

**From:**

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 26, 2017 9:50 PM

**To:** Blackwood Carol; Hayes, Thomas; Glasgow, Thomas; LaBedz, Robin; Rosenberg, Bert; Sidor, Mike; Tinaglia, Jim; Deasey, Kathi

**Cc:** Arnold, Robert; Holohan, Joe; Lytle, Rick

**Subject:** AH Board of trustees letter re 620 S. Beverly Ln. subdivision

Dear Members of the Board of Trustees,

I am writing in regards to the matter of subdividing the property at 620 S. Beverly Lane slated for discussion during the meeting scheduled on Monday May 1, 2017. Let me start by saying that my family and I have been residing at 615 S. Beverly Lane for 21 years. I am a physician who works in the community at Northwest Community hospital for the same period of time. I originally bought my home due to the character of our neighborhood rather than moving to other regions such as Barrington or the Northshore. We've never regretted that decision.

I, and the remaining neighbors that surround the property, are strongly opposed to division of the 620 property for several reasons including reduction of property values and flooding problems (the facts are relayed in other letters). However, my main problem with the proposed division is in regards to significantly changing the integrity of our block as well as the neighborhood.

The north portion of the block has the 5 largest contiguous lot sizes in the neighborhood. Clearly cutting the central property in this region would change the character. In addition, we have no reassurances regarding the quality and style of the proposed homes for this lot. The current owner is clearly a "developer" based on their recent track record and occupation. They have bought and sold several properties since buying their current home. Therefore, they have no vested interest in maintain the quality of our block, neighborhood or town. This is a money grab. The surrounding neighbors have invested time and money making our properties better and contributing to the look of our town. Please be reminded that Scarsdale is the closest premium neighborhood to downtown Arlington Heights.

Although we have 3-50 foot lots and 1-75 foot lot on our block, they are all located south of the section of houses opposed to the division. I would encourage you to drive down our block, before the meeting, and imagine how this property division will change the character of the block.

In 2002, a similar subdivision was proposed to a property located on Central Road on the 900 block of South Burton. Despite the fact that this property was located on the periphery of the neighborhood, the board (including Mr Daday, the petitioners attorney) **unanimously** voted down the division to maintain the "character" of the neighborhood. This argument is even stronger in the current situation. Despite the fact that both proposals met the Planning commissions property requirements, the board correctly voted in favor of maintain the integrity of Arlington Heights and Scarsdale. I believe strongly that the current board needs to perpetuate this goal. Do we want Arlington Heights to slowly turn into Chicago with one house built on top of one another? That's not why I moved here.

Although much misinformation was purveyed during the later portion of the Planning Commission meeting, Mr. Evans staged a monologue by the selling agent Mrs. Wilcox. She stated that the current property was unsellable because no one would pay to renovate the property maintaining a single family residence. All 4 surrounding neighbors have invested in full renovations of an original Tacket home, who was the same architect of the proposed division. I am quite proud of my home. I again encourage you to drive down the block and evaluate the quality of the surrounding homes.

Finally, I have two questions that I will ask the board. How much current permeable water space will be exchanged for non-permeable space based on the current recommendations. Secondly, How many times in the past has the board allowed subdivision of land within the "core" of the Scarsdale neighborhood? Please review the 2 properties where this was allowed in the past. One was allowed on a block where all lots were 50 foot on a property that was 100 feet. The second one was on the corner of Pine and Fairview. It is embarrassing how close those houses are together. This was clearly a poor decision by the board at that time. The current owners of the larger house can't even sell their home. They have no backyard.

Thank you for your considerations in this matter in advance.

Jim Hill, M.D.