

PLAN

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

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

COMMISSION

RE: A.H. PARK DISTRICT - SUNSET MEADOWS SAFETY NETTING -  
700 SOUTH DWYER AVENUE - PC# 16-010 (continued from 6-8-16)  
PUD AMENDMENT

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  
22nd day of June, 2016, at the hour of 7:50 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

BRUCE GREEN, Acting Chair  
LYNN JENSEN  
MARY JO WARSKOW  
JOHN SIGALOS  
JAY CHERWIN

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Our next hearing is the Arlington Heights  
Park District, and it's a continuation from last time.

MR. PETERSEN: Good evening.

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

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: My only question to you is were you sworn in last time?

MR. PETERSEN: I was not, I was not.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, so whoever would like to speak tonight who wasn't sworn in, please raise your hand. If you want to double it, that's fine.

(Witnesses sworn.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. If you would state your name and address and spell your last name for the court reporter?

MR. PETERSEN: Absolutely. My name is Allen Petersen, last name is P-e-t-e-r-s-e-n.

Good evening. I'm the director of Parks & Planning for the Arlington Heights Park District. You met our park planner last meeting, Scott Elman, he's also here. Then also we have Steve Neil who is our division manager for recreational programs for the Park District. So, as necessary, if we need to have them answer questions, we brought them here.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Tell us what you'd like to do again or tell us --

MR. PETERSEN: All right.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: We have another part to this hearing.

MR. PETERSEN: Okay, wonderful. Well, I apologize, first off, I was not able to be at the last meeting. But our park planner, as I mentioned, was able to discuss the project with you, and I acknowledge that this is a project that was asked to come back. We had some questions that needed to be clarified and we are happy to do that. We also know that the Plan Commission as well as the neighbors had several concerns and we acknowledge that. We understand the concerns and we also understand that we're looking to do this as part of a big project to the park and we feel that public safety is the number one priority and we feel that the netting is a necessary part of that.

Just a quick, if you don't mind, I'd like to do just a quick background on the project. We've got an existing park there, Sunset Meadows Park located at Kirchhoff and Dwyer, at least that's where the entrance is. The park receives a lot of us. We've got a golf driving range there as well as a putting green. We've got a park shelter, playground, bocci ball courts, toilets, as well as many walking paths all the way around. There's also two existing athletic fields that are in question for this evening as far as the safety netting portion.

We've got two fields that have been, to date they have been natural turf grass fields. They were developed approximately eight years ago with the intention to be used for soccer as well as football. Unfortunately, because of the nature of the sport football, in the fall the fields would be used each year and get torn up. Then it would take the Park's department all of spring and into the summer in order to rejuvenate the fields in order to be used and, therefore, we wouldn't be able to use it for soccer. Then the fall would come and it's just a vicious cycle of tearing up the fields and then rejuvenating over the last seven to eight years or so.

So, the original intention was to use it for soccer, to get some use for soccer, primarily for practices over the years in the spring, just selected use so to speak. So, we unfortunately just only were able to use it for football. That was the main reason for this overall project to the park, we wanted to convert those two natural turf athletic fields to be able to use all throughout the spring and throughout the summer and the fall.

We also had a minor issue with the football fields. They were not to specification for our new Bill George League Football Conference that our Cowboys Football League was part of. They were slightly undersized and so we needed to renovate the field as well. So, we decided this was the right time to convert them to synthetic turf.

We understand that there, as I had mentioned, that there were a series of questions that we were provided from your development planner Sam Hubbard. So, we have answered those. I think you have a copy of those responses. I'd be happy to go through each one of those if you'd like. I don't know, as a continuance kind of thing, I don't know what the best approach is.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, I think the public might be interested in what those questions are, so I think we should go through each one so they can hear this.

MR. PETERSEN: Be happy to, okay, sure. The first question that we were given was to clarify if a different location for the new soccer field can be provided elsewhere on Park District property which may reduce the need for the safety netting along Kirchhoff. As I've stated already, the initial use of the, the intended use of those fields was for soccer in the first place. Unfortunately, we weren't able to do that.

So, we really would like to use that space for soccer. It's a great location with flushable toilets and a shelter and a large parking lot that could be used. So, it's an ideal location to be used for soccer. We also have, we do have many soccer fields throughout Arlington Heights. Unfortunately, it's just never enough. We're always looking for more. We're always looking for the ability to rest fields so that we can have the best playable surface.

So, this is the ideal location for soccer and we feel that it's justified to be able to put that soccer field out there.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, just for clarification, these two fields, are they double use? Is it football and soccer playing on the two fields?

MR. PETERSEN: Yes. Actually what our intended use is, we've got a full, as you can see in the diagram, we've got a full-sized soccer field on the west side. That will be used for both soccer, full-sized soccer games as well as practices, training, camps, you name it. We're also using it in the fall for football practices.

The east field is intended to be kind of the flip of that where we would not necessarily use it for full-sized soccer, we'd be using it for smaller sized soccer games with a north-south orientation, but then use it for football games. So, both fields we'd be able to use for both types of sports.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay, thank you.

MR. PETERSEN: Sure. The second question that was similar to what you just asked was please explore a different orientation to the new fields, which new orientation may reduce the need for safety netting along Kirchhoff or potentially a smaller net along Kirchhoff.

As I explained, in the fall we plan to use both fields for football and as well for soccer. We also in the spring plan to use both fields for soccer. But we are willing to acknowledge that we're not planning to use the north-south orientation which is the primary concern about balls going over the fence or onto Kirchhoff. We're not planning to use it for ages 11 and older, so we'd be planning for having younger kids on those fields. Those groups that, if they were used for practices, they're not game situations. It would only be, they would not need a net to be shooting at, there would just be drills and that type of training exercise.

We would definitely work with our coaches. We have a lot of control with our soccer program, so we would work with our coaches and the representatives from the soccer program to be able to make sure that those games are exactly like we said, younger ages, and that practices do not have the use of goals where balls are getting kicked out onto Kirchhoff.

Unfortunately, with that, there's still the chance that we're going to have balls, in a game that's going maybe an east-west direction, there might be balls that go over the fence and out onto Kirchhoff, and that's exactly what we're trying to prevent.

The third question was reevaluate the need for the two pedestrian gates along Kirchhoff. If they are necessary, please explore the option for lockable gates or a more secure means to prevent younger children from slipping out and chasing balls across Kirchhoff.

In the time that we did use the field for soccer, there were some times where we had some issues with the ball going over. It was voiced to us that it was a pain to go around to get the ball. We feel that we still need some kind of opening there. However, we do think that we would be willing and have no problem putting a gate on those openings rather than just have an opening with the velcro connection as discussed last time.

We could put a gate with a latch, the latch could be at a height, at a five-foot or higher height, only be used for adults. Again, we have the control of the users for the most part with our programs and we would be able to talk to the coaches, talk to those programs and make sure that it's only adults going through those gates, it's not children running through. By putting a gate on there, it does slow down and make the user think about what they're doing in order to go out and retrieve a ball in that situation.

Number four was explore the option of landscaped area on the outside of the fence to provide some screenings to the neighbors across Kirchhoff. We have some photos. These are some existing pictures of the parkway along Kirchhoff. There was at one time some trees. Over the years, they did their job and have since been removed. I don't know if the varieties were of ash variety or if there were other varieties, if it's due to just old age and maturity, were removed through either IDOT or the Village.

But even prior to us coming to the Plan Commission and as part of this whole project in general, we had already started the process to determine what we can do with street trees along there in the parkway. We think it's necessary. We think it would be great for the site, you know, even before it was brought up as a concern.

We have already submitted an application to IDOT. IDOT has jurisdiction over that parkway. The parkway is about 25 feet wide. There are power lines as you can see, so we would work with IDOT for a variety of trees that would work along there.

There are some, here in the lower right, you can see this is just east of the Sunset Meadows Park, these are some parkway trees that were planted by either IDOT or the Village. These are a smaller variety, approximately 20-foot tall tree, and that would be what we would be looking to do. You can see in our drawing there, it's an artistic representation of what we would be approaching as far as landscaping to address that concern.

We agree, we'd love to make it look better along the parkway. We think it would help soften the overall look of the netting, and we'd be happy to do that.

Number five, explore the option of a retractable netting that can be easily raised only during games and practices, or a removable netting system that can be taken

down at the end of the season.

There's basically three different types of netting. One is just a permanent net that's up year round. There's kind of a semi-permanent type of netting that is up and can be taken down. Then there's the retractable type or a type that can be raised or lowered as necessary.

We've talked and done quite a bit of research, and we've talked with the installers and manufacturers. For our situation, the wear and tear of up and down for each game or each day or each week, it's just not a practical application. We don't have the staff resources to be doing that for this length of netting.

We also understand that the wear and tear just would give an undue burden on the budget as far as replacement. It would reduce the amount of time we could have that, they only last for a couple of years in that situation. The biggest thing was it does not look nearly as nice as a more permanent type of situation. A retractable, it just could be loose, it doesn't look as clean and crisp and tight as we want it to look.

The type of netting that we have planned to go in there is actually a semi-permanent situation. We could take it down if need be. We would rather not. It does take a considerable amount of labor to do that. But if that was necessary, we would be able to do that.

Number six, evaluate if the netting must be 20-foot in height or is a shorter version a viable option. We did look at a variety of sizes. We actually initially thought we were going to be more in the neighborhood of 30-foot was what we were going to need. We felt that was too big. We actually scaled it way back even in our planning stages. We brought it down to 20-foot, we felt 20-foot would have met the need.

Following the meeting, the last Plan Commission meeting, we did look at if 15-foot would meet our need, and we just don't think it will meet our need. 15-foot is just too low. The potential is there for a ball to go over the fence and over the netting, and we don't want to risk that. You know, we're looking at safety and we feel 20-foot is the right height for the possible uses out there, soccer, football, and any other sport that we may or may not have control over. I mean we don't know if there's going to be, you know, some neighborhood kids that go and have a pickup baseball game or softball game and that's quite possible. We feel that a 20-foot would much better meet that need. We agree, we think that the 20-foot is the right height and we had initially thought 30-foot would be it and we pared it back from there.

Number seven, are there any protective netting systems at other sites near residential areas within the Park District? As we stated in our response, we do have two golf courses and we have protective netting at both of those in various locations. They are in residential situations, they are up against homes or backed up to homes. We have not had any instances of concern or question or problems with those.

Then a third location that we are aware of is the existing safety netting that's been installed at St. Viator High School for their baseball field at Frederick Street and Dryden. That field is right there in a residential area. Those nets are we think closer to 30-foot, maybe even taller. The poles are probably twice the size in diameter as what we're proposing. So, there is existing situation here in town that was installed within the last couple of years.

Last question was providing perspective which we did. You saw this one already as well as just the overall aerial perspective of what the netting would look like. We

also went out with our staff and asked for a 20-foot pall to be held up. You can see the staff person holding, you know, he's about 5'10. That staff person, he's holding a 20-foot pole, you can see how tall that is. It's not a monstrosity, it's 20 feet of netting, it's black netting that the idea is you'll be able to see right through it.

So, we don't feel that with the landscaping, with the height that we feel will meet our need, and we understand the concerns but we still think this will meet our needs and meet the needs of safety at the site.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Allen.

MR. PETERSEN: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Sam, is there anything you'd like to add to that from Staff?

MR. HUBBARD: No. I don't know that there's too much to add. I think, you know, Staff has summarized the issues as we saw them based on discussions at the last meeting for the Park District. We asked them to respond, we've reviewed their response, and we're glad that they're at least addressing some of the items, especially with relation to the latch on a gate. I think that was a big part of last meeting.

I think we're still supportive of this and I'd be happy to answer any questions from the Plan Commission.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Okay. Who would like to start? Lynn?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sure. Just a few clarifying questions.

MR. PETERSEN: Sure.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: There may be more until we hear from the public. How many balls do we have, currently with the arrangements you have now which are mainly football fields, how frequently do balls go over into Kirchhoff?

MR. PETERSEN: It's really hard to say because it's only been used primarily for football at least just in the last few years. But when it was used initially for some soccer, some games and some practices, we did have it. I don't know that we have a record of exact numbers of instances, but it did happen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Was it frequent or infrequent?

MR. PETERSEN: I would say more infrequent than frequent.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: You're having any trouble with just the football, and speaking of soccer --

MR. PETERSEN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: You said when you answered the first question you have 25 soccer fields, and yet when you were going through where you had seen these or where you had these netting arrangements, none of the soccer fields that you have needed the netting. Why does this need it and the other 25 don't?

MR. PETERSEN: It's this site, it's the proximity to the street. We do not have other fields that are this close or that have had this kind of situation where it's within, you know, 25 feet of a pretty major road.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I guess that brings me to a more major question. When you were doing the planning, I don't know the process you went through, whether you came before the Plan Commission when you first went from the park to having fields that are played on, did that come before the Board or the Plan Commission? Or was that process inside the Park District?

MR. PETERSEN: You know, I was not with the Park District at the time. Do you know, Scott? Was that --

MR. ELMAN: I believe that it did go before --

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Please come to the podium.

MR. ELMAN: I'm sorry.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Give the court reporter your name and spell it.

MR. ELMAN: My name is Scott Elman, E-l-m-a-n. If memory serves me correctly, I believe we did bring this up to the Plan Commission. We did have to get a variance at that time, or we applied for the PUD at that time.

MR. HUBBARD: Right, there was an amendment to the PUD in 2005 and it outlined the various phases of improvement that the Park District would be going through at this particular location.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I guess that brings me to, I have a concern with both the Park District as well as the Village then. Wasn't anyone concerned about building any kind of a field this close to a major artery to begin with? I'm just worried, I'm not as worried as much about the cars on Kirchhoff as I am about the kids. I think it would be rather startling to start having balls come over into Kirchhoff and causing accidents. So, I'm wondering what happened with the planning process that you got it right the 24 or 25 other places, but with this one we have it so close to a major artery and it really clearly poses a safety issue or you wouldn't be before us today. So, I'm not sure exactly what happened during the planning process.

MR. PETERSEN: I can't speak to that portion, I wasn't here. But I do know that at this point we do have a concern by it where we do have the ability to use the fields more and we think that will increase the possibility of balls going into the street. I do know at the time of the planning, or I know in discussions that a netting was brought up. There is a fence that's there, a six-foot fence currently, so I don't know if that was a compromise at the time that we, you know, put a six-foot fence up for concerns about children running out in the street, not necessarily for the balls going over. So, I know that there was some concern about safety and that was addressed at that time.

I do know that, like I said, that there were some discussions about netting. I don't know how far that went, I don't know if that was a discussion as far as, well, let's observe the situation and decide at a later date if that's necessary. But I would imagine that, because that's a typical way to approach this type of situation. If we didn't have to put the netting up, we wouldn't. We certainly do not want to put it up, but we feel it's to the best interest of the user.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Let me come back to that after. I guess I'm just surprised that we got to the point where someone didn't say, hey, this looks like a bad place to put a field for a variety of reasons. Now, we're confronted with a real dilemma which we will come back to after we hear from the public as to how to balance safety, aesthetics, and the concerns of the neighborhood as I'm sure there are going to be some as there was at the last meeting. But anyway I'll stop at this point.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Lynn. Mary Jo?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes, I think my question is about the latch. I mean I definitely think it's an improvement over the last presentation that we got with just the velcro. I'm wondering how you determined that this would be the best latch. I still have a

concern that for use, there is use of the park where you do not have Park District supervision, and if somebody opens that latch and then doesn't close it back again, that kids who come right after them can have access without needing that five-foot requirement.

Did you research anything that would be kind of a self-closing latch that would then ensure that actually the gate closed and it did latch?

MR. PETERSEN: We did have those discussion and that we are definitely open to that as an option. We felt that this addressed the needs --

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I understand. In an ideal way, yes.

MR. PETERSEN: Yes, I mean there's lots of different ways to latch that and make sure that that closes and stays closed. We weren't looking for something where we'd lock it because it would defeat the purpose.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Right.

MR. PETERSEN: So, yes, we do have a situation, we have those throughout the Park District, you know, self-closing gates on our kids pools and things like that. So, that is an option that's out there, but we did look at it as a simple solution that would meet the, we felt that would meet the need the best.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Okay, well, I'll be interested to hear what the public says.

MR. PETERSEN: Sure.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: But my thought would be since you already know of those and have used them elsewhere, that this, too, would be a good application also. That's all I have.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes. I've spent sometime driving up and down Kirchhoff and looking at this location, looking at the resident properties on the north side of Kirchhoff. I had noted that almost all those properties have some very large trees, some dense landscaping, and they all have a six-foot high solid stockade type wood fence. So, I think, and I'm sure the residents can speak out in the public hearing portion, that that house shelter is screening some of the view of what this netting will look like.

Also, I observed these utility lines, 20 to 30-foot high utility lines along the south side of Kirchhoff, and those look really ugly to me. So, when I see the plan that you, I saw a photo here with proposed trees and they will be located where the 20-foot high poles are, I'm not as opposed to this aesthetically as I was at the last hearing, especially when I saw those utility lines. Those, I mean that is a little better than the utility lines look.

The other thing that I'm really not convinced about are these two gates. If you have a low incidence of balls going out into Kirchhoff now with a six-foot high fence, the whole purpose of this 20-foot high netting is to stop balls from going out there. I don't see where you need to add these gates. I just see that being a hazard for young children going out there to get a soccer ball. Yes, easy to say you're going to have adult supervision; you know that doesn't happen all the time. Somebody is going to be there, maybe one of the family members are watching their brothers or sisters playing out there, they're going to go out to get the ball. Five-foot is not that tall, I mean a ten-year-old could reach a five-foot latch. As Commissioner Warskow said, how do you know it's going to be latched properly?

So, again if you have a very low incidence of balls going out over a six-foot fence, why would you need access when you're putting up a 20-foot netting that's to



prevent these balls from going out there? So, I'd be supportive of this but without the entrances.

MR. PETERSEN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I don't, I see that that would be extremely rare that a ball would go over a 20-foot netting. That's the whole purpose of putting it there. That's really all that I have now. During my time that I spent out there, I just changed my opinion from the last three months when I saw you're adding these trees and I see the trees that were existing there over at St. Viator High School as their baseball netting, and that's taller. That's at least 30 feet tall. You can see how the trees do block that. So, I'm more in support than I was the last meeting. That's all I have.

MR. PETERSEN: Would you like me to address the question about the openings?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Oh, yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes. Yes, why don't you?

MR. PETERSEN: The reason, and we did talk with Mr. Hubbard here and we knew that the openings would be, is a big point of contention, we know it from the last meeting. Our thought behind it is, one, we have had balls in the current situation go over the fence, and the users then had to go out and around the entire perimeter of the park. It just held up play, and we were also concerned about when those balls were out in the street, getting that ball out of the street as quickly as possible for those drivers as well because of the safety of the driver. So, those are the big concerns that way.

We do intend to hopefully with the 20-foot netting stop most of the balls if not all of them. That's the plan. But those balls that do go over the netting, we would like to retrieve those as quickly as possible and prevent any accidents or anything that way. I think it's not only the safety of the children but also the safety of the drivers that are driving on Kirchhoff. I'd hate to be a driver and have a ball, you know, landing in front of me and swerve and then hitting another car or something, God forbid.

So, we're looking for protection that way. We understand the concern, and if that needs further discussion and further review and if we need to reconsider the openings, we're open to that. We're most concerned about getting the netting put in place so that we can prevent it. If the openings is a concern, we can talk about that.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: It's my opinion that it's one thing to have a ball bouncing around and then target it, but not for a young child, an eight-year-old, nine-year-old child who runs out there and sees this ball bouncing around Kirchhoff, they're not going to look. They're going to run out there to get the ball. I have more of a concern with that. Again, if it wasn't that big of a problem, yes, it's an inconvenience to walk around the fence, but if it wasn't that big when you have a six-foot tall fence, it should be very minimal with a 20-foot netting.

MR. PETERSEN: Understood.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: That's my opinion, that I would rather not see those entrances. That's all I have.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: I think I'm going to hold my comments and we're going to open it up to the public here.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Jay.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I'm still here.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: I'm sorry, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: That's fine. Yes, so I appreciate my

colleagues' comments, I think all very good. I was supportive of the plan initially. I think that the issues I brought up were, you know, additional safety around these gates, to get some latch for them, and then suggesting of a landscaping which I think, you know, in both of these cases the issues that I had you have addressed.

I live down here so I'm very familiar with this area. So, like John said I know there's electrical lines all over the place and there's like three levels of wires.

MR. PETERSEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: There's light bulbs for the fields, there's street lights. So, I don't, I mean I'm certainly respectful of doing it as, you know, as professionally as possible and as aesthetically pleasing as you can, but I don't see any extraordinary aesthetic value here that we're trying to preserve. I know John said the houses to the north of Kirchhoff have pretty significant landscaping, open fence. So, from an aesthetic perspective, it's not something that I would be concerned about. Additionally, we have a precedent for it of course in the Village, so that's not an issue.

The thing that, I guess for me, you know, we did talk about the need kind of generally, but I think it is important. I'm familiar with the football program, I run the Cowboys flag program so I've had 20 teams that, you know, I've accounted completely for. I also have three kids in the Arlington Aces program. So, I'm familiar with the strain on resources in the Village, notwithstanding the fact that we did have fields all with the Park District in terms of maintaining them to a level, particularly on the club soccer side, there's a standard of care you need to have for the fields. We haven't really gotten to that discussion but if you go to a lot of our neighboring communities, they have some very impressive facilities on, you know, kind of these compositions of land that we just don't have available in Arlington.

So, if you go to Palatine, they've got a big facility where they have, you know, six fields like these next to a high school. You've got communities that have access to that. We don't. Our park land is kind of parceled up all over the Village. So, when we do find, you know, an opportunity to improve, I think it is consistent with the Park District trying to provide for the children and families in the parks.

I think, you know, Mr. Petersen, how many families do we have in the soccer program approximately? I want to say it's probably 300 or so?

MR. PETERSEN: Steve, would you know that answer from a programming standpoint?

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Please give us your name and spell it for the court reporter.

MR. NEILL: First name is Steve, last name is Neill, N-e-i-l-l. We have approximately 300 children in the Aces program. Now, there are some siblings, so maybe 260-270 families within the Aces program. Within our house league, it's about 1,200 kids.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: So, you know, as we look at the need for these fields, I think right now there is no soccer that can be played at these fields. We're not looking for a change in use. The only reason we haven't really played a lot of soccer in these fields is because of the conditions from our football program have been wearing down the fields.

MR. PETERSEN: Just the nature of the sport.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: That's going to go away because the fields are being constructed, so there will no longer be that sort of practical restriction on these fields that football has been putting on these fields. So, there will be soccer played on these fields,

and then the question would be, you know, the safety of it all.

I do think that, having watched hundreds of soccer games on these big fields, there will probably be, you know, balls that do make it over these 20-foot nets. I think it will be probably few and far between, but it will be there and then the question will be how we'd manage them. I guess from my perspective, that would be a very, you know, valid concern. If that's what it takes I think to get this through in terms of locking the site down, or maybe it's even a key, maybe the person who's in charge of the site has a key to it, and that way you have a gate installed but that person physically has to go over there and open it up or have someone that's sort of standing by in case they need to do it.

I would be, you know, I would be fine if we had to work with the Park District to further the access to the street, and that would be my main concern is with the access. But I do think that the Park District has done a very good job of addressing all of the concerns that were presented by the Board and the public from the last hearing. So, I appreciate you guys going through the effort.

I think it's a good project and I think it's important for the quality of the programs from Park District that, you know, we do as good a job as we can in finishing this site, it's already in construction, so in terms of finishing that. That would be all I have to say, Bruce.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Sorry, Jay. I didn't see you there.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: That's all right when you're down at the far left.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, there's so much space in between. Now I'd like to open it up to the public. Do we need a motion to do that, Sam? What's the procedure on that? Because we closed the public hearing before.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, why don't you make a motion just to --

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Could I actually make a motion to submit the, if we haven't already, submit the further documentation that the Park District has provided in the record?

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, I would do that.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I move to provide the documentation into the record, the memorandum dated June 17th and the letter from Mr. Petersen dated June 15th into the record.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there a second to that?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those opposed?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: So entered.

MR. HUBBARD: So, you can reopen the public comment.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Do we need a motion to do that?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, just to --

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Could we have a motion to open the public hearing?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll make that motion.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there a second to that?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those opposed?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: We're open again. Hopefully there's somebody, after all this, that would like to get up and give us some additional comments. So, please come forward, state your name and address and spell your last name for the court reporter.

### **QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE**

MR. MALIK: My first name is Troy and my last name is Malik, M-a-l-i-k. My address is 1215 West Francis. I am one of the neighbors who is north of the field. So, I just wanted to address a couple of questions.

So, John had mentioned there's fencing and landscaping. You know, a 20-foot fence or net is going to be a lot taller than a lot of what's out there now. Now, I do admit that there are power lines there. But prior to these fields being there, that whole area was filled with trees. It actually used to be just completely almost like a mini forest. Once the park was built, those trees were removed. Then more recently, I don't know if it was the Village or it may have been IDOT as you mentioned, they removed a number of additional large trees that had been along Kirchhoff. So, there has been a significant change to the aesthetics of that area over the last several years. First, when the park was initially put in, and then actually within the last several months when they started this project.

A couple of concerns that I still have are we keep talking about safety, and I've written a letter to Allen a couple of times about what goes on at the park when it's not being used by the Park District. There has been racing there in the parking lot. We've had to call the police many times because young kids, teenagers I suppose, use it as a track. They use the parking lot to do racing, and then what they do is they go out on Dwyer, they race down Dwyer to the Central area, race down Wilke and then come back. So, the police have been called many times.

So, if there is any, I know that has nothing to do with this particular project but this field is right along the parking lot, so if we're going to talk about safety with netting and the cars on Kirchhoff, my question is what's going to prevent players from running into the parking lot or balls from going into the parking lot? If you actually go to this field, and the way it was when it was a grass turf field, they actually put up a little fence in the corner so that the football players wouldn't actually run out into the sidewalk and into the parking lot. So, you know, Lynn Jensen had mentioned that this is a very small space for these fields, so, you know, I think there are other concerns here that I haven't heard the Park District addressing.

Then my final comment, as Jay mentioned, I'm also a volunteer for the Park District. I'm a huge proponent of our Park District. I take advantage of it. I volunteer my time as a coach. So, I get the need for these fields. My last concern is if we do put a 20-foot net there, what is going to stop people from climbing that net?

Now, you've mentioned the St. Viator field. Those fields are pretty

much contained within the St. Viator property. There is a chainlink fence around those properties. I don't know if the public can access those fields without being part of the St. Viator community during an event. I don't know that for sure. But if you put these fences in an open use park, it's very possible people are going to climb that net. Believe me, I live right there, I see all sorts of goofiness going on at that park.

So, thank you for allowing me to speak. That's all I had.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.

MR. MALIK: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Could we, would you like to answer some of that, Allen? I mean is there, I think that the ball going towards the parking lot, I think the obvious answer to that is that there is less traffic. It's not that it's a totally safe thing but it's, supposedly the parking lot is for cars that are parked.

MR. PETERSEN: Correct. Correct.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: But I mean has there ever been a problem with that? You know, cars hit with a ball or anything like that?

MR. PETERSEN: Well, of course there have been balls that have gone into the parking lot. But like you mentioned, they're not moving vehicles typically there.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, there's not as many moving there.

MR. PETERSEN: Right. So, it's not the same type of situation, correct. Just like many don't want a 20-foot net on the Kirchhoff side, we don't want to put two 20-foot nets up. We want to try to minimize as much of that as possible. We realize, you know, it's not the best looking type of thing to put out there, so we don't feel it's as necessary. We don't think it's necessary at all actually on that side.

One of the fields, that west field is actually not adjacent to the parking lot. That soccer field is actually adjacent to the playground there and bocci ball courts and the walking paths. It's only that east field that is adjacent to the parking lot. Again, that's, in the fall the primary use is football, it will be used for some soccer. In the spring it will be used for some soccer and primarily practices on the north-south kind of orientation. So, we don't feel that there would be as many balls that way.

As far as the St. Viator fields, those are open to the public. I don't believe they are locked off, so there is the same type of use or available use to somebody going on to those fields. I don't know that St. Viator wants people out there, but I think they're open if somebody were to go out there.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: My other question that Troy brought up is are you aware that there's these shenanigans going on in the parking lot?

MR. PETERSEN: We have that kind of situation that we're constantly dealing with at all of our parking lots, all of our community centers. Unfortunately, there's kids and they find our parking lots. We are constantly working with the Village Police and doing the best we can to address those situations.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Do you have parking lot lights on this field?

MR. PETERSEN: There are lights on that parking lot, yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Do they go off at a certain time or are they on all night? What's the --

MR. PETERSEN: I believe they have a night light on that parking lot. So, not all the lights are on but there is night light.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Right. Does that help answer it, Troy?

MR. MALIK: Yes, although, Allen, I have to say --

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Troy, you've got to come up.

MR. MALIK: Sorry.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Otherwise the court reporter can't get it.

MR. MALIK: Sorry. I was just going to say, Allen, have you been out to the site? Because it appears that the soccer goals are being put on the east side. So, this diagram is wrong that you're showing us.

MR. PETERSEN: Actually the soccer goals that are going to, actually the goals are being put in. They're going to only be used for football.

MR. MALIK: Okay.

MR. PETERSEN: Yes, they're not planning to use those. It's the style that we use is --

MR. MALIK: It looks like a soccer goal.

MR. PETERSEN: It has an opening but we can't use that for a full-size soccer field, it's not the right dimensions. So, we would only be using the north-south for the --

MR. MALIK: It looks like they installed soccer goals on the Ace field.

MR. PETERSEN: Yes, it's the type of goal that's installed. Yes, the uprights are just not on yet.

MR. MALIK: Okay, fair enough, fair enough. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. Any other questions? Please come forward. Your name, spell your last name.

MS. MULVIHILL: Hi, Pat Mulvihill, M-u-l-v-i-h-i-l-l. We're at 615 South Yale, which is the corner of Yale and Kirchhoff, on the north side of the field and we do not have an eight-foot fence. We have a chainlink. Our backyard faces east which is directly in line with where the proposed netting is going to be.

I'm not against having soccer and football being played there, but I do have a concern about allowing children to run out onto a 35-mile-an-hour speed zone there. We've lived there over 20 years, and Kirchhoff is highly, highly trafficked, especially on the weekends. We also have ambulances going down there to get to the hospital. To allow children to have access is to me, it takes my breath away because I cannot in my best judgment see those children adhering to having to follow a locked door. There's children over there all week long, not just on game days.

The second comment I'd like to make is about parking. With the additional use of the soccer in addition to football, we're going to have traffic over there, and I would assume everyday of the week. Right now on the overflow, it goes down Dwyer, goes down our street on Yale, goes into that side parking lot that takes you around to the utility portion of the park, as well as the lot itself. I'm assuming it goes down Dwyer, and I'd like to know if there's any proposed ideas on how you're going to accommodate additional parking.

My sons both went through the programs here. I think Arlington Heights has the best Park District in areas around. I'm just hoping that you seriously consider not letting the children come out onto Kirchhoff. Thank you very much.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. Is there any answer to the parking problem?

MR. PETERSEN: As far as the parking, we do not plan on using both the

soccer field and the football field at the exact same time. So, as far as the usage out there, it would be similar to what it has been. There might be more usage in the spring obviously because we are able to use all this, but it's not adding more cars at any given time.

We do know in the fall there are some times where it's been very busy over there, depending on who the visiting team is and that kind of situation. But for the most part, we feel like we can accommodate all the parking. It was designed for parking for a couple of athletic fields for practices or for games. There are lots of parking spaces along that parking lot and over off of New Wilke. We are going to encourage people to use that, especially our home players to use that parking rather than the parking adjacent to the site here or the athletic fields here and hopefully reserve some of it for visiting parking and that kind of thing as necessary.

We have a lot of soccer games that are going to be in-house programs, so we will have our own residents. So, as far as a visitor vs. the home situation, we do look to address that by encouraging people to go over to the New Wilke side for things.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Great. Thank you, Allen. Any other questions? Yes, ma'am, please come forward.

MS. REBSAMEN: Hi, my name is Lara, L-a-r-a, Rebsamen, R-e-b-s-a-m-e-n. I live at 1307 West Francis.

Question, I'm going to go through the questions that were proposed to the Park District. The first question was about clarifying different locations for the soccer fields. The Park District has over 58 facilities on this flyer which is out of date. At that time, 13 parks were designated for soccer that did not include Sunset Meadows at that point in time.

The Park District partnered with 214 in year 2011 and the Park District and District 211 shared approximately a \$1 million cost to install artificial surfaces on the football field at Hersey High School. Officials said that the 12-year cost of the fields including the installation is about \$265,000 and that would be more than maintaining the cost of the grass fields over the same period of time and allow for far more activities on the surface. How much of Hersey has been utilized to its full extent which is a turf field that we partnered with? If you're looking for other facilities with bathrooms, Heritage has soccer and Olympic has soccer. There's indoor toilets there.

My next comment is about the parking lot. I counted the spots from the aerial view. There's 124 non-handicap spots in the lot off of Dwyer. Again, other neighbors have commented about the parking on that Kennington on Dwyer, by the park on Dwyer, north of the park. The neighbor commented on the parking on Yale as well as parking going on to Francis. It appears that maybe between two and four spots have been removed from the parking lot with the reconfiguration of these larger fields, and you're talking about increased capacity at the park. How much further are people going to be parking on residential streets?

My next comment is in regards to question number two, safety and the need for netting along Kirchhoff. You brought up the majority of the play that's going to be north and south is oriented for younger children only. Also, that you could not give a number to Mr. Jensen on the number of balls that have gone into Kirchhoff with the number being infrequent. At the last meeting, you were asked about how many accidents occurred, were reported to the Village regarding balls going out into traffic, and you said you did not have a number. So, you're talking about north and south play for an extreme sliver of the population that would be playing soccer, the younger children. Why can't you continue to play east and

west without any issues?

Regarding number three, the pedestrian gate, there is no need for any open fencing along Kirchhoff. Inconvenience of people walking around, if you're at a sporting event, you're there for sports. Sports involves physical activity.

Kennicott is a highly traveled road. It is a major ambulance path. The ambulances, once they turn the corner off of New Wilke, unless it's a significant emergency, turn off their sirens. They are usually traveling faster than 35 miles an hour. The high school students in the neighborhood are bused, not to Rolling Meadows, not due to the distance from Rolling Meadows but due to the safety of the street. So, now you're opening up gates for children to go on to a heavily traveled street. There is no need for any pedestrian access in the middle of a gate. Go to the intersection, cars barely pay attention to people at the intersections, now you're allowing people to enter off of the park.

Your latches you said are going to be five feet tall. I talked to my neighbor boy who is four-foot-four going into third grade, when he puts his hand up he can reach over five feet tall. So, a child can access any latches. In your statement, the Park District will also inform coaches and team managers that the gates are intended for adults only. Just because you inform adults, it doesn't mean they're going to follow through and say to everybody that's not for kids. Who is really going to follow through on that?

Who is going to monitor if the fences are closed at all times? Who is going to monitor if those fences are closed when game play is not going on, when neighbors are out in the evenings, when kids are doing their shenanigans in the park? There is already vandalism there where the statue, the football statue was also damaged. So, now that football statue can't even be out 12 months of the year.

Point four, the landscaping. If you look at the picture of the trees that they submitted that are farther down, farther east on Kirchhoff, those trees are low. Those trees are not going to grow. As you can see, they would be growing into the power lines and the utility lines. Those trees are not going to grow tall enough to block my line of vision out my backyard.

The property immediately behind my house is not my property. I cannot put up trees right behind my fence because I don't own that property. So, I can't put up additional trees, and what trees would be needed to block the park would be evergreens. The trees proposed are not evergreens.

Point five, about number two, about the retractable netting being more expensive, I do have a question to the Park District about how much money you spent on the irrigation system that you put in that park a few years ago that I saw being bulldozed a few weeks ago. That's all of our taxpayers' money at waste.

Number three, Park District has limited availability of staff to be able to put the netting up and down. There's attendants on site for the golf, and you also pay other attendants at other parks such as Pioneer to keep the building open so people can use the gym in the evenings. So, you do have staff and you do pay for staff after hours and for other occasions.

Then at the bottom you talk about you do not plan to remove the net. Soccer starts in April after spring break. It goes from April until the second week in June. Football starts in, practices start in August, and soccer and football play goes through October, maybe the first week in November. So, you have seven months of non-continuous use of these fields. Again, you stated the primary purpose of the netting is for the smaller children who will be



playing north and south orientation. So, I'm looking at netting 12 months a year for the purpose of seven months of non-continuous use out my backyard.

The picture that you showed regarding number seven and other netting in the area, you didn't even show Park District property. You showed private property, St. Viator's. Those trees on Dryden a big mature trees. You're talking about putting up tiny little trees.

Number eight, your rendering of what you're showing is really not an accurate rendering of looking out my backyard at the park. The aerial view of trees along Kirchhoff, you did not go to Google Maps and use a Google Map picture. That's how I counted the number of parking spots in that lot to see what driving down Kirchhoff looks like and what actual netting along Kirchhoff would look like. So, I think your rendering was kind of inaccurate to what you're proposing it to look like.

Now, my children have been involved in soccer and in football in Arlington Heights. I support the Park District and the park programs, but this I cannot support.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. Yes, sir.

MR. STACK: Hi, my name is Ed Stack, I live at 1211 West Francis Drive in Arlington Heights.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Spell your last name please.

MR. STACK: S-t-a-c-k. I just want to point out like Troy did, I've also had my son go through park activities, and I have coached the Park District basketball and Park District soccer over the years. I'm all for the parks. I'm not in favor of the netting.

One thing I want to tell you, John, about the landscaping in people's yards along Kirchhoff, you know, those of us on the north side of the street, there is some stuff that grows wild. There is some stuff that people planted. But a lot of the stuff that is growing wild is slowly coming down just like it did on the other side of the fence. The big trees, as fences are getting replaced, are being cut down because we can't replace fences. So, a lot of what you see, and some of the houses do have some barriers, some of them don't, but a lot of what you see will not be there in the future.

I do agree with Lara that if this, you know, I do not like the aesthetic of the netting at all, but I think that she's right, that evergreens, there's actually, if you look at the east side where the trees do exist on the east side of Dwyer, you know, they are going to grow right into the power lines. But if you were to go south of the power lines and plant evergreens, you could plant trees that will grow much higher and they would cover the netting.

But the primary thing I want to say is that it seems to me the issue is not playing soccer there. I will say though that there has been a lot of soccer played there over the years. I think that there is a misrepresentation here like, and I'm not sure of all the timing of it, I'm sure there's been time there hasn't been soccer but there has been plenty of soccer there in the spring over the years. It's not like it's been football and no soccer. So, there has been soccer.

Now, there may have been some seasons where it was down, I'm not sure. I've lived there 14 years. But it seems to me that the problem is not the turf fields and putting in the soccer fields, it's the orientation of the fields. So, now that we've decided we're going to have north and south fields, we need to have a net, because before we had plenty of football and plenty of soccer and no net as long as we were running east and west. So, it seems like the north and south, wanting to put these smaller fields in has made a necessity of the net.

That's how it seems to me because they've been playing there for years without a net.

My last comment about that would be, too, people have brought up the parking and that's a big concern, too. It looks like you may be losing a couple of parking spots also with the new construction, is that correct?

MR. PETERSEN: Correct, three or four.

MR. STACK: So, there's going to be three or four less spots. During the football season when there's a maximum of two games, you've got the parking lot full. You've got parking down Dwyer, sometimes down Francis. Sometimes it reaches my house, not normally but it has. So, now instead of two soccer games we're going to have four soccer games, correct? Sometimes there will be four soccer games being played?

MR. PETERSEN: It's possible there would be four.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Why don't you come up just to the microphone?

MR. PETERSEN: Yes. To address that, yes, it's possible there will be four games, soccer games. But those fields are, those north-south orientation are much smaller rosters of children. They're only playing a six on six or seven on seven variety of games. So, you know, rosters are ten kids each, so we're talking the same amount of kids as a large size if there were two games going on. But in fact, as I mentioned earlier, we're only going to have, at any given time, one full-sized football game going on or one full-sized soccer game. It's not going to be both full-sized fields are going to be used at the same time ever. That's not how we're planning the program.

So, we've already talked with the football association. They're only using that west field for practices, they're never going to be using it for games. We've got the east field for games. We've got, as mentioned we've got the Hersey synthetic turf field that we can use for games, and we also have football fields that we use at our Pioneer Community Center location. So, we're planning to ever have two football games at a time. So, as far as the parking concerns, we don't see that being an issue.

As far as the number of games like you mentioned, yes, there are four games but the rosters are much smaller. So, the smaller kids, the smaller games, they don't have the same need.

MR. STACK: So, do you currently only have one football game at a time?

MR. PETERSEN: I know in previous years they have used both fields at a time, but it's not planned. We don't have the field on the west set up for games.

MR. STACK: Okay, but now, okay, let me just run the numbers by you real quick. So, you're saying six on six on the small fields?

MR. PETERSEN: Is that correct?

MR. ELMAN: Yes.

MR. PETERSEN: Yes, six on six.

MR. STACK: Okay, so that would be 36 kids playing on one field and 22 on the full-sized field as opposed to 22 and 22 if you were having two regular soccer games. So, you're still going to have a lot more kids playing. I'm just saying it's going to affect the parking. There's going to be a lot more parents, a lot more people there, and the parking is going to be, because it really, you guys know it doesn't hold, the parking lot doesn't hold games now. It's held up and down the street down Dwyer.

So, what I'm saying is the full-sized field, you're playing 11 on 11, that's 22. On those three small fields, you're going to have 36 kids playing.

MR. PETERSEN: Right.

MR. STACK: Where it was just a full-sized --

MR. PETERSEN: But it's still under the 100 plus parking spots that are out there.

MR. STACK: No, the parking spots right now don't hold the games when you have a football game. They come down the streets. So, you're going to have a lot more kids meaning a lot more parents.

MR. PETERSEN: Is the math correct on that?

MR. STACK: I'm pretty good at math. Okay, that's all I had to say, thanks.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. Any more hands? There we go. You're closer, you can come now please.

MS. BRANCATO: No, go ahead. Actually I was going to mention something that he proposed the last time that hasn't been mentioned. So, you go right ahead.

MR. MAREK: Good evening. My name is Bob Marek, M-a-r-e-k, and I live at 610 South Yale Avenue. I only wanted to address one item at this time and it's based on my reading of the Park District's response letter.

In response to point number five, the Park District has a nice discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of a retractable netting versus permanent netting. What it talks about there is that the permanent netting has the advantage of having a tighter fit which limits moving and waving in the wind which I assume goes to some noise pollution issue, and also a tighter fit limits sagging and slack which leads to some, you know, decay and atrophy and also I would assume the same noise pollution.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: It's an aesthetic thing.

MR. MAREK: And aesthetics as well. Now, on that point then is I also took a ride over to St. Viator's to look at their netting. What I noticed as a non-engineer, it seemed to be that they had some sort of a tension adjuster at the base of the netting. So, I thought that was a nice idea because if in fact there is an advantage to having a taut net, then you'd want some sort of device during this permanent netting of being up for 12 months a year that you could reset it, adjust the parameters and make it taut so you don't have, you said maintain the aesthetics and you avoid the other problems with the blowing and the noise or whatever.

So, I would just like to pose to the Park District whether or not in fact the object that I did see, was it a tension adjuster? If it is, were they considering having that along the, you know, 700-foot stretch of net on Kirchhoff Road? Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: We're going to throw that back to the Park District.

MR. PETERSEN: I'll trust Mr. Marek's point.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: This is Allen Petersen again.

MR. PETERSEN: Yes, and that's exactly the type of netting setup that we would propose, that St. Viator has. It's kind of that semi-permanent in nature that it's strong on tension lines across the top, the bottom and the sides along the holes. Very similar to the way it's set up at St. Viator. St. Viator has a much bigger, taller netting, but in our case it would be the same type of situation.

The permanent type netting is connected directly to a pole and it's

with brackets. That way there's really no flexibility of change or use in there. So, we agree, we'd like to be able to tighten those nets up as necessary and keep them as tight and as taut as possible because that's going to give us the best look along there anyway, and the least amount of wear and tear on the system. You know, as soon as it gets loose, it's going to pull and tug and rip, and we don't want to have that kind of situation.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Allen. Yes, ma'am, I think you're up.

MS. BRANCATO: Rose Brancato, B-r-a-n-c-a-t-o, I'm at 707 South Yale. First of all, I want to express the opening on Kirchhoff, when I first heard it, I think it's an absurd idea. Nobody really needed to think about it, not only for the kids but there's going to be grownups, that easy way since there's a door there, they're going to go ahead and drop off the kids right there. It takes time to go around? Oh, well, a sacrifice that we have to make to run a team. That's the number one thing.

As far as the 20-foot fence, I'm not into sports so I'm not a, you know, a judge to say, but is it really needed that tall? Is it really needed for 20 feet? Someone at the last meeting mentioned maybe we could only just go 10. It hasn't been mentioned anymore. What the prior gentleman mentioned the last time, he mentioned something where you could take it down when the games are done or maybe at the end of the season so we don't have to look at that 20 feet all year round.

What the prior lady, I will introduce myself, that brought up everything, I'm very supportive of a lot of things that she brought up. As far as the parking that I never thought that you had mentioned and now brought back memories from last year, I live in the cul de sac right behind there. I actually have to direct people because they park there and they try every house to try to get into the people's yard to go back there to get to the park, where I finally had to say, hey, no matter where you go you're going to have to go around. There is no opening. Well, at some corner, some kids did find some ways to get in.

It gets overpopulated during the summer that's parked there that we don't, our cul de sac is fully parked because there is not enough parking. So, running more games within our area is going to be chaos. This is going to open us up with more injuries and things with the opening. So, there's a lot of things to consider before this decision is made, and I hope the safety and the keeping up our area as beautiful as it is is being considered by all of you guys. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. There you go, you're up.

MR. ANDERSON: Paul Anderson, A-n-d-e-r-s-o-n, 1303 West Francis Drive. I fit in between everybody else that's already been up here talking as far as where we are located from the park. Thanks to Troy, too, for letting us use his son for a guinea pig over and over. He's the one we measured for a height reach, and I also challenged him to kick his soccer ball over his basketball hoop sitting in the driveway to see if he can kick over 10-foot. He was excited to do it but he couldn't quite make it.

Oh, thank you. Sam has graciously put up some slides up on the screen for me. These are some Google street view images. This one is back where I came from, this is actually in the Arvada, Colorado area. I picked this because it's very close to what Kirchhoff looks like, and the shallow angle, you're going to have a view looking at this fence or netting. As you can see, it's very visible. I mentioned last time it's got a very strong vertical presence. This is how it's going to look when you drive down along Kirchhoff. I don't know if you

can flip back and forth but you've still got that same angle and it's going to be unsightly I think. I agree with John, those telephone poles, they don't look very good either. Throwing that in there is not going to help.

I was under the impression there was a lot more room for landscaping. Unfortunately, I was wrong. I'm very happy to see that they're even considering putting small trees in the right of way. But whether or not they're going to hit 20 feet or not, I don't think that's going to help.

We've been talking a lot about the netting over at St. Viator. The reason I walked in here last is because my wife and I drove over there and checked out the nets as well. In there, they're nestled in to some very tall, large mature trees. Yes, you don't see them, they don't disappear. That isn't going to be the case here. We're going to have small trees is what they've got planned.

So, going back to the list of items here, as far as number one is concerned, I'm happy to see that, you know, you're putting in fields that the kids are going to be able to use for sports. Happy to see that, you know, you're going to get a lot more use out of this park. But you are trying to put, I think, too much into a small area.

Then item 2, it seems as though you've talked yourself out of even the need for a net. You talk about game are going to be continued to play north-south. Those ages will be limited to 11 and younger. Older groups will be going parallel to Kirchhoff. Practicing, that won't involve any high kicking, it's just going to be footwork, et cetera. So, even though we've put in these nice, new turf fields, it doesn't look like the use is going to remain the same. We've changed some parameter here somewhere and come up with the need for this net.

What else was I going to say? Oh, that other 88th Street view, the other one, yes. That to me is absolutely unacceptable if we have anything that looks like that. I think our neighbors all agree, I think anybody driving down that street will agree. I know that that netting will disappear when you're at a 90-degree looking at it straight on, but all those poles, they're just there and that's all you're going to see as far as I'm concerned.

I appreciate everybody's considerations and everything that you've brought up tonight. There's been valid points, but we've still got some work to do. As far as the gates in the middle, I am also in agreement that that isn't necessary at all. That's a safety issue.

Parking, yes, those parking lots over there, they're full all the time. You're on a very busy intersection right there. You've got traffic coming in and out of those parking lots. That's going to be a nightmare, too.

I guess that's all I have to say. I just want to keep things looking beautiful. I don't want something like this. We're close but not quite there.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you.

MR. REBSAMEN: Good evening. My name is Jim Rebsamen, R-e-b-s-a-m-e-n. I live at 1307 West Francis Drive. I just have one question. Because we're playing north-south with younger kids who miraculously aren't going to be able to kick it over a 20-foot fence, there's no way, but if you're going to have four games, that means we have portable goals. Can you tell me how you're going to secure portable goals even when you're not staffing fields? Are they locked? If they're sandbagged, they're going to fall over because kids are going to move them.

MR. NEILL: Again, Steve Neill, N-e-i-l-l, Division Manager of Recreation

Facilities at the Park District. The portable goals that we're proposing to use on the north-south fields are weighted down, not with sandbags but with a screwed-in lead-based weight or like a weight plate. So, they will be secured in place for that.

MR. REBSAMEN: You're going to screw them into the turf?

MR. NEILL: No, not screwed into the turf, screwed into the actual base structure of the net so that they would be in place for the game. Then they would be removed, not offsite but off field after the north-south game so that they could play east-west.

MR. REBSAMEN: Then what happens, they're locked?

MR. NEILL: Yes, they would be locked kind of --

MR. REBSAMEN: Together.

MR. NEILL: Yes, together.

MR. REBSAMEN: So, no kids could pull them apart or adults --

MR. NEILL: Or it could be used by a row group.

MR. REBSAMEN: So, they'll be locked all the time?

MR. NEILL: They would be locked when they're not in use by park

programs, yes.

MR. REBSAMEN: Okay, thank you.

MR. NEILL: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you. Anybody else? Okay, seeing no hands, I think we'll close the public hearing portion of this and get back to questions, deliberations.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I heard a lot of support for the Park District and the Park District programs. Most of the criticisms that I have heard go to the issue of the actual placement of this field and what you did sometime ago and it's really not the purpose of this hearing. But I do find it a little, quite interesting that you placed such an important field that close to such a large artery and created a safety problem just to begin with.

So, I think you've put, I think the Plan Commission, the Board and others are put in an awkward position, you're asking us to balance aesthetics against what you call safety because you feel the safety of the cars as well as of the people playing depends on this net. So, I think most people will have to come to the side of safety, but we don't feel very comfortable, I don't feel very comfortable doing that. I feel that things were not well thought out about this park from the very beginning. You did it very well with the other parks where you're not right on major traffic areas. But with this particular park, you not only put it there but you've put a lot of activities there and it's probably stretched beyond capacity.

So, I'm feeling very conflicted about your petition. If this were a private petitioner and not a government petitioner, you went through the process from start to finish, we would not be here discussing this. We probably had denied it somewhere along the process, that we would not allow somebody to put a miniature golf course or some other thing where balls can fly out into the road. So, I feel like we've set a lower standard for government than we have for the private petitioners that have come before this Commission, and I'm very troubled by that.

I'm still not totally sure how I'm going to vote on this but I don't really like the position you've placed the Plan Commission in and the Board, and I think it's very unfortunate. But we're not here to deliberate the existence of this park. What we're asked to do is deal with the aesthetics of this netting versus the safety aspects of it. So, it's a very

disconcerting position I find myself in.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I somewhat echo that. I can't change the past, I can't take this park away. I can't move it to another spot farther away from the road. I can't change any of that. All I can deal with is what's in front of me right now.

Unfortunately, if I have to choose between somebody's life being lost in a car accident and aesthetics, I hate to be the homeowner and I have a lot of sympathy for you and I hate that I'm in this position, but I would have to choose safety over aesthetics.

If the fence doesn't go up, are you still going to go ahead with all of the programs that you have planned for this? If the Board denies, even regardless of what we decide, if the Board denies the net, what will happen at this point?

MR. PETERSEN: If the Board decided to not approve the safety netting along Kirchhoff, we would have to look at our uses there because we do have concerns about safety. You know, it might not be where we would use the use initially, we might have to just monitor it. We might have to have people out there to monitor it constantly if that's necessary. We don't think that it should come to that. We think that, you know, a 20-foot net serves this purpose for this location.

This is the land we have. Unfortunately, with the Park District, we don't get the best choice of property and we do the best we can with what we have. We definitely have a need for soccer and soccer locations. Right now, the site that we have in our possession is not getting used to its full potential. As I first acknowledged, we know this is a concern but we're trying to address it as best we can by putting in safety netting.

I know that there's concerns about the aesthetics and the landscaping and the openings. But as you mentioned, us as well, we have to side on the side of safety. You know, we're going to use it for soccer and we don't want there to be a problem there.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I do want to weigh in on the gate. When I asked before, I was thinking of the limited scope of mostly being used for the park stuff. But just thinking about people potentially and I can imagine people would do it, drop their kids off on Kirchhoff and let them come through the gate. That's crazy but I've seen people do some pretty crazy things in my life. So, even if you made it self-closing, I think I would just prefer to get rid of the gates all together.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Thank you, Mary Jo. John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I wholeheartedly agree with both Commissioner Jensen and Commissioner Warskow that, again we can't go back into history but I think there is some very poor planning here with the location of these fields. I don't know if it was ever thought of to flip-flop with the parking lot. Yes, that's an additional cost, of course it is but, you know, when you add the cost of this 20-foot net in and over a period of many years of replacing that because that has a limited lifetime of exposure to the elements. So, again but that's history.

So, right now we're dealing with this netting. I fear problems with parking, but again we can't do anything about that today. This is strictly about approving a variance to allow a 20-foot high netting. If we have to choose between safety and aesthetics, I've got to go with safety. I would not want to be the one to have to deal with the fact that we, and not have any gates. I'm totally opposed to having openings on that fence and allowing somebody to go out there. If it's an inconvenience to walk around, let that be an inconvenience.

But I don't want it on my conscience that we allowed gate openings where a young child ran on to Kirchhoff and was injured or possibly killed by a 35-mile-an-hour vehicle coming down that street.

So, right now I'm going along with this netting but without any entrance openings. I'm just sorry to see that things weren't thought of years ago before these fields were put along this Kirchhoff Road. That's all I have.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Jay?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, all good comments by my colleagues up here and certainly the public, and thank you all for your comments. You know, just a couple of issues that I would raise is, as we go forward, regardless of the outcome, I would ask the Park District potentially to work with the Village, you know, the Yale cul de sac concern about parking, people, you know, kind of coming through Yale. Now, that's an issue right now, so, that's just something that, regardless of what happens with these fields, I think that as a Park District and as a Village, we should probably figure out if there's any sort of controls that we can put there or enforcement issue, because that shouldn't happen regardless.

Then maybe more, you know, I don't know, it seems to me like the parking issues, I've been at the park some of those nights where you have multiple football games, you know, with teams coming and teams going, so you may have four or five teams there at one time, and it does get, you know, again current state, and so parking loads up along Dwyer. But I don't know, maybe there's a way for us to ease some of that with better use of that Wilke parking which I think we're not really talking about. We're talking about the parking lot, there's plenty of parking along Wilke that maybe we're just not directing people or people don't know they have access there. So, maybe as we direct whether the visiting teams, you know, that are coming in for Aces games, we say, you know, park along this.

So, I think that the parking issues, while it may not be the subject, I think are real issues that we probably need to address regardless of what goes on here. The other thing I'd say about the landscaping is I appreciate the work that the Park District has done about the right of way trees. You know, I would also ask that, you know, if we think that it would help at all, to look at the northerly right of way, if there is something IDOT is interested in, because you're achieving the same, I think that the people's concern isn't necessarily driving along Kirchhoff, I think we're talking about the folks on Francis has the main concern for aesthetics and, you know, you'd be able to address that whether the plantings go in on the north side or the south side. So, whatever makes the most sense, if we can get taller trees on the north side because you don't have those huge overhead lines, you know, maybe that goes a little bit further as well as to assuage some of the concerns on that.

Then I would just say about, you know, there were still some questions about the use of the fields. Kevin Malik is a player that I have coached and I do know he's an excellent player. So, I know the neighborhood used him, you know, he's a great athlete. But I will say we're talking about kids who are going to be up to like 18 years old playing on these fields. If there's a question about whether the current fence or maybe even a 10-foot netting would be sufficient to stop those balls even on the north-east, I mean, even if you knee a challenge on a soccer ball, that ball will go flying sideways even though the field is not directed that way. So, I can assure you there will be plenty of balls on the street if there is no netting, and there probably will be several with a 20-foot netting.

But I would also say that it seems as though my colleagues here are



opposed to really any gating. It seems like that's a big concern not just from the public, a completely legitimate concern of course, and also from the Board. Maybe that's something that we need to just get over here as we make a vote, maybe we have to adjust our recommendation. I'm not sure if, like I mentioned before, a keyed entry so you literally can't open it or close it unless there's somebody there that's going to be at the facility, probably the Aces director coaching who's going to be out there running it, if he has a key, then that's the way in and out. I mean is that sufficient for the Board?

Maybe that's something we need to talk about. Or is it just simply we're not going to allow it in any event? If it really becomes an issue then, so I would just ask the Board how we address that in our recommendation.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Since I'm the last one to speak on this, I think if we had a gate, and I'm really against the gate, I think it would have to be locked. I think that might be something that I could consider if it was a lockable thing.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: But that doesn't serve any purpose them.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, it --

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: If they're going to have to go out and get a ball, are you going to wait for somebody to go and get a key from somebody, whoever has this key?

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, John, let me finish. I'm against the gates to begin with. If there had to be a gate, it would have to be locked. I question, as you were just stating, what good does it do if there's one key on this giant 1,000 foot long field? So, I think that, the gates I think are too much of a safety hazard just in general. So, obviously locking is not any way to change that.

Also, the netting here, I echo everything you've heard here about how hard it is to make a decision here based on where we are today. I'm thinking that maybe we should change the recommendation that without an acceptable landscaping on the north and side right of ways there is no netting. So, if we all feel that we need to have netting which I do for a safety thing, and that the Park District has shown poor planning I think over the years, then if we're in this situation of concern for safety, then we have to go a little bit further and say that we want to see more landscaping on both sides of the street and get a more acceptable 20-foot by, isn't it 975 feet long? How long is this thing?

MR. PETERSEN: This is 816.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: 800, I'm sorry.

MR. PETERSEN: 816.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: 816 feet long, which is considerable, I think that we have to work a little harder here. A tree every 50 feet or whatever the pole is facing isn't going to do it. They're going to have to get landscaping that's going to be able to grow and miss the power lines because ComEd comes along and butchers up all the trees that are planted on the power lines. So, I'm just throwing that out. Is there any way to, without just saying okay, we're going to have the net and then not concern ourselves with the aesthetics of it?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Well, I would say, I mean I think that, so are you saying that it would be a condition of our approval? Because I think we're willing to say, at least I'm willing to say, you know, to approve the Petitioner to go forward and work with the Village to get essentially the most, you know, reasonable landscaping we can from IDOT. The Park District is not going to have, the ultimate control rests with IDOT. We just have to get some

good faith here from the Park District and working with the Village to get the most, you know, acceptable landscaping they can get from IDOT. I don't know holding it up on our approval is not going to, I don't think that's going to do it.

Right now, if we put any, as far as I'm concerned, you know, with all the electrical lightings and the lighting poles and everything that you have in the site plans, a considerable amount of landscaping that the Park District has already proposed is probably an improvement on that space as well now.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, yes, it's a single tree where every pole is which I think is 50-foot spacing or something.

MR. PETERSEN: 48 feet.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: 48 feet, you know, which is not a lot.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: It's not a lot. You know, and I guess --

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: If it's a typical IDOT tree they put in, it's about a two-inch caliper if I had to guess. So, it's going to be many years before that tree does anything.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Right, but I still think, you know, that's an improvement over, I mean as far as I can see from those lines and poles and everything that sits there, I think that would probably be an improvement on the current state.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: No, I think it would be. Anything you do there is going to be an improvement.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I guess what I would be inclined to do is, you know, take a vote, and if we want to put a restriction on the gates, that the gate is not part of the approval and we've mentioned that, then essentially the Park District would meet at least the landscape requirements that they've shown but will make further efforts to, you know, provide further landscaping more densely and perhaps some additional landscaping on the north side, all subject to IDOT's approval, because IDOT has final approval that I don't know if we can --

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Well, if IDOT was to refuse it, then what?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Well, so if we can make the condition on the landscaping that they've proposed as shown, that would be kind of the minimum standard. I mean I believe our Petitioner, the Park District would be able to go forward with our recommendation with the landscaping they have if that was all IDOT was going to give them, yes, I think so. But I also think we can put in there, if the Park District is willing to accept it, a requirement that they go back to IDOT and try to intensify that landscaping on the southerly side of the right of way and potentially on the northerly side. I mean in good faith I think you can do that, correct?

MR. PETERSEN: Absolutely. We've already applied, as we mentioned, for trees at 48-foot on center. Those trees are a variety that would reach approximately 20-foot in height which would be at the height of the net. So, that was our plan is to block as much net as we can in that way. So, those trees are going to be a minimum of 20 to 30-foot wide. They're that type of variety. So, they're 25, 20, 25-foot tall, 20 to 25, 30-foot wide. So, they're going to fill the majority for that space across the whole parkway.

We are, absolutely, we are willing to work with IDOT if they, like you mentioned, we really don't have a lot of say or a lot of jurisdiction about what happens on the north side of Kirchhoff, but we can certainly appeal to IDOT and work with the Village as necessary. We've already established communication with them on the south of Kirchhoff so I

don't know why they wouldn't, you know, work with us and hopefully meet our needs there, everybody's needs. I think that would address the concerns.

I think that the type of tree that we're planning to do is going to, like I said, cover the majority of the netting. It's going to be at the height of what the netting is proposed at. We don't necessarily need it to go above that height and we really can't because of the power lines. So, I know at one point somebody else had mentioned evergreens as a variety. Our interpretation of IDOT's landscape code is I don't believe we are able to use evergreens in that location according to their code.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is it the salting? I think it's salt.

MR. PETERSEN: I don't know for sure why. I think that they don't want necessarily a solid screen, you know, along a parkway like that. That's not what we're looking to do either.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: I don't think it reacts well to the salt.

MR. PETERSEN: Possibly. If I can address the concern that's been discussed about the openings, as mentioned, we know that was a big point of contention and we have discussed it at our side with the Park District. We feel openings are in our best interest but we're willing to take that out of our proposal if that's what it takes to get the safety netting up and protect the children.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Before you sit down, a point was made by someone in the audience that the fields are only used five months, is it five months out of the year and seven months out of the year they're not used for sports? Is that accurate?

MR. PETERSEN: I don't know if that's what was said. I think what was said is that's seven months that would be used, and that's not entirely accurate. It's probably closer to where it would be downtime three to three-and-a-half, maybe four months period of time. Basically, that's December through mid-March, early March, somewhere in that period of time is when it wouldn't be used.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, it doesn't give the neighborhood much. I think I would feel a lot better about it if you did get to a retractable netting or one you can bring down. Now, obviously that adds to the cost, but you're already spending \$2 million plus. You've got \$80,000 you're going to put into this netting. I feel like we ought to give the neighborhood something. Taking it down during the periods when you're not using it may add some costs, but quite frankly I think it would be helpful to some degree. It doesn't solve all of the problems but it does give you some period of time without the netting.

So, and I agree with what other people said, I don't think you really want to have a gate there at all. It's just going to borrow trouble you don't need.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Lynn, can I just add? I think the tradeoff with the retractable also we talked about was the aesthetics of a retractable while it's up are unfavorable I think. So, yes, I agree, I mean soccer season is going to run from, they're going to start practicing in early March, they will run through probably early November. Football, obviously August through November. So, you're really looking at dormant from probably early to mid November to early to mid March. So, you're going to have the net dormant for whatever, three-and-a-half, four months. But I think the time, the critical time where the majority of the time it's going to be up, I think the retractable is going to be disappointing to people in terms of how it looks when it's up. Not to mention the, you know, the mechanical wear and everything else.

So, I think for the Commissioners, Sam, I think we have to make a

recommendation here and I think what I would like to do, Bruce, unless as Acting Chairman you have a different idea, based on the comments I've heard from the Commissioners, to take a vote on the recommendation subject to the conditions stated therein, adding a condition that no gates --

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: No gates.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: No gate be allowed.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: And a second additional condition, that the Park District work in good faith with IDOT to intensify the landscaping along Kirchhoff road.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: North side.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, north and south sides.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Actually, there should be more in the north side where we can get taller trees, you could get the taller trees because --

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes. Sam, if you would keep that wording in there, I think we're in agreement with that.

MR. HUBBARD: Can I clarify?

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: I can, do you want me to -- oh, go ahead, Mr. Petersen.

MR. PETERSEN: Sorry, I just want to clarify. We would eliminate the openings? There is an existing maintenance gate, I believe it's an eight-foot or six-foot wide maintenance gate that's on that fence currently that we have lockable. We would be willing to not add any openings. I don't know if it's the semantics of it but just make sure, we don't want to add any gates or openings.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes, yes. I will cover that.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Keep it locked, the one they have, the maintenance gate.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes. So, I think I'll read it to Sam, the way I kind of presented it and we can take a vote from there?

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, I think that's good.

COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: So, I motion to recommend.

**A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC# 16-010, an Amendment to PUD Ordinance 87-052 and Ordinance 05-088, and a Variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.13-3(a) to allow a 20-foot tall netting in the front yard where code limits the maximum height of a fence in the front yard to three feet.**

**This approval is subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. There shall be no additional gates added to the Kirchhoff Road side of the property. This excludes the current maintenance gate which shall remain locked in accordance with current procedures.**
- 2. The Park District shall work in good faith with IDOT to intensify the landscaping along the southerly and northerly right of way for Kirchhoff Road.**
- 3. The Petitioner shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local codes,**

**regulations and policies.**

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Sounds good.  
ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there a second?  
COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Second.  
COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Roll call vote.  
MR. HUBBARD: Is that second, who had the second?  
ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Mary Jo.  
COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Mary Jo had the second, it's obvious.  
MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Cherwin.  
COMMISSIONER CHERWIN: Yes.  
MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen.  
COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes, with comment.  
MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.  
COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.  
MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Warskow.  
COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.  
MR. HUBBARD: Acting Chairman Green.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Yes, with comment. Lynn, go ahead.  
COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sure. I think it is clear that the issues that

were raised mostly go to things that aren't before the Commission at this time and they have to do with the original placement of the practice fields and the game fields that close to a major artery. This Commission couldn't really address them, but I think it is really a sad situation when we set a standard that is much lower for government than we would have in my opinion set for a private petitioner coming here trying to put a recreational field on this kind of a situation. We would have probably, it probably wouldn't have gotten through this whole process.

So, I feel like I'm in a very conflicted position, but I can't ask the Village to throw away \$2 million of investment with the turf that they've been putting in, and I can't side against safety. So, I've voted yes but it's not one that I'm glad I did.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: If I can use Commissioner Jensen's comment, that would be mine. Congratulations, you have a unanimous recommendation here. It will be passed on to the Village Board of Trustees, and that date is?

MR. HUBBARD: Again, we're targeting July 5th pending receipt of the minutes in a timely fashion.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: July 5th. I would suggest you keep in touch with Sam here to make sure that is the date. Thank you all for coming.

Is there any other items on the agenda?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: I make a motion to adjourn.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: Is there a second to that?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: All those in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN GREEN: We're adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned public meeting was adjourned at 9:36 p.m.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS     )  
                                  ) SS.  
COUNTY OF COOK       )

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
ROBERT LUTZOW

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO  
BEFORE ME THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF  
\_\_\_\_\_, A.D. 2016.

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