check with them but there is no requirement to do so.

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, if there is a reservation, that's when we notify them. If there isn't, they don't necessarily know about it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Then they might not know about it and --

MR. ENRIGHT: Then they get the fee instead of land.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Then they don't have the rights. So, they don't have the rights without this is what you're saying?

MR. ENRIGHT: Not necessarily. I mean --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Well, yes or no. I mean you might say it's common courtesy.

MR. ENRIGHT: When you say we're taking away the rights, the answer to that is no. But do they know about what's happening if there is no reservation, not necessarily either. But that doesn't necessarily take away their rights. They could know about a project, if you recall the process, like any citizen and write to the Village and say, hey, we're interested in receiving, you know. We let them know when there's a cash contribution involved, we inform them of that, too.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, they will or will not have opportunity before it's too late to speak up? That's what I'm not understanding.

MR. ENRIGHT: Let me answer it clearly, because apparently I haven't. If there is a reservation, we inform them. If there is not, we do not.



COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, they would be left to monitoring the public process, right, for notices and signs going up?

MR. ENRIGHT: That's right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: If there was, at some point you said you would notify them if they were receiving money in lieu?

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, they eventually find out about it because we inform them that they're, because they do a lot of planning, for planning.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But at that point, it's too late down the process is what you're saying.

MR. ENRIGHT: Oftentimes, yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, to follow up on that, it seems to me we could actually put in some kind of a protocol for cooperation that people would, that staffs would follow, the two staffs would communicate without having to go through this unnecessary thing that really doesn't yield as much benefit, and obviously people feel there is some harm there. I just don't see any reason to add a rigamarole, you know, in this process when you could do it, whether it's formally or informally between the two staffs.

MR. ENRIGHT: We could certainly, just as a policy, any subdivision send notice to the Park District. We don't really get that many now these days.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: If that's the first time they're going to hear about it either way, then why put this in your plan, you've got this plan and allow these sites to be restricted?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But the problem is we have to vote tonight without that policy being in place. So, I mean you've been very vocal of your opinion, I don't know that that will sway you, I'm not saying that. But I think we have to be clear that there is currently no policy in place. There might be a suggestion that they will put a policy in place and I don't doubt that they would if we ask them to, absolutely they would, but there isn't one now and we have to vote without one in existence.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, if this were a very common event happening frequently like once a month or once every six months, I might feel a little differently. But you said it's a rare event. So, I think you'll be able to get a protocol in place before the event occurs would be my guess.

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, and that's a decision that our department can make. It doesn't require any higher body to tell us to do something, that's correct. Just like we didn't have to notify the public of these reservations, we did, and that was a Staff decision, Planning Department decision. So, that can be easily accommodated.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Does somebody want to make a

motion?

COMMISSIONER DROST: **I'll make the motion, yes, that we deny the park side reservation portion of the Comprehensive Plan.**

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. How does this work if someone wants to make a comment --

MR. ENRIGHT: You have to call for discussion on the motion, and then you have to either ask for reconsideration or you have to take a vote on the motion. Then if it fails, then someone can make another motion.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: All right, so we have a second?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I second, yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: We have a motion and a second to deny the park site reservations.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: I agree partially, George, but just to exempt the ones that are rejected for this and leave the other ones who have not objected onto the list.

MR. ENRIGHT: I can clarify who has objected in writing. 214, High School District 214 which involves Hersey High School and Forest View Educational Center, the Christian Liberty Academy is not only in writing but present here, St. Viator High School and the Viatory Novitiate who wrote a letter and they may be here, I'm not sure if, who these gentlemen are, and Mr. Grandt from 406 East Northwest Highway, and I believe the president of the Toyota Manufacturing might be here or representatives of, although they didn't testify or write a letter but they are here as well. So, the only entity that's not here for many of these, as far as I know, there may be, is the East Rockwell Property and St. Peter. There is someone?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I think it's a bad idea to exempt people that are here from those that aren't here.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I would certainly agree with Commissioner Drost. I think that you either, you know, it's all or nothing and for me it would be nothing.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I have the comment I would actually go a step further. I think, you know, I haven't said much here but, you know, I think that there are processes in place for residential development and subdivisions for Park District to get land dedication or fees and get appropriate notice through processes developed between the District and the development process. I would I think echo a lot of my colleagues here in that I am not in favor of the site reservation and I would agree with Mr. Drost that I'm not in favor of carving out specific sites for folks that may be mis-understanding or lack of wherewithal to, you know, come and attend. I'd probably go a step further and say the sites that have been reserved in the original Comprehensive Plan that are in there that aren't part of

the Park District, I actually, I feel like it's either one way or the other and not just the new properties coming in would I carve out, I would carve out any property in the original list that's not already under the control of the Park District and take that out of the Comprehensive Plan because I think what we're voting on here is, is this the appropriate policy or not. It either is or it isn't for all these properties that aren't under Park District control.

So, I would vote to deny adding them to the site reservation for the District's request, and I would add removing the site reservations that were in the '97 plan that aren't under the Park District's control already.

MR. ENRIGHT: For the maker of the motion, Commissioner Drost would have to accept the amendment.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I would have to amend it to include the '97 reservations.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: How could we possibly make that decision tonight without any of that information before us?

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Right.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: It's the same information.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, it's not the same information.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Different sites but --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: You don't even know the list of the sites.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I have them right here in front of me.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'm very, very much opposed to going back without that discussion.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I think it's simple just to deal with --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: We can bring that discussion in another time.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Let's just vote on George's recommendation.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I have one comment. I think one thing, Commissioner Dawson, from what you said, one thing that the Park District loses in this is possibly notice when the property goes for sale. But this might not -- like you say if somebody researches the deed and finds out that this is on there. But if they are interested in buying the property, they might lose notice to that. There might be another buyer and you'll have the authority to go and --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Does the site reservation give them any other notice?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I don't know, possibly. But I

think if they're interested in a property, what they should do is go to owners and say if you ever sell this property we'd be interested. So, under that condition --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But I think you're talking about two different things. You're talking about we're now going to buy the whole property and be part of the bidding process, or whether or not part of the reservation as been stated earlier is just so that they might get a portion of that. Then they're letting the Village know that they might not want, they want to be asked whether or not they want money or land.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Whether they have the reservation or not, if there is a subdivision for residence, they're going to get their fee or land one way or the other.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: No.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Unless, without the reservation, the Village makes that decision for them.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Right, without notifying them.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Without telling them until it's too late.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: But that's handled in the procedure.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, no, that's fine. We're just clarifying what is being said because that's not correct. I mean to me, when you look at this list, these are very high profile places. It would not be surprising to me, I mean it would be very surprising to me if the Park District would miss this, miss that Hersey High School is up for sale, that St. Peter is up for sale, that Forest View is up for sale. These are very high profile. Well, Grandt's, you know, I mean I live right by you, I use you and my children were in your daughter's preschool, so you know. But all I'm saying is that they already have that area under watch because there is already this watch. So, I don't see anything on here that they would miss or that would put an undue burden on the Park District to have to monitor these sites.

If we're going back and we're saying never, ever, ever again any site possible in the entire community, they have to start driving around looking for signs, that to me is too much of a burden for the Park District. But these are high profile sites. Other than this one small little area, I would be surprised if they would miss it if they went up for sale.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Mr. Enright, correct me if I'm wrong, did I hear wrong that you stated if the property is subdivided for residential, the Park District is going to get its fee in lieu of or its land no matter what if it's subdivided, they're going to get it?

MR. ENRIGHT: That's right. No matter what.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: If that property is sold. So,

they don't have --

MR. ENRIGHT: Not if it's sold, if it's subdivided and that subdivision is approved and houses are built.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right, they're going to get that fee in lieu of or land dedication.

MR. ENRIGHT: That's right.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, they're not losing that. What they're losing is the possibility of getting notice if the property is for sale and they have an option to --

MR. ENRIGHT: The reservation doesn't give them any notice of a property for sale. They may or may not ever know about that because it's between two private properties.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, they actually might not be losing anything.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, not necessarily.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: If we're looking at this, I think the only one they would lose would be the East Rockwell property because I don't see a half-acre site being subdivided. So, they wouldn't be notified or the Park District wouldn't gain anything out of that, correct? It's only if it's a subdivided development?

MR. ENRIGHT: Right, and that's largely I think true, what you're saying.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But keep in mind, wait, what you're saying is not correct. If you're in the purchase process, if there is a reservation, then before the contract is finalized there is a discussion with the Park District and the Park District is able to come into play. But if there is not a reservation, the Park District might see a sign, they might be able to call the Village and they might need to say we want a piece. But if they had any interest in the parcel itself, they would be too late at that point to engage in that.

Now, that being said, as been stated up here, they could talk to property owners and say, hey, we've always liked your property, if you ever sold we'd like to be a part of that. But they would not be able to, they'd be too late for them to purchase the entire parcel at that point if their reservation is not there under the current.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I agree.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, just, again, I'm not trying to sway anyone's vote, I just want to make sure everyone understands how the purchase process works.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: If we could, just for clarification, what is it that they get if the reservation is in place? When do they get notification so they could make a bid for the entire property?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Well, if they run the title, if they're waiting until they run the title, if they're not telling them up front when a purchaser comes in or if the potential purchaser before the contract doesn't get finalized hasn't contacted the Village, they wouldn't find out until title process.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Which happens after a contract is signed you said earlier.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Except that with the reservation, my understanding would be that the Park District could come in and say we'll match your offer and we'll buy that property and would have that right to undermine, that's the wrong word, but they would have that right to be involved in that process.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: I think that question is for Bill to answer that question.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Is that not correct, Bill?

MR. ENRIGHT: I'd like to restate they do not have the right of refusal.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: It's not a right of first refusal, it's a right to say can we match this price and can we be part --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: That's a right of first refusal.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, can we match this price and be part of the conversation. They can't do that under this general due diligence. It's too late.

MR. ENRIGHT: Now, I'm not so sure any government agency is going to get involved when there's a private contract already negotiated between two parties because that can be a problem for legal liability I would think.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Well, I don't know, I mean I'm not trying to say that they could force it. I think that the idea is so that they could come in to the conversation at that point, that they would be open to it.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Can we go and take the roll call vote on George's, Commissioner Drost's recommendation?

MR. ENRIGHT: Mr. Drost recommended denial, Commissioner Jensen had seconded just to remind you. So, Chairman, you asked for a roll call vote, so I'll start with Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, with comment.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. ENRIGHT: And Chairman Lorenzini.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: My comment just for the record is that I would ask that you do consider a policy to be put in place, that there be more communication between the Village and the Park District when you become aware of these developments.

MR. ENRIGHT: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, that wraps it up. Thank you.

MR. ENRIGHT: Just as a point of record, this will be forwarded to the Village Board at one of their September meetings, probably September 15th, it might be October, so I don't know for sure.

You'll have to contact me a few days prior, the Friday prior to September 15th or the Friday prior to the first Monday in October whenever that is.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: This is just a recommendation to the Board of Trustees, the Trustees have final approval.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Bill, Commissioner Cherwin made what I think is a, raised a topic that probably deserves some discussion with further development from probably the Staff getting Board additional information. There's been a lot of discussion about this whole process and there's a lot of things on the books, and as I understood it what you would have done is basically put it before us that we could even go back and kind of rescind what had been done earlier in that 1997 Comprehensive Plan. I think whether it's at the upcoming meeting of the Board that takes this up or the subsequent meeting, I really think that topic needs to be addressed, and I would certainly encourage Staff to do the work to focus and frame that issue so the Board can take a look at it whether this policy makes any sense at all.

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, we will do that.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Don't we have a next presentation you want to make?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes. Also part of the Village's Comprehensive Plan is the future land use map which is purely an advisory document. It has no force of law whatsoever. It is not a cloud on the title. Basically, a future land use map is what the Village would like to see down the road for parcels of property in the

Village.

There are several parcels where the zoning doesn't quite match up with the Comprehensive Plan. In fact, the Comprehensive Plan in some of these cases shows more restrictive designation which again is just advisory than the zoning which is the force of law, which is how the property is regulated. In my letter to the property owners that could be impacted by these changes, I indicated that there is no change in the zoning, so you could still use the land as is irrespective of the future land use map. In some cases, it's actually a benefit to some property owners that changing the land use map will then indicate that the Village may be interested in these property owners coming to the Village to rezone their property to a higher use.

So, having said that, there is, I'll just quickly go through some of the proposed amendments in the land use map. One is up at the Bob Rohrman site, a lot of that is being developed for auto use. It's zoned currently Manufacturing, that would stay. We're recommending going to Commercial for that middle piece that used to be a warehouse building, it's still there. Then also next to it, there's a daycare center, which more appropriately would be if it became commercial. So, these are just aeriels.

There's a couple of parcels south of Dundee Road where they're commercially developed but are showing Office on the Comp Plan. We'd like to just change that to Commercial to match up the uses. A couple more properties over and by Buffalo Grove High School on Dundee, again they're showing as Office, yet they're developed and zoned for Commercial.

There are some properties on Arthur Avenue, on the east side of Arthur that are Manufacturing on the Comprehensive Plan, which again is just advisory. They are zoned Manufacturing, we're not changing that. We do recommend changing the Comp Plan for these parcels from Manufacturing to Commercial because a lot of the properties in there are auto-related uses which would be allowed in a Commercial Zoning District in addition to other uses beyond auto. It would require the property owners to come in and petition the Village for rezoning so it's not a guarantee, but it could allow for property owners to seek rezoning to a higher use like B-3, which is a commercial use that allows auto repair plus other retail businesses. So, again, the change in the Comp Plan here doesn't change the use of land, but it would require further action initiated by a property owner, and it's still no guarantee.

There's a couple of properties south of Central, the one up here kind of the north portion, it's currently designated as Office, yet it's zoned B-1 Commercial. So, we're recommending just matching the Comp Plan with the underlying zoning. Then further south,



there are some office buildings across from Dryden, former Dryden School, it's 25 administrative building on the east side of Arlington Heights Road. Those are office buildings and zoned that way but they're showing as Commercial on the Comp Plan. We're recommending changing that to Office to reflect the uses.

Then the STAR Line area adjacent to this lot of industrial property, changing that to Mixed Use from Industria, again it's all zoned, for the most part a lot of these properties are zoned Manufacturing. We're not changing that. There's a couple that are zoned Commercial. We're not changing that. There is a Comprehensive Plan that was approved in 2009 for this area to potentially redevelop if there was ever a new Metra train line within the right-of-way of I90, which is now being expanded. It hasn't met the warrants yet in my understanding, and it really doesn't have funding, so it's something that may happen down the road but probably quite a bit down the road.

Hopefully I'm not speaking inaccurately, Chairman Lorenzini, you have a little more knowledge on this, but the idea here is the STAR Line Master Plan that was approved is a vision for the area to redevelop for higher intensity uses. Changing the Comp Plan to Mixed Use would mirror up with that. But the zoning would remain and the uses would be allowed under that current zoning.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: As usual, Bill, you are correct.

MR. ENRIGHT: Okay. Then the last piece is the Arlington Downs. It's not part of the Arlington Downs site, it's an office building that's actually zoned Commercial. We're recommending changing that to Mixed Use because a lot of that area is going Mixed Use, which does allow commercial or offices. So, it's to kind of get away from the old plan, which had a lot of spotty Comp Plan designations and make it more cohesive. Again, it doesn't affect how you can use your property because we're not doing anything to the zoning.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Bill, is that that strip center?

MR. ENRIGHT: No, it's the office building just west of the strip center.

So, if you want to make a separate motion on this as well, you can, and then we'll have maybe a third motion on the whole Comprehensive Plan material we haven't gotten to yet.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Any questions from the audience? Yes, sir. Would you come up, state your name, spell it please, and your address?

#### **QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE**

MR. OLSON: Yes. My name is Len Olson. I'm the owner of Ageless Furniture Restoration on Arthur Avenue.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: S-o-n or s-e-n.

MR. OLSON: O-n, Swedish. And as many people that live out there know, I've been on Arthur for 13 years. I recently moved last year down the block by 53 from that store -- I've been trying to move for about five years. I was looking for a facility that I could move in to. I talked to the Planning. The problem came in because of the old description of a furniture repair facility, I am restricted to the only place I could have my business is on Arthur Avenue. There was one other spot which I forgot where it was, but I believe it was over by 90, by the tollway, which wouldn't work for me anyway. Right now, I kind of enjoy where I'm at.

But if I retired and sold my business, this would be a little bit restriction on me. Now, the zoning regulations for Arlington Heights is anything that has to do with furniture, whether it's cleaning, upholstery, or anything like that is only allowed on Arthur Avenue. So, if you change it to Commercial from Manufacturing, it will eliminate a spot for me in Arlington Heights.

So, I'm getting the indication that that's not true which I'm glad to hear. I wish I would have known five years ago, and they did offer to find me a spot at one point and reusing some of the rules. We did have one location in Arlington that moved an upholstery, but it came after the fact. So, I just wanted to get clarification if you were going to vote on that today to zone me out for future or recommend that, I think to reconsider that.

Arthur Avenue for Arlington Heights has already been the industrial lot for Arlington. Everybody knows Arthur Avenue for that reason. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Bill, do you have any comment on that?

MR. ENRIGHT: We're not changing the zoning, so you won't be zoned out. All this is is a future land use map, which is potential zoning down the road. But that would have to come from you, so you would have to petition us to ask for that zoning change if you thought that made sense for you to allow for more commercial type uses there, say if you did want to sell it. But we're not changing the zoning, so you can continue to operate under the current zoning because that's not changing.

MR. OLSON: But once it gets zoned to Commercial --

MR. ENRIGHT: It's not going to be zoned Commercial. You would have to ask us to do that.

MR. OLSON: But you are recommending that it go to Commercial.

MR. ENRIGHT: Not at this point. We're recommending that the land use plan be changed to allow for the possibility of people coming in to us and asking for it. But it would be a property-

by-property basis. So, if you chose to not rezone your property, then it wouldn't be rezoned. If someone else on Arthur came in and said they wanted to, we can then consider that for their property but not for yours, you would have to ask for it. If you don't, then we won't.

MR. OLSON: Okay. I won't. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Anybody else from the public who have a comment? Yes, ma'am. State your name, spell it please, and your address.

MS. KOZINSKI: Nancy Kozinski, K-o-z-i-n-s-k-i, and I am with NLRP, 425 Algonquin. We are the owners of the industrial building that's impacted by kind of the STAR Line right there. I just want to go on record that we're an interested party in this and we'll continue to monitor. Bill has been great keeping us up to date, but you know, we'll certainly monitor to see if it impacts our property. So, that's all. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you. Anybody else from the public? Okay, now we'll close the public comment portion. Commissioners, any comments, questions? Do we have a motion or a recommendation?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: What's the motion on this one?

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, it would be the second component of the motion that's on your desk, the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: **I make a motion to approve the amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map.**

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Roll call vote please.

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes. Let me get glasses on again, although I do know who each of you are. Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Chairman Lorenzini.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Yes. Okay, again this is a

recommendation to the Board of Trustees, they get final approval of this.

The last part of this, Bill, do you want to make that presentation?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes. This would be the Comprehensive Plan itself, the document. Let me pull it up here. As Chairman Drost of the Subcommittee mentioned earlier, since September of last year, the Subcommittee has been meeting to discuss the 1997 Comprehensive Plan booklet. Let me just pull this down so you can see the full page. With this, the first five sections include the introduction --

COMMISSIONER DROST: What was the salary?

MR. ENRIGHT: Pardon?

COMMISSIONER DROST: What was the salary for attending the meeting?

MR. ENRIGHT: You didn't get paid for any of that, but I think you get 15 bucks per meeting.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Okay, I'm just want to make sure everybody knows.

MR. ENRIGHT: I get a little more but --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: How many get told before that.

MR. ENRIGHT: Anyway, the first probably five sections are really updates to the statistical sections, the demographics, the housing and populations, the goals and objectives. One thing about the goals and objectives is we did make some modifications to the '97 Plan to reflect other documents where goals and objectives have been updated over the years so everything is consistent.

There have been three sections added for the first time to our Comprehensive Plan that we've never had before. One is on Historic Preservation. This section kind of plays off, the School of Art Institute did a survey of some of the older areas, historical areas of Arlington Heights. We don't have any designated Historic Districts, but the study alluded to the possibility of the Village designating Conservation Districts, and that's outlined on page 55 of the Comprehensive Plan.

So, those Conservation Districts basically, again, they aren't a cloud on the title or anything like that, it's just saying these are special areas in town and we may want to study them further to try and preserve some of these homes or areas of homes. A couple of the areas that we want to do a little more detailed study that weren't done as part of the Art Institute are on page 56 which would be referred to as Stonegate and Scarsdale Subdivisions. There's also some strategies that we'd recommend for the future in terms of our residential neighborhoods. Those are indicated on this page here, 58:

Continue to require Design Commission review of homes within these historic areas. We do that now, although adding in

the Stonegate and the Scarsdale neighborhoods would, not codify it but putting it as a policy document here with the Comp Plan.

Designate these areas as Neighborhood Conservation Districts. If we do that as part of the Comprehensive Plan tonight, then we would further evaluate Stonegate and Scarsdale and have to come back to the Plan Commission to see if you wanted to designate them as well. What that would mean is we would just further review these areas one by one and, you know, look at various options to protect the architecture. If new additions are made, we might want to have specific design guidelines for these areas, or we might want to change some of the zoning regulations to better fit with these specific neighborhoods because as you all know, our zoning districts, one size does not fit all because we have so many different neighborhoods in town.

So, these are the types of things we would want to look at. The Board may also want to discuss the possibility of historic designations although that was discussed a few years ago, and because of the potential impact on staffing, it was decided not to pursue that. But we think it's important and the Subcommittee felt it's important to have our architectural heritage as a major component of the plan.

The other section added in is on Corridors. We have several corridors in town that we'd like to study individually as a separate document from the Comp Plan. But this sets forth these corridors as priority areas to be individual subsequent studies that would come from the Plan Commission and the Village Board in the future. The Subcommittee has prioritized these areas on the maps and one of these areas on Rand Road we've already started to look at, making aesthetic improvements and better visibility and signage and so forth.

Northwest Highway, we're also actually starting to look at for enhanced landscaping because there's pockets where there is either dead or dying landscaping. But the whole idea of the Corridor section is to identify corridors that are important to the Village and identify key issues, and to then subsequently do individual studies for each of these to improve the appearance of the Village. But it will also look at land uses, too, whether or not there should be any land use changes to these corridors in terms of future possible development.

The last new section is on Sustainability. The Village has never had a sustainable section in our Comprehensive Plan. This brings it to everybody's attention that we want to encourage sustainable development. It outlines some of the practices for good sustainable development. It's not a requirement to do sustainable development, but it is a policy that will set forth certain actions to look at trying to achieve more sustainable development throughout the

Village.

There's a series of goals and actions on land use, transportation, and housing on pages 83 and 84 that would set a guide for Staff to start looking into and encourage --

COMMISSIONER DROST: There's no reference to Chapter 21 of the UN resolutions here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, I'm not sure what that is.

COMMISSIONER DROST: All right, just to make that clear. It's not hidden in there, guys.

MR. ENRIGHT: In Chapter 7, we included Public Input where we did a study survey of about 16 questions. I just summarized a few, the key ones here, but the full survey was presented online with our Novus System on the Village website. Anyway, we did a survey in April and sent out a lot of notices, e-mail blasts, Facebook blasts, Twitters, and informed the Park District and the Chamber of Commerce and the Senior Center and the Library. As of a couple of weeks ago, we had 535 responses to the survey, which I thought was really exceptional. Really, what it did is it gave us a good idea or a gauge on what's important to the community.

What's interesting is that sustainability and improving our corridors and historic preservation all rated very highly in people's minds in their responses to the survey because they were given, you know, it could say is this important, somewhat important, very important, not important, and we got a lot of positive feedback and we kind of summarized those results. What's interesting is we say for 535 out of 75,000, it was mostly Arlington Heights residents, so we have 99 percent Arlington Heights residents, which is good. You know, the survey, I monitored it and even, you know, after about 250 surveys versus the 535, the numbers didn't change. So, we got a very good sample size here I think.

So, I think if 20,000 people answered it, I think we can probably find very similar results. So, I think the survey was a good way of garnering public input. We got a lot of comments from people, you know, just additional free comments, and some of them were very appreciative of being able to participate in this manner through an online survey. So, I thought that was very successful, too.

The Comprehensive Plan Subcommittee has recommended approval of this plan to the full Plan Commission. So, I'd open the floor up to the Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay. Do the public have any comments? Yes, sir. Please come forward, state your name, spell it, address please.

MR. JUFFA: My name is Juergen Juffa, J-u-e-r-g-e-n J-u-f-f-a. For the sake of full disclosure, I'm also a Commissioner on the Village's Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission. First of all,

I would like to congratulate the Village Staff and the Subcommittee on the excellent work on this revised Comp Plan. However, from the perspective of a cycling advocate, I think that some of the transportation goals and policies mentioned in this revised plan could be further enhanced to better reflect other policies and procedures that the Village has set elsewhere.

Chairman Lorenzini, is it acceptable if I just pass out quickly what I have prepared? Because I think that's much easier for you to follow along.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Sure. Bill, while he's doing that, this plan could always be updated because this is a living document, right?

MR. ENRIGHT: To address your question, the transportation, everything that's outlined in this Comp Plan before are simply taken from the recently adopted by the Village Board of Trustees Transportation and Thoroughfare Policy Plan which was done a couple of years ago. That was adopted, it was recommended for adoption by the Plan Commission and the Village Board adopted that document. So, the language that's in this document that you're looking at tonight, the Comprehensive Plan, just mirrors what the Village Board just recently approved.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Go ahead please.

MR. JUFFA: So, to make this more specific, I believe one of the goals for the Village is that we become a bicycle-friendly community. I think the strategic plans of the Comprehensive Plan should mention that as number 10 on the Thoroughfare and Transportation Goals as to achieve bicycle-friendly status as designated by the League of American Bicyclists is one of the goals of the Village.

The Thoroughfare and Transportation policy, the Village has adopted a Complete Streets Policy in June 2013. I would find it extremely appropriate if actually the core sentence from this policy becomes the over-arching theme on the Thoroughfare and Transportation Policy, and it reads, "to create a comprehensive, integrated, and connected network of transportation options for all modes of conveyance designed and operated to enable appropriate access for all users." I think these are the true core proposals that I would like the Commission to consider.

On page 42, Transportation, I believe for a strategic plan and for a visionary community like Arlington Heights, it would be appropriate to include the greater use of public and active transportation as one of the measures how we can achieve our transportation goals.

The corridor plans were of high interest to me. I believe again that in objection 3, it would be appropriate if the complete street policy that was previously adopted by the Village Board

of Trustees be a reference because that best describes how traffic circulation systems in this Village should function in the future.

As far as specific corridors are concerned, I believe it is noteworthy that the Northwest Highway Corridor is a regional bikeway corridor as designated by the Northwest Municipal Conference, which is a conference that the Village participates in and has done substantial planning on.

Lastly, on Public Improvements, page 73, I believe it is once again appropriate to say that the corridors should be redesigned according to the Village's complete streets policy. That concludes my comments.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Okay, thank you. Bill, any comments on this?

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, this is the first I've seen of this, so it hasn't given me any opportunity to really evaluate this to be able to give you any sort of advice on whether or not these things should be incorporated. I will say though that the Thoroughfare and Transportation Plan was vetted through the public process that included review by the Engineering Department. So, and I know that the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Commission has their own policy plan which is kind of an adjunct to the Comprehensive Plan which I believe they're in the process of updating. I don't know if it's been fully updated or not, I think they're still working on it.

But correct me if I'm wrong, has that been approved yet?

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Why don't you, if you want to make a comment, please come forward.

MR. SZABO: Sure.

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

MR. SZABO: My name is Peter Szabo. I'm also on the Commission, I'm the chairman. My last name is spelled S-z-a-b-o.

The comment I'll make is that, yes, it is still being developed. We have publicized the existing conditions report, which I think would be a great document for the Plan Commission to review if you haven't already. We also, with the help of CMAP, Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning, conducted a survey and we had over 1,000 respondents. So, I think that could also reflect on the Comprehensive Plan. I'd also like to echo anything that my colleague Juergen just said.

Did you have questions about the Bike & Pedestrian Plan?

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Not at this point, thank you.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I have one question. What do you mean by all modes of conveyance? Segways, skateboards? I'm being



extreme. That's a pretty all inclusive part.

MR. SZABO: Yes, it is. That's a term that's used often by the League of American Bicyclists, League of Illinois Bicyclists, and other advocacy organizations. But the idea is to, wherever appropriate and legal, make it safe for all these modes of transportation to exist and be used as fairways.

COMMISSIONER DROST: On 606 Trail, that's sort of multi-use there, too.

MR. SZABO: It is.

COMMISSIONER DROST: It uses, you can get in on skates on there.

MR. SZABO: Right, that's a great example of a linear park, and they do have a divided line through the center. They have a sort of softer walking pad to the right and it's separated as mentioned in your Comp Plan from motor vehicle traffic. An example of an opportunity for that which we discussed in our commission is the ComEd right-of-way. It would be entirely separated from motor vehicle traffic, but it only crosses at seven points and it would connect Palatine, Prospect Heights and the Lake Arlington bike trail and the park.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Now, Bill, when we define vehicular, does that include --

MR. ENRIGHT: It doesn't include bicycles. It's motorized other than human power if we're going by the Illinois definition.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Any other questions from the Commissioners? Or anybody else in the audience? Anybody else who has a question? Okay. Commissioners, any questions?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, I just have two. One being having bike-friendly communities, bicycle-friendly community status by the League of American Bicyclists, is that something that's been adopted at all in the Village and is that something you're familiar with?

MR. ENRIGHT: I don't know, I'm not familiar with it.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, because I've seen the whole list of standards right now, but I'm not sure if anyone here is familiar with it.

MR. ENRIGHT: Right.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: The second would be in reference to the complete streets as well, which is something that is entitled Village's Complete Streets Policy. Is that something that's enforced right now, Mr. Enright? It says that, all that are effected by applying the Village's Complete Streets Policy. Is that something that we've already agreed to as a village?

MR. ENRIGHT: It's my understanding that, yes, but I'd

have to, you know, double check with Engineering. I think what that means is whenever there's a transportation improvement, you try and accommodate alternate modes of transportation so it's just not vehicular. So, that's built with, you know, safer pedestrian and bicyclists.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay. That would be my two points of, you know, uncertainty because it sounds like the complete streets is maybe one that's already been vetted. I'm not sure the bicycle-friendly community would be a new standard that we'd be calling ourselves in that we might not fully understand it.

MR. SZABO: So, the bicycle-friendly community application, it's really just an outside organization that the Village would present itself to essentially. We have applied for it once previously and it's not setting forth any guidelines for the community, but rather they provide examples of other communities that have invested in, you know, separated bike lanes or improvements in pedestrian crossings of major streets. By making those improvements in the community, they would recognize that and publicize Arlington Heights as a community that maybe takes special measures to make the community safe for those other modes of transportation.

The reason we think it's of value is because communities that do attain even the lowest bronze level of recognition do see an improvement in property values and people moving to the community because of, not because of the status necessarily, but because of what gains the status.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Can I ask a question? I'm confused as to why this kind of information didn't go to the Subcommittee. This has been in the works for a while, because quite frankly to bring it to the full Plan Commission at this point gives me trouble. I even have trouble voting on it even though I want to go on the record saying I am in favor of letting us be a bicycle-friendly community. I am not in favor of that being the rationale for imposing a tax on people who come before us and petition things, and I've spoken at length about that.

I think we should do everything to be bicycle-friendly. But you're asking us to basically approve things referencing other documents that we've never seen. We have no idea what the standards are as Commissioner Cherwin pointed out. So, I'd have trouble taking any action on this, and I come back to what I opened with, why wasn't the material given earlier? We have an 11-month process going on to redo the Comprehensive Plan. It's kind of a huge imposition to try to bring it here tonight as we're trying to deal with something we've actually had a chance to read.

MR. SZABO: Sure. The Complete Streets Policy was adopted by the Village Board in 2013. So, that's been on the books

for --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: That's not the question. That may have been on the books but we have a Subcommittee that was working on that and this material, probably all good, maybe it should all be included just the way that you brought it up before the Commission. However, to bring it before a commission and ask us when we haven't had a chance to actually review it and Staff hasn't gone through and seen where all the references are is really not an appropriate thing at this point. I have trouble voting on that.

MR. SZABO: I apologize. Had there been other public hearings before this?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Bill, were all the other commissions notified of this process and given a chance to input?

MR. ENRIGHT: No, because this process is the Plan Commission.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I'm sorry, that just clarifies for --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'm just trying to understand why because I have trouble dealing with something that --

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes, but I don't think --

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Well, anyway, I think, we appreciate you coming. This is great stuff, I'm glad we have it. Maybe it didn't work out right, but there's nothing that says we can't add this in the future. We don't have to vote on it now. So, let's give Bill a chance to look at it. This is a living document, it's not like this is the end forever, so let's let Bill look at it and go from there.

Now, does anybody else have any specific questions about his presentation?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I'm sorry, I just want to speak on, a question on that. Do we have to wait for the next complete round? Or can we as a Plan Commission, say two meetings from now, we would like to discuss and add this to the Comprehensive Plan?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, we can do it any time, we don't have to wait 17 years. Just for the record, I was looking at my phone to look up if we have Complete Streets on our website, so I wasn't texting someone or anything. Yes, this could be taken up at any time by the Plan Commission as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

I think what I'd like to see is, you know, what happens first with the Bike Commission's Plan that they're working on and see what happens with that through the Village Board. If the Village Board approves that plan and it includes some of these items, then we can follow up with our Comprehensive Plan and mimic that.

MR. SZABO: So, the Complete Streets Plan which the Board did approve, is that something that could be considered added to,

or could be considered to be added to the Comprehensive Plan at this point?

MR. ENRIGHT: At some point but, if they want to add it tonight they can but --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Well, just to clarify, if we were to approve this as is, no. But if we were to wait, have comments, have more --

MR. ENRIGHT: I'm highly recommending that we review their request for the future. It won't wait 17 years. I don't know all these elements because I haven't had a chance to look at it until tonight and it doesn't get me an opportunity to review this and discuss it with Engineering and to also review what they are going through the process right now through their committee.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: So, does anybody else --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, we would not then approve at this time, correct?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: No, we can approve the Comprehensive Plan but not make an amendment to include these items to that Comprehensive Plan.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But we would potentially amend it further --

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: In the future, yes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: -- in the future, which could be two months from now.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Correct.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Or it could be next week.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I have other questions about the plan not related to the Bicycle also.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Well, let's close the public portion and then we'll go, thank you, Mr. Szabo. So, let's go for the questions from the Commissioners. Jay, were you done?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Well, if we're talking about the plan as a whole, I guess I have two points of questions that I'll start with. One was about the historic preservation. Is that something through the process that, I don't live in the area on the south side, Bill, but is it the HANA, the Historical Association in Arlington Heights? Is that what they call it?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay. Has that group, because I think that's really where their focus is, exactly where you're looking to put this. Is that group involved in this process and what has been the general cooperation?

MR. ENRIGHT: Not at this point because there is, you know, this is just guidance to start the process. So, what we want to do is if the Village Board ultimately approves this, we would then

start working with these neighborhoods on ideas to potentially preserve their neighborhood or changes or there may be specific design guidelines for these neighborhoods because they're all a little different.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Okay. The other question I guess I had generally was, this has been brought up in the last few meetings and I know I've been beating on it probably a little bit and making it maybe sound that worse, but just on when we talk about infrastructure improvements and everything, you know, the issue around data and cell towers and developments like that. Not that we have to come up with a map but I know one of the things I've been saying is I'd like to see some thought, maybe a goal or two in terms of what the balancing would be in building out information infrastructure potentially. Not specifics but just so that it could come up as an understanding that, you know, what are the goals and what we have to balance when we look at land use decisions on information infrastructure. Because I think, it's not that it's going to be evolving so quickly, we probably can't get many details around this is exactly what we're going to do, but it's going to be coming up more and more.

If you look at sort of the intended build-out of that industry, those types of requests that we've seen over the last few months I think are just going to escalate. I would like to have some discussion about it and maybe some general guidance that would give us some framework to make those decisions.

COMMISSIONER DROST: If I can pipe in, those are good points. In fact, what we tried to do is, on looking at these corridors, to look at sort of the aesthetics and to, for instance, the utility lines that you see and the towers, you know, sort of that visual blight to find ways to remedy that.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I think we had a good exercise in the last meeting with Verizon, that's going to be a big part of an overall plan. I believe that's what we're also recommending.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Coordination of those particular uses and with data.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, I would appreciate it, and that's why I think you guys are doing a great job thinking through how to improve our corridors, and it's all for naught if, you know, a 75 or 100-foot monopole goes up in the middle of a corridor that you're trying to improve with landscaping. That's all I have at this time. Thank you. Nice work.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: In the Chair's absence, Commissioner Sigalos, do you have any questions?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I really don't have any questions. I was part of the Subcommittee for this Comprehensive Plan and I just want to commend the Deputy Director, Bill, you've done a tremendous job with this. I think the whole process of preparing this and explaining it tonight, explaining it to everybody, and I really commend all your efforts. So, thank you.

MR. ENRIGHT: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, I'm very, very concerned about the Historic Neighborhood Preservation which I'm sure is not going to be very favorable opinion on them because I live in one of those areas. When we were going through construction on our home, the entire process, the Village tried to stop because they tried to claim that I lived in a historic area and that I had to go through various proceedings and approvals and all of this such. Then when I find out that there is in fact no historic area designated currently in the Village of Arlington Heights, it finally dropped. But there was a significant delay, and I see this and I wonder what's happening.

So, I'm a little concerned only because I've been through it. We just went through this public hearing and everyone up here was very concerned about this cloud on title which it wasn't a cloud on title, is it or isn't it. But yet laying down historic neighborhoods, that impacts what you can and can't do with your house. You have to get approvals, the rights, and it's very concerning to me.

So, I don't know that I understand, but you're saying that all you're doing is looking at it. But now we're saying there's going to be potential historic areas and, you know, you're going to go out and talk to these neighborhoods as well. I don't know if you are or aren't, I don't know how that's going to happen. No, but I don't, I mean I honestly don't know what's going to happen next because, again, when we went through the process to put an addition on our home, we were told by the Planning Department that we were in a historic neighborhood. It wasn't a historic neighborhood and we had to fight that battle. Now, quite frankly, if I was going through it, you could tell me I was in a historic neighborhood.

So, just with this, you could say we adopted this Comprehensive Plan and you're in a historic neighborhood and we have to investigate this further. I feel like there hasn't been any public input, no residential input. Tonight, all of those people didn't have to get noticed, they all got notice and got to come here and voice their opinion but these people did not. So, that's just very concerning to me that we're making this decision without any input.

It may be that after input we would decide to vote in favor of it, and clearly I would have to abstain because I'm biased. But there has been no public commentary on this historic neighborhood

and it does in fact impact homeowners. So, that's a big concern of mine.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: That was addressed quite a bit, and a process is what would have to happen. That would have to come out of the process on how this evolves. That was a huge concern of mine because to me a property owner should have to decide he wants his property to get it, not that it's being put on him, oh, we like your property so you'll have to abide by all this.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: You're talking about a historic designation on a specific house. I'm talking about just designating an area generally as potentially historic, which is what I was told when I went through process that my neighborhood Rec Park was a historic area and that I was going to have to put up public signs and go through increased scrutiny on what I was and wasn't doing, okay? Through that, and finally, we were under lots of time pressure, we had as everybody who's going through construction, financial pressure, my husband's father was dying of cancer and we were trying to get it done in time so I can get my mother-in-law so she can live there. There was lots of things going on and there was, you know, this was just going to be an added burden to the process.

So, what's concerning to me is, from what I see is now if I went to the Planning Department and said there is no designation of Rec Park as a historic area, the answer could be, well, in the Comprehensive Plan we have in fact designated this as potentially being a historic neighborhood so you have to go through a special scrutiny. So, I do see how this could cause an impact and there hasn't been any public commentary or any allowance of the public to contribute in this process.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I would just like to add to Susan's comment there, as an architect I've been involved with housing projects that are in these types of areas and I agree with her a hundred percent. We have to be careful that we're not taking away people's ability to do anything they want to do with their property because they might be designated in one particular area or another. So, I'm in total agreement with Commissioner Dawson on this issue.

I would have to know a lot more about what it would do and how it would impact the people in these areas, whether they choose to be part of it or not that it just, that's a concern that I have as well.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Dawson, any other comments?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, that was it.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Drost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes. I want to thank Bill Enright for putting up with us, shepherding the whole process because it was

page-by-page, chapter-by-chapter, and I think, you know, the compliments go to the Commissioners that served on it and also Trustee Tinaglia who is an architect by the way.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: That's what I hear, George.

COMMISSIONER DROST: He has input into this. But, you know, thank you, Bill, and thanks for all that effort, a lot of research and a lot of work that went into it.

I personally think that the additions of these different pieces, and maybe we can, you know, talk about the historic preservation aspect of it, I don't think it was meant to put a cloud on these areas but basically to start this discussion. And that was the idea, and let the public get full notice, to talk about this and say is there any housing stock that's worth saving. I think I was around for the 2004 Art Institute when they came up with almost a zero. So, you know, there's no Frank Lloyd home here. There's no Robert A.M. Stern, Mies van der Rohe didn't get a chance to put his Tugendhadt home in here, you know, he had to find some other place.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: There are some Bruce Greens though.

COMMISSIONER DROST: There are, there are.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: But they started to look for, you know, the Chicago bungalow.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, the bungalow row and all that stuff. We talked about a lot of that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: It also opens it up to public commentary to provide all your neighbors with notice of what you're doing. They have the right to come to a meeting, object to anything in your plans.

COMMISSIONER DROST: If you're changing that shingle.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right. I mean it does become, and now then the Design Commission could, you know, change your plans or give into, I mean there is to some degree a design approval.

COMMISSIONER DROST: But there's a plan to try to get the dialogue. It wasn't trying to put a brick on anything.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I just, I foresee it as it's going to be, basically it was already attempted to be used on me without this being in place. So, I see this being used.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Drost, anything else?

COMMISSIONER DROST: No.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I would just like to say good job, Bill.

MR. ENRIGHT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Ennes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: My compliments to the Subcommittee



for all their work and to Bill. I agree with Sue on her comments, I wouldn't want to see this become, the historic preservation put an onus on these property owners. But other than that, I think, and that was discussed at the, during our discussions on this. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Warskow?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Also another thank you to Bill. You did a fantastic job of guiding us through the process, keeping us focused on our task and being very open-minded to our suggestions and our discussion points, and putting a lot of work to get all of that, just verbal dialogue put into an actual document that looks as professional as this does. So, thank you very much.

In terms of the points on historic preservation, I just want to read a paragraph from the historic preservation. It says, "The stated goals and policies serve as a guidance; however, they do not control the use of land unless supplemented with enacted codes such as a Preservation Ordinance." So, I think we're stating right here in the plan that this is just something of interest to us and it has no teeth whatsoever.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I just want to make sure the Planning Department, I mean the average resident doesn't read this and doesn't see this. So, I was fortunate enough to be very involved and know that this isn't there. But do you see what I'm saying?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes, and if we can have the Planning Department --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: There was a discussion where they flat out told me our house was in a historic neighborhood and I went back to them and said, no, I'm not, and there was a debate and an argument that went back and forth as to whether or not it was in a historic neighborhood. If I wasn't who I am who is involved in the Village, who is able to read, research and look into things, I would have had to go through the process, because the average resident is very much at the mercy of the Planning Department.

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, let me comment on that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: So, I just want to make sure that, I mean I'm not, I'm very much in favor with what's going on, with the research and the investigation. I just want to make sure that this isn't going to be used by the Planning Department in that way.

MR. ENRIGHT: Chairman, can I go ahead please?

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Yes, Bill.

MR. ENRIGHT: Mercy of the Planning Department. With respect to Design Commission, what properties have to go to Design Commission or not, that was directed from the Village Board to the Planning Department. So, at one point, every single house in Arlington Heights had to go to Design Commission for review. That was onerous. So, the Village Board backed off on that policy and directed Staff to

just look at certain neighborhoods when new houses were being built. Some of those neighborhoods were ranch areas where you have the McMansions being built and they were, you know, out of sync with the size of the homes in the area. Other areas were areas that had some homes that were more of historic nature, not necessarily designated by the National Register of Historic Districts or the Village for that matter.

So, anything that the Planning Department is doing with respect to whether or not we send a petitioner who wants to build a new house to Design Commission or just administratively approved, that was a direction from the Village Board. So, we're implementing their policy.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you, Bill. Commissioner Warskow, anything else?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: No, that was it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Commissioner Jensen with an E.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, that's Danish, not Swedish, not Norwegian. Just a question about this. So, I'm actually looking at the same thing that the others have been looking at. So, nothing here is really binding in these new sections that you've added at this point. You'd need additional action to be taken.

MR. ENRIGHT: Right. This is similar to corridors. We're saying these are the areas that we want to look at and work with the property owners through a process to establish what things we may want to do or not do with these neighborhoods in a future development.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, I should have opened that by also giving you my commendations. Kudos to both the Subcommittee and the Staff. I think it's a very good document and, you know, I think the Village will be well served.

I assume at some point though you will put an action plan together to actually take pieces of this like the corridors, historic areas, and you will begin to develop those and bring the materials before the appropriate commissions? I assume that's your intent?

MR. ENRIGHT: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: The only area I have a question about is your survey. Was your survey, were the people sort of selected to take the survey?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes. I mean they were given several options.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Right. I mean if the people were to go on and say --

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes. So, it's not a real statistically relevant kind of --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, what it really is is an electronic focus group?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And you get a lot of great ideas out of this, and I think the focus group serves a very, very good purpose. The number of people responding means nothing because the people who respond can have a real bias, you could have respondent bias. So, I would not put very much stock in the percentages in a sense. I would put stock in what is identified as things that people are interested in. If you're going to do anything further based on this, you really actually need to do a representative sample on things that you care about knowing.

So, I think it's good to have this in here. It suggests areas of interest. But I would not oversell this as a survey because it truly isn't. As I said, it's an electronic focus group of a fairly large size. But it's vastly different than what a real representative sample survey would be.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Thank you, Lynn. I, too, would like to thank Bill for an excellent job, and Chairman Drost of the Subcommittee. Just some comments. On the Historic District issue, it certainly wasn't the intention to make it an official Historic District, it was just to start the discussion. But I've got to agree with Commissioner Dawson. If the last issue put a cloud on it, this certainly does, you know. But that was certainly wasn't the intent.

Anyways, I think it's a great --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Joe, can I just interject here? If you look at the very first sentence under Historic Preservation, it says that the area surveyed was further broken down into seven potential Neighborhood Conservation Districts. I think that's all it's really saying. These are potential, it's not designated these are Historic Districts.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I think we all understand what this document is trying to do. Everyone here understands, the Village understands, everyone understands. I'm just trying to make sure everyone else understands that without even this piece of paper it could happen, okay? So, that's all. I just want to make sure that everyone understands and that it's on public record that this is not going to be used in any type of permit process for additions or construction and all that in these areas unless further steps are taken which would, I would assume, involve public commentary. Correct?

MR. ENRIGHT: You know, this document says that, no, I can't make that assertion that if there is a house in one of these areas, that the Planning Department may or may not send it to the Design Commission for review. Because there's houses that are being built in these areas that are colored A through E and H and I, that if

there is a house on these, houses do go to Design Commission. So, I can't sit here and say that they won't go until some further action is taken because --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, no. They would go to Design Commission for other reasons, they wouldn't go to Design, what I'm saying is they wouldn't be told they're in a Historic Neighborhood and, therefore, need to follow processes associated with what a Historic Neighborhood would be. That's all I'm saying.

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, I guess, does the Plan Commission view this, does the Subcommittee view this as designating these areas as Conservation Districts or do you want further study before that designation is done, which has very little meaning quite frankly because it's not an official designation of a historic district. That's a whole other process that the Village Board has looked at but decided not to go down that route. So, I mean if this is in the Master Plan, I would think we would pay special attention to tear-downs in this area or additions.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Can I just ask a question?

MR. ENRIGHT: That was your question I believe, right?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, so you've answered it.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: So, what would be, so the Design Review, does it have particular criteria? I should, I haven't looked at the criteria that it uses, but would it have particular criteria for this historic district that's different from any other neighborhood?

MR. ENRIGHT: Not at this point unless we further redefined our design guidelines, which are more Village-wide.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Because they're not specific to neighborhoods. But many neighborhoods are different, so, but the gist of the design guidelines is, and you may not even touch those, is that you're supposed to build additions or even houses that, you know, pick up some of the characteristics and fit in with your surroundings no matter where it is. So, it's contextual.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: So, would the Design Review Committee do that regardless of what was in the Comp Plan --

MR. ENRIGHT: That's right. They do that, yes, they do that right now.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I haven't been to Design Commission. Maybe Commissioner Green can speak to it, about what that process is like. But it would require a notice. So, there is already a design review without going to Design Commission.

MR. ENRIGHT: Staff, right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Right, there's a Staff design review in process without this. So, it does get reviewed by Staff and there is Staff commentary and they certainly frequently request

adjustments. Okay, so what this does then is potentially allows the Staff to say you're in a historic area and, therefore, you must go to Design Commission. Is that the proper term?

MR. ENRIGHT: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: And you have to put a sign and allow public commentary to come in and get involved with your process, which would not necessarily be required if you didn't meet the other criteria which requires, there are other criteria which automatically puts you in Design Commission. A tear-down would go to Design Commission.

MR. ENRIGHT: Not necessarily, no.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Not necessarily, no? Okay.

MR. ENRIGHT: No, that's not the policy.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But there are other criteria that require that you go to Design Commission. So, outside of those criteria, again I'm not an architect so I'm looking at it through a one-house construction, so I'm looking at Commissioner Green, so this would potentially then require homes that would not have had to go to Design Commission to go to Design Commission.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: My experience with the Design Commission has always been that there is, how can you say it? Some of the lesser designs, some of the lesser looking additions on homes go to the Design Commission because they need some help. In other words, you've seen some things around town that here is the house, here is the addition, and it's a horrible mesh between the two. Unfortunately, these things get pushed through.

I think there is an attempt here by the Design Commission to have a more compatible design, whether it's an addition to a home or if it's a new home, they want some kind of input on it. I can tell you from an experience where I tore down a house some years back and put up a new house. I went to the Design Commission and I said no matter what you think, I don't want my house, this house, to look like any of the other houses in the neighborhood. It was an awful-looking neighborhood to me. It had no architectural style or design of any kind that you'd ever want to repeat. They all kind of chuckled but they agreed, so the house went in. It did not fit the neighborhood in that the neighborhood is awful, if I could be very frank about it.

So, you know, it's not just that you're going to force you to do this or force you to do that. The design speaks for itself I think is what I'm trying to say.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I'm not trying to say the Design Commission will do anything inappropriate or force your design.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: No, that's not what I'm saying.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, no, I'm just trying to

clarify. I'm just saying it would then add another layer, which allows for public commentary and your neighbors to come in and be part of the process in the design of your home when there is already a design review process in place. So, it's just my concern that we have a Subcommittee decide what areas should be designated as historic and it will in fact now it seems impact or could be used to impact those homeowners and they had no ability to participate in that. We just went through a whole process where people were notified when they didn't have to be notified and everybody commended the Village for notifying them and everyone was worried about a cloud on the title and impact on property, you know, and now we're saying but in this situation the homeowner shouldn't have any say into whether or not the area they live in is designated as a potentially historic neighborhood.

So, it's a concern of mine and it doesn't really need to go into any more dialogue. I think everyone understands where I stand. But it's significant, other than, everything else I think it's wonderful. I think the idea of historic neighborhoods are wonderful. I just know that I would like to have some say if I was going to live in one, I would like to have some input, that's all. And I might agree with everyone, I might say, hey, I think we want this, we want more review of the characteristics in our neighborhood. I just think that I should have that input.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: And I think what Bill had said is that there's more, if they pursue this, there would be more information coming forward before it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No, what he just said is this could be used by the Planning Department once approved by the Village to make you go through the design review process.

MR. ENRIGHT: We can do that now. Any property being built with a house in any platted lot in Arlington Heights comes to the Planning Department, and the Board has authorized us to use our judgment on whether or not it has to go to design review. Of course there are property owners that aren't happy about having to go to design review, we understand that. But that's as judgment call that we've been directed to make by the elected officials in the community. We make judgment decisions everyday on everything involving the community. So, that authority rests with us right now as public officials to be able to require that.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Bill, you know, I kind of see the item that Susan is making. By putting this designation on the area, you know, five years, 10 years from now when you're president somewhere and you're gone, the next person may say, oh, it's a historic area and automatically sends it to design review.

MR. ENRIGHT: That's, you know, if you look at page 58, it says, "Continue to require Design Commission review of designated

homes within historic areas." Now, do you want to clarify what that means? Do you want to say that these, only if these areas are designated but, you know, through a formal Historic Preservation process? Or is the intent to say these are areas that are unique to the Village and we should look at new development in these areas to make sure the new development is consistent with what's there?

I mean some property owners, you know, might like that because, certainly I can understand why people building houses don't want to have an added review of the Design Commission, they'd rather just have Staff do it administratively. But there are neighbors that often appreciate the ability to participate in what's going up in their neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Could I ask a question of you, Bill? Do you feel this document, especially the section we've been talking about, gives you additional authority, power or whatever, that you didn't have or wouldn't have before the Board, or if the Board approves this, does this give you anything you don't already have?

MR. ENRIGHT: It gives us more clarity in these neighborhoods, but you know, we could still, you know, if there was something coming in in one of these color neighborhoods, we still have the judgment to decide whether or not it has to go to design review or not. I mean that is a, you know, Staff does have leeway on that and it's the Village Board policy to be, you know, before like I said they made everybody go and there were complaints. So, they said, Staff, you're professional planners, you can make these judgments on behalf of Village Board to decide if you think something needs to go or not.

So, I think these areas, we would have, you know, more clarity on scrutinizing them but it doesn't, it's not absolute that it would have to go if it fits in with the neighborhood. That's what we're doing now throughout the --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: That's the point that Commissioner Dawson and Lorenzini are making in this, by actually declaring these as even, you know, on the radar as historic areas, historic neighborhoods, it almost encourages the additional review, and I see your point in making it.

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, I would agree with that. So, if the Plan Commission doesn't want to recommend that just because these are, show these as areas for further study but not necessarily, you know, impact the policy of the Village with respect to Design Commission, so if you look at page 58, you might want to just delete number one and that takes away any extra scrutiny I would think because it gets rid of that verbiage.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Bill, just for clarity, okay, it's not the fact that they're going to the Design Commission because they're from the neighborhood, I think the question is does Design

Commission have more criteria that they would put on that house because it's in a designated area. In other words, if I am in a designated historical area and I want to tear my house down and put up another house, is it harder for me to get through the Design Commission because I'm in a designated historic area and tear down a house?

MR. ENRIGHT: No, because they're looking at how houses fit in with neighborhoods, period, all over the Village. So, whether it's, you know, up north, down south, or in the middle of town, when they review something, they review it within the context of the neighborhood. So, if you want to build a pink elephant anywhere in the Village, they're probably going to have some comments about it and maybe not approve it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But if you live in a bungalow in one of these areas and you have a potential buyer who wants to change the house, you could lose the buyer because some of the bungalows are dilapidated and he would just want the lot. I'm not saying I'm in favor of that, I'm not. I like the characteristics of my neighborhood a lot and I would not want some crazy house to go up in that area. I'm just saying that if this is in place, it could impact the buyer or the resident and we've done it without talking to them, that's all.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Right. But then you do have the freedom to put up any kind of house you want. That's --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Not necessarily.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Why not?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Not if Design, if the buyer for your house wants to tear it down and put something else up that doesn't fit in characteristics of the neighborhood, but is it necessarily, I mean there's plenty of areas where there's a house that doesn't fit in, there's plenty of them. But if you've got now a historic neighborhood, you have that kind of added layer of saying, no, no, no, in these areas we actually need the houses to fit in with the criteria, and you can potentially impact the home, the resale.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Well, this to me seems to be bringing me back a few years to the argument about if you live in an area where there's a ranch next door you can't put up a ranch house next to a ranch, or a two-story next to a ranch.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: A huge two-story.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: And that was awful. I think that was one of the worst things we ever went through here in the Village. If this is something like that, I would be totally against it. If there is anybody that, I just don't think these kinds of restrictions, I can see going to the Design Commission to hit the basic guidelines, we have design guidelines that are issued and I'm all for that. It's just that if you live in a bungalow neighborhood and you want to tear down the bungalow and put up a two-story or something, that should be



allowed and it shouldn't be just because you live with other bungalows that you can't put up a two-story home.

MR. ENRIGHT: This designation doesn't mean that at all.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It doesn't mean that at all.

MR. ENRIGHT: No.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Then I'm fine with it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: I don't think it means that. I just don't know what kind of, I just don't know what it means and I don't know what kind of slippery slope and I don't know that anyone has really thought through what does it mean. Now is it going to give the Design Commission that feeling that, I don't know and it just, it makes me nervous because I've been somewhat through it and I'd like to better understand what it is we're doing.

So, you had stated that there is a way that we could approve this but we could put the requirement that this can't be used without further designation? There was another sort of statement, not that it can't be used but there was something you said, that we could say that it requires further designation.

MR. ENRIGHT: I think it's getting a lot more complicated than it actually is. Designating, showing these areas as potential study areas and areas of interest to the Village has no impact on your ability to develop your property. However, if the Village Board says that these are important areas, then in some of these areas we already do send people to Design Commission already. We have that authority. Like it or not, we do have that authority. We try to be fair and consistent, and that authority was vested by the Village Board to the Planning Department.

So, we do make these judgment calls all the time on the house is going to design review or not which is about a 30-day extra process because we can get them on fairly quickly. It doesn't mean they're going to get approved that night. But having this area designated, I think we would look at this and if there is a house there of interest, we hear about it, they send it to Design Commission. But the way to solve this is just get rid of, on page 58, number one because that's saying continue to require Design Commission review of designated homes within historic areas. If you take that out, then we're just, you know, it doesn't give us any more guidance on this. We just go by the policy Village-wide that we have been which is certain areas we're going to send which we do already.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay.

MR. ENRIGHT: For better or worse.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Does somebody want to make a motion? Go ahead, Sue.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: A motion? Okay. I don't even know what the motion is at this point.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Minus that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Okay. So, but a motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC# 14-020, the 2015 -- I don't think I can do this motion because I just want to make a comment with my vote. I think someone else has to make this motion because I still have reservations about it in general even though I will approve it.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll make the motion. **I'll make a motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC# 14-020, the 2015 Comprehensive Plan.**

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: But we've asked for a modification on page 58.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: **With the modification that we delete item one to require Design Commission review on page 58 of the Comprehensive Plan.**

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll second the motion.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Roll call vote.

MR. ENRIGHT: Let me start it this way. Commissioner Cherwin.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, with comment.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes, with comment.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Warskow.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye, with comment.

MR. ENRIGHT: And Chairman Lorenzini.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Yes. Comments?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: So, yes, my comment would be, you know, very much in line with what the other concerns have been about putting this into the record. That's why the first question I asked had to do with the involvement of the historic owners association. I do feel that, you know, we do have some protections in here, that this is not a final designation on this property. I think we've been very clear with the comments here.

I would like to see some more involvement from maybe those citizens as we go forward and maybe a consideration that they be more actively involved in this process so that we do want to get more rigor around the historic neighborhood, that we make every effort we can to involve those people very thoroughly in the process before we put any level of restrictions against them.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: My comment is simply that I feel that we need more public commentary before impacting these areas. I think that the residents should have the ability to give input before a decision is made that impacts their neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, my comment is to start the process of making Arlington Heights a bicycle-friendly community and to incorporate some of the comments that the Bicycle Commissioners had presented to us and to see if we can incorporate these, after study, that they become part of the Comprehensive Plan.

CHAIRMAN LORENZINI: Anybody else have comments? Okay. All right. I guess congratulations, Mr. Enright.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, congratulations.

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, to the Subcommittee, they did all the work.

(Whereupon, the above public hearing was concluded at 9:54 p.m.)

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

I, RONALD LeGRAND, SR., 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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
RONALD LeGRAND, SR.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO  
BEFORE ME THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF  
\_\_\_\_\_, A.D. 2015.

\_\_\_\_\_  
NOTARY PUBLIC