

APPROVED

PLAN

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

COMMISSION

RE: RED FLAG RESOLUTION - PC #24-002

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 11th day of April, 2024 at the hour of 7:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

MARY JO WARSKOW, Acting Chairperson
LYNN JENSEN
JOE LORENZINI
BRUCE GREEN
JOHN SIGALOS

ALSO PRESENT:

MICHAEL LYSICATOS, Assistant Director, Planning & Community Development
DAN OSOBA, Assistant Planner
HALEY NICHOLAS, Assistant Planner

APPROVED

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: I'm calling the Plan Commission to order.

Can we all stand and say the Pledge of Allegiance?
(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, roll call, please.

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Cherwin.
(No response.)

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Sigalos.
(No response.)

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Ennes.
(No response.)

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Warskow.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Here.

MR. LYSICATOS: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Here.

MR. LYSICATOS: I don't have my list, sorry.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Commissioner Lorenzini.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, sorry. Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MR. LYSICATOS: And Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Here.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Excuse me, I didn't hear you call my name, but I'm here, Sigalos.

MR. LYSICATOS: I think I got you at the beginning.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, our first piece of business is approval of the minutes from the last Commission on March 13th for Arlington 425.

Do I have such motion?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'll move.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Second?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All in favor?
(Chorus of ayes.)

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I will abstain because I was not there.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I will abstain also; I was not there.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, now we can move the motion with three?

MR. LYSICATOS: I think, yes, it will be a majority of the members that are here.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, that works.

Now, we are on to the main part of today's hearing is to hear about the Red Flag Resolution.

MR. LYSICATOS: Thank you. Actually, I think we need a motion to open the public hearing.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Oh, okay, then I'll make a motion to open the public hearing.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll second that.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Anyone opposed?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, the public hearing is opened.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, thank you for having us tonight to have a public hearing regarding the zoning regulation of properties in the vicinity of 116-120 West Eastman. This is a resolution that was passed by the Village Board a few months ago in October which called for a public hearing to discuss some of the issues that were discussed around the approval of the Eastman project about two or three months ago at this point, or no, about four months ago at this point.

What the Staff has done, we've prepared a presentation that's gone through all the steps that we've taken so far. This will be our first public hearing which was required as part of that resolution. What I'll do is I'll walk through the presentation and then come back to specific properties and then get comments from the Plan Commission. Specifically, we have some materials that we'd like for you to kind of take some notes or give us some input if you're not necessarily wanting to discuss in detail at the moment.

So, without further ado, I'll start going through the resolution summary. Basically, it's going to lay out what the Village Board adopted on December 18th and directed the Plan Commission and the Staff to gather public comment concerning the possible amendments to regulations regarding the properties within the vicinity of the Eastman project. These are basically in the north side of Northwest Highway, between Vail and Walnut, and there's a few properties along St. James directly adjacent to the Eastman project.

We are directed to do research that could possibly lead to the establishment of overlay zoning, rezoning of certain districts and certain properties, and revision to the Comprehensive Plan and the Downtown Plan. What we've done is we narrowed it down as part of the presentation with the Village Board to about six properties where we would probably recommend more detailed conversation and possible changes. There were some preliminary recommendations made in December that will just give us a little bit of history of where we've been since that point.

The Red Flag Resolution overview itself required the notice within 90 days which we did furnish, and I'll put that on record that we did do the appropriate public notice for this. We put it in the paper, notified all the property owners that were identified in the resolution, and met our legal requirement in that regard. We'll be looking at all of the standard documents that really make up what we do here from a comprehensive master planning standpoint and a zoning standpoint. You see the Comprehensive Plan, the Downtown Plan, the Zoning Code, our Zoning Map, our Subdivision Controls. I've highlighted the Comprehensive Plan because I think that's where we're really going to have our discussion tonight which is really kind of focused on the concept rather than get into detail of zoning and those kinds of elements. The Master Plan and the Comprehensive Plan I think are really where we want to focus our discussion tonight to determine what the process is going to be through the Plan Commission, but also just what the general thinking are for these specific properties.

So, the public hearing will obviously give the Plan Commission their first chance to give us feedback based on your institutional knowledge where you've seen , you

APPROVED

know, plans and projects, and also going through the process with Eastman, and also the public to have an opportunity to make comment, for you to take that into consideration.

We have a few maps that I'll walk through the specific area that we're looking at here. You see the big number one and the big number two on the map, right in between them is the Eastman project. These are all the properties north of Northwest Highway with Vail Ave being on the east or the right-hand side, and then Walnut on the left. There's also an additional property, number six, on the south side of the tracks that we included. It's sort of a housekeeping item from a Comprehensive Plan standpoint. It's a parking lot currently, and we kind of brought it into the conversation because it's very similar in the discussion topics. We also included some of the zoning, that's not going to be a specific emphasis tonight. We really want to think from the master planning and land use standpoint, long-term land use standpoint. This will kind of clarify a little bit more how many parcels we're talking about.

Number one is the bank property, Village Trust Bank. Number two is the AT&T building. Number three are some of the single-family homes; there is a quad townhome, an apartment building, all on Park. Number four are the auto-oriented business uses on the corner with Walnut. Number five are actually two lots that are currently the public parking lot owned by the Village. Those are still zoned residential, so I think they're in the Master Plan residential. So, it's about cleaning that up, some sort of housekeeping you'll see here. That's number five. Number six, specifically, are sort of looking, and this is an important map for us to think of that comprehensive master planning sort of land use standpoint.

Steps in the process. So, to give you a little bit of background where we are with research, what we've done is we've met with the specific property owners at each of those numbers. We've reached out to all six of them. We haven't heard from two, but we have met with the rest of them at this point. We had a neighborhood meeting on March 21st which I'll get into detail what we actually did to prepare for that meeting. Then, here we are today with our initial public hearing on April 11th.

The next steps will be further research based on what we hear from you tonight. I think your input will be important, especially from that 30,000-foot kind of level for land use. That will determine really what the process is and we'll have some discussion tonight on how you want to take the process; whether it's the whole Plan Commission, breaking out into some of your subcommittees which we think the larger Plan Commission is probably a good idea to carry that conversation forward because there's a number of moving parts here. It might get really clunky to have the conversation separately and then try to put them back together again, but we can get into more detail later. Then any additional public hearings that will be required legally whether we change the Comprehensive Master Plan, any of the zoning, overlays, whatever the process is, we'll have to follow through dictated by state law.

The property owner discussion process, what we do is begin with outreach. We've sent out letters to all the taxpayers of records on the properties, scheduled individual meetings with them. Several of the property owners were reached out by phone, we were able to currently have contacts for them, or they reached out to us after they got the letters. So, like I said, the status of the meetings, we had four meetings.

In the Park Ave properties, there were a number of owners in that area so it broke out into several properties, there's I believe five buildings, four or five buildings there. It outlines who we speak to here. Again, that's the West Park Place, I accounted for two of them. We did get some feedback through e-mail from another owner on Park Place, and then the commercial property owners right along Northwest Highway including the corner, there's auto-

APPROVED

oriented uses, actually the same owner. I believe they're here tonight. Also, the Village Bank property, we got a one-on-one discussion with them.

The neighborhood meeting summary, what we did was we sent out 127 mailers for this. We had a Village website, a simple Village website as you can see on the screen, that was set up. We used the e-mail notifications from the Eastman project, and that e-mail list that was generated of people who were interested, we used that for e-mail blast. We had about 14 people that came out to the meeting and we had a really robust conversation, a lot of detail about different concerns, about the potential redevelopment of those six properties, and just overall individual concerns with the neighborhood.

Now, what I'll do is I'll go through each of the properties just to give you a sense of the ones we're looking at in a little bit more detail, the feedback that we received, then we'll come back to number one here and we'll get your feedback on what you think really should be those master planning goals, those larger land use questions.

Number one is the Village Bank & Trust building property. It's the largest property that we're considering. You can see just here in some of the photos that we gathered, so that's what it is at this point. We all got new photos for everything. So, what we heard from them will also give you a sense of what it's zoned for. So, the property itself right now is in the B-5 district which is what Eastman was. It's probably our most intense zoning district that we have. So, you can see what's possible here if you built it out to the maximum that you could. This is what's allowed there. So, it could be a significant redevelopment.

At the December meeting, there was a recommendation to discuss this more because it had so much of a comparison to Eastman where it could potentially redevelop. What we heard from the property owner and from the neighborhood is that it's not going where that Eastman project is right now, and I'll get into some detail there. The property owner, they just invested in the bank property; right now, there are no plans to redevelop. They plan to be there for a while, they're not going anywhere, they really want to focus on being good neighbors. They do want to be able to consider their future redevelopment. They are cognizant of the concerns, whether it's the step-backs from the property on the first floor or even setbacks on the higher floors, they understand those concepts. As it stands, they're really concerned about their access on St. James with the drive-through; to them it's really critical for that function.

When we spoke with the neighborhood, obviously the maximum heights were a concern. Similar to what we heard during Eastman, they would like to see those step-backs on the initial floor, and then step-backs as higher floors come in. Density is a concern, and what that would generate from a traffic standpoint and access standpoint, and if, you know, it does get to a point of redevelopment at some point in the future, considerations for more green space. You'll see a lot of the neighborhood feedback would be really consistent across these properties.

The AT&T property which is just east of Eastman, currently, AT&T has long-term operations at this facility. There's very little staff that works there. We actually haven't been able to get a hold of the management company for this one, so we're not sure what their plans are for it. Again, this is in a B-5 Zone, so it does have the capability of being a larger building if it does get redeveloped at some point in the future. This was one that we obviously wanted to get into further study and more detail, it's probably the other more complex property in this discussion.

I think what we heard here is a little bit more specific from the neighborhood which was how it dovetails with the Eastman project as it's been approved. What

APPROVED

would be the massing next to that building? Would it match those heights? Because there's still the opportunity for a lot of the same issues in terms of shadow from the building, things of that nature. So, how would that come into play with the Eastman project? Staff has been looking at it, and obviously we have to take that into consideration, especially when Eastman is built to have the two buildings work together.

The next set of properties are along Park Place. This one as I described earlier is a mix of uses there, a mix of typologies with the buildings. So, there's 303, 303 is an apartment building. You have 307 and 309 which are the single-family homes. Then you have the townhomes at 402. Then 315 is a new one, it's actually a quad townhome, and we had a pretty robust conversation with the owners at 315.

As it stands, it's an R-7 Zone. So, it would allow for a little bit more density than there is now, especially the single-family homes. If they were to be redeveloped they could be developed in a larger intensity. We've recommended that this actually get down-zoned to an R-6 in our December meeting. The conversation we had, especially with the quad townhome, they did not have issues with that. The one concern was that what they have there is grandfathered because it would put a cap on that density. That project wouldn't necessarily get through without modifications, but it doesn't affect what's been built. They just really wanted assurance of that.

I can outline it here, I sort of got through it already, but that group of owners also were in favor of changing the corner with Chestnut to multi-family, or potentially high density. They did talk about not having larger buildings on Northwest Highway. They were concerned about that overshadowing their backyards. On-street parking came up with the property owners and also with the neighborhood. It's a very narrow roadway on Park, so how on-street would be affected by potentially more density or more traffic and just to be cognizant when those things potentially redevelop.

When we spoke with the neighborhood, you know, they really wanted to keep the character of that neighborhood. It's one of the three sides of the triangle around the park, potentially keeping those two single-family homes. They are two of the older homes in that neighborhood. And I think I touched upon, you know, increased traffic and access and how any redevelopment in the future would impact those. Also, the green space keeps coming up.

Number four is the two auto-oriented commercial properties on the corner of Northwest Highway and Chestnut. Both properties are actually currently under the same ownership, the same company owns both of those. They're both currently occupied. Let me give you some snapshot of the zoning. So, right now it's a B-3 Zone which is a Business Zone that does allow for auto uses. So, the current occupants do comply with the zoning.

The December 18th conversation did potentially recommend going to a B-2 to sustain more of that commercial gateway into the downtown. As it stands, these are the zoning regulations for B-3. They're the same for B-2 when it comes to residential as far as how much land you need. When we spoke with the property owners there were significant concerns from them with reducing development rights and potential density. We did hear about the maximum height on the B-2 which is really dictated by the size of the land, because remember, you can get more units the bigger the property. There isn't a height limit per se, it's a unit limit, and that really limits what you can do there with the size of the property, how high you can go.

There was a question on a concern about the commercial aspect of it, and what they relayed to us is that they're having concerns with newer development. It's harder to get some of the local businesses because it's a brand-new building and higher rents.

APPROVED

As it is, they can't get the national retailers in because the traffic on Northwest Highway isn't as attractive as on Rand Road or Palatine which get those high volumes and we're seeing a lot of those national commercial properties come in.

They did prefer an R-6/R-7 Zoning to maximize the development potential which would drive it up to three, four potentially higher stories. Access to Park Place was important for potential redevelopment because of that intersection at Northwest and Chestnut. You can't really access that corner, it's a very congested corner. It has the railroad, it's complex, so redevelopment would require some sort of access out to Park.

They were comfortable with the current tenants and they're actually able to get attractive rents because of the limits right now. Limits on properties for these types of auto uses near residential or commercial areas. A lot of it is in warehouse zones which aren't as attractive, so they're actually able to do pretty well with the existing uses.

I alluded to the fact that the neighborhood is worried about the maximum height along Northwest Highway since it's directly adjacent to those residential buildings in the back. Access onto West Fremont was a concern, again the traffic into the neighborhood, access onto Park. Those are things that if it redevelops, we would have to look at and possibly limit the access or at least the direction of the access so it didn't just cut through the neighborhood. I think we could balance that, and then obviously the green space.

So, the next two are really focused on parking lots, and this is where we do a little bit of housekeeping. The two lots that you see there are not aligned with the rest of the parking lots. Those were purchased by the Village and turned into a parking lot. So, you can see. If you're familiar with the Farmer's Market, you'll know that well.

Right now, you can see that their master plan and their zoning isn't correlating with what it is now. The Village purchased that to create the parking lots, so the Comprehensive Plan, our recommendation is it should be changed to a Government Institutional use so it just complies with how we're using it. The neighborhood did have an interest to potentially bring back single-family homes at some point, and obviously, if that lot gets improved, potential green space, or if it gets redeveloped into something at some point, the parking lots could potentially be land-banks in the future, bringing more of that green space back. You see some themes as we go through.

Then the last one is the property to the south of the tracks. This is on the corner of Chestnut and Campbell. It's the parking lot and there's also a single-family home that are owned I believe by the same owner. You'll see the zoning here is R-6, so it is a multi-family high density Comprehensive Master Plan use right now. There was a recommendation to bring it to a moderate density, so the orange would extend all the way to the corner. That's what we recommended just to bring it in line with, you know, what we've heard from the neighborhood, and also with the Master Plan.

The property owner here is obviously concerned with restricting development rights, including height and density. The neighbors were really worried about the maximum heights as well. There is this sort of balancing act between the two, so that's why we felt like a moderate density would allow it to develop something like a townhome, but not a larger building where we're getting the density across the street with Arlington 425 if and when that gets built. That's sort of density sort of balances it out.

So, these are the six properties. What I'll do now is I'm just going to backtrack to one, and I'll ask for any comments from the Plan Commission. What I did is I've left you those sheets of the four properties we felt are the most comment-worthy. The two parking

APPROVED

lots we feel are sort of housekeeping at this point. You can make comments there or just make your notes.

What we've done is tried to organize how we're going to approach the Master Plan standpoint into four areas which is the architecture, the building height, setbacks, and density. Any other concerns, you can just kind of fill in into Other, but we feel that those are the big picture things we want to discuss with you with what you've seen, you know, year after year with different properties, and especially with what you just went through with Eastman. So, I'll start with the Village Bank and, through the Chair, kind of hear what the Plan Commission has to say.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Thank you. Thank you for that very thorough presentation. I am going to start off with my fellow Commissioners.

Commissioner Jensen, do you have any questions, comments?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I guess I need a little help in getting a crisper statement of what problem we're trying to solve. Obviously, you have a highly dense downtown area and our planning requires a step-down to a transitional area, and then you'll be down to residential and, at most two-story residential or one-story. I'm not sure what problem, I mean, that's kind of the way we've got it set up now. What is it we're trying to solve with this Red Flag Resolution and the approach? Do we want another layer or step-down before so we would go Central Business District, then we have the transitional, and then are you talking you want to put another transitional before we get down to the neighborhood where we have single-family? So, I'm a little confused on what's the problem we're working on.

MR. LYSICATOS: It's a very good question and I think that's actually really an appropriate place to start, right? It's concept and detail. I drive people crazy with saying that all the time, and I drive them crazy by saying that part, too, but it really is about the concept.

So, the concept was coming out of Eastman where we did hear about that step-down. There was technically a zone where it's stepped down, but the reality was those were single-family homes across from the Eastman project, and therein lies the rub. How do you take the two zones where there isn't necessarily the opportunity for that step-down and talk to the neighborhood about those concerns?

That's kind of what we're hearing is that how do you work that in to the Master Plan and redefine what we think is the most important. So, it's almost like a refresh, right, from a concept standpoint. Are those land uses still consistent with what we think is appropriate in these transition areas? I think that's the first question, is to start off and answer it in a large perspective, and then get into the detail of zoning because I think if we're not clear, and that's why I want to hear from you specifically about where we think that land use stands. Is this, the long-term land use outcome, still appropriate the way we've looked at it?

For Village Bank, we're looking at that from a land use standpoint. It's mixed use. From a land use standpoint, is that still what we want there in the long term? Not necessarily what's there now, because we know these things happen in the few years, in decades, we don't know the timing, right? Properties can be sold or they can just be redeveloped based on market conditions. I think that's the first thing we're trying to answer here to your point. Is that the land use? Do we have to look at some consideration to build in some of that transition possibly through an overlay? Things of that nature.

Again, the detail I think we'll get to. I think there'll be a series of discussions we'll have with you to think how that goes best, but I think that's the first question.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, this is for future development.

APPROVED

MR. LYSICATOS: Right.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: We're not talking about doing anything necessarily, although the AT&T, as it's almost non-used at this point, maybe one of the early ones that gets redeveloped is something.

MR. LYSICATOS: Potentially, but we don't know that.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, basically, this could be something that doesn't change anything for quite a few years --

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: -- because it's basically laying the groundwork and restrictions and limitations on what we want to go in here when we start doing some redevelopment.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right, correct. I think that's what it is, is to put a little bit of sunlight on what's allowed here. That we're comfortable with allowing this type of development here. Because something could sit vacant for a long time and people don't realize that that's a B-5 Zone, that's the Downtown Zone, and when it gets developed, there was a little bit of surprise in the room with Eastman. To avoid the process of having to go back and redesign. I think one of the good outcomes for that was the architecture, right? It came in with a little bit more of a modern design, it came back to a little bit more of a neoclassic design.

So, for this specific property, what do we feel is appropriate? Do we feel that mixed use is appropriate? Do we feel the architecture should be more classic or something that should maybe be more bold? You know, I think that those are big questions we could answer tonight, and give us a little bit more to then whittle down based on your feedback, from the neighbors, and give the Village Board that direction to say, you know, we've looked at it again, this is the direction it should stay, this is the direction it should go.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: The last point I guess I would either address, I mean, it's a question or statement, the architecture should probably be directed or dealt with by the Building Commission.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, the Design Commission will definitely --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Design Commission, yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, but I think the Plan Commission and the Village Board will kind of set the policy, will set the guidance of what it should be. Then the Design Commission will make their recommendations in their review based on what's been put into our guidance documents. I think that your role is really to say this is the vision, right? Then the Design Commission gets into the nitty-gritty, like this doesn't really match the vision, or yes, we can play off it. You know, they get into the real detail of some of these architectural elements that may be above my head. Steve is really good at managing that process though.

I think answering these questions about each of these properties on what the Plan Commission thinks appropriate will be important. From your standpoint, you know, is it a classic architecture that you think would build in better with the downtown, or is it something that should be more avant-garde or step out? You know, the density, yes, that should be a maximum density, or no, that should have a transition to it. Same thing with the building heights.

I think if we can answer some of those questions or preferences from Plan Commission tonight, and again you can jot it down, you can take it home with you and say, I need to really think about this, that's fine, too.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: That's all I have.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Commissioner Lorenzini?

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Thank you.

So, the whole concept of having a transitional zone makes a lot of sense. Ideally, you don't want a 50-story building next to a residential home.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, the whole concept, we're going to come up, we're looking to come up with a plan for the way it should be. We're not necessarily changing any zoning to these properties. I don't think that would actually be legal to tell somebody they've got a certain capacity they can build to and then you're going to cut it back or rezone it.

MR. LYSICATOS: But we can rezone. I mean, rezoning is part of every municipal process. You can rezone. You want to stay away from spot zoning, that's why I think we're looking at these areas within the Comprehensive Plan to say how do these land uses butt up against each other, and should there be some sort of a transition to it. You know, you can do that with step-backs and buildings, and so you can use overlays to sort of modify potentially some of these zones where you're not changing the zoning, but you're sort of tempering some of the aspects of it.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I guess at this point, I don't know if I should say this, but I wish one of our attorneys were here. But if somebody bought a piece of property that could be developed pretty substantially, can the Village just come in and change every zoning which is going to reduce the value of that land?

MR. LYSICATOS: Well, rezoning happens. The other piece of that, too, is let's say we make no changes, people come in for rezoning as part of the entitlement process as is. So, they may have a project and say I need, yes, I'll step it back on one side, but I need more density on the other side. That might be a variation, that might be a rezoning. So, we do consider those things just as part of the everyday process that we bring to you.

So, it's not necessarily I think a legal conundrum. That's why I want to stay away from zoning per se, because I think that's where we can answer some of those more fine-tuned questions as we get down the process. I think where you start it off with a transition area, I think that's a good sort of place to start is do we want to have, do we want to look at maybe the same zone, but ask for a transition within the piece of property? You know, is that something that the Commission thinks appropriate?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: All right, that's all I had. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Well, I'm going to address the elephant in the room. We had a transitional zoning up against the single-family residential, and the neighbors opted out of that.

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, I am concerned that we're asking for, to install a new transitional piece as Joe said across the street and impose that on the next property owner over, and I don't think that's right. So, the fact that there was, how would you say, things were, the Eastman project was revised three times to accommodate the fact that there is no transitional zoning anymore across the street. I would say for me, the maximum that I would possibly consider would be some kind of a stepping back or something like that.

But I just want to go on the record that I said that you can't take it away and then expect it to come back automatically on somebody else's property. That's my comment for tonight.

MR. LYSICATOS: Okay, that's it. We want to get this feedback and dialogue from you guys because you're in the middle of the process, right? You had to sort of

APPROVED

help break the eggs and make the cake at the same time. So, that's --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'm the guy to do it, too.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right, and I don't mean you specifically to you, but I think everybody on this Board has had a lot of experience going through some of these more difficult projects. That was interesting because it was one of the first redevelopment projects in the downtown in many years, that and Arlington 425 from what I understand are the first ones in 20 years. So, it's not an easy process.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Well, let's keep in mind that the whole big Downtown Plan has been working for decades than I've been here to get something on the north side of Route 14.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Commissioner Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, I really don't have any comments at this point in time. If I'm understanding this correctly, right now there's a Village Bank & Trust, the maximum height there, that property could be 90 feet --

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: -- and whether that warrants a transitional zoning there, again, I understand the Village's desire to expand the downtown area north of Northwest Highway, so it's kind of like a tightrope we're walking on.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right, right.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: So, I don't have any really comments beyond that.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, looking at the sheet you provided, what I'm not seeing on there is consideration of access to amenities and what that particular geographic area provides and how we should be considering that. The fact that it has access to the train, it has access to the Jewel, has access to restaurants and other, you know, amenities, it's appropriate for a more dense use in those considerations. So, I don't want to leave those things behind.

I do appreciate the property owners. I live in a home myself, there are things I get concerned about in my neighborhood, but we're not all going to be here in the future, and we do have to give some consideration to those that will be and what is best for them and the Village in the long term.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right, and I think that's why we're having this conversation. I think that's why the Village Board directed us because it's where the two kind of pieces meet and how does that work. How does it meet the goals of the downtown, but also meet the goals of a really stable residential area? I don't think they have to be mutually exclusive, right? I think that, like you said, that neighborhood works well because of all the same access, the positive aspects of that.

So, I think when it comes to, because this is the largest property that could potentially redevelop, I think it's probably going to be the more detailed conversation. Again, we don't have to settle on anything tonight. It's really to get you caught up with where we've been, the discussions we've been having. I understand the consideration you put into everything, so I don't want to, I'm not putting you on the spot. Just putting it out there to see if there's something that's, and they're all great points.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: I guess my only concern, and I hate the fact that I feel every Plan Commission discussion comes down to this, the parking. So, that

APPROVED

would be the other area that I would be really open to in terms of putting something, I don't know whether it's, you know, a wish for a redevelopment, but there is adequate consideration to maybe underground parking or, you know, aboveground parking in the first couple of floors to prevent street parking and also, you know, a parking lot, because I, too, would like to see some green space, some attractiveness to that property.

MR. LYSICATOS: Great. Yes, I think those are great things and it's, right, when we get into the nitty-gritty, but these concepts are important, right, it's what do we want the outcomes to be, because then we can go back and kind of backwards engineer, right? I think that's important is to talk about the outcomes. So, I think that's it, to keep that street parking to a minimum, to kind of be respectful to that, and then we can go back into the properties and say, okay, where do we need to modify something.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Right, and I mean, I do see much more concern and I'm glad for this about sustainability in the future, and more green amenities in buildings. So, if, you know, you could look at the side facing the residential as, you know, where they provide those type of deck amenities with the patio and the trees and those type of things so that's more attractive than looking at a facade of a building.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right. No, I think those are good things, yes. So, I think that's a good way to look at it, that outcome-based discussion, what the Plan Commission thinks are good outcomes. Then I think that's the easiest way to kind of, the comments I've heard is, you know, what's the process, what are we trying to do here? I think it's to talk about the outcomes we want to see. So, I think that's it, thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Yes, that's the outcome I want to see. I want to see the property used well for future, to take advantage of amenities, to build in some more sustainability and green space, and provide something of a transition to the residential, but not lean so far that way that we're not considering the future and what is the best use for that lot.

MR. LYSICATOS: I think that's great.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Mary Jo, if I could make another comment?

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: You know, by zoning, they're required to self-park on the property. What I didn't like about the Eastman first go-around, even though it was code, that for reasons of economy on their part, raising the parking levels up above-grade. As far as I'm concerned, that should not be a consideration because no matter what, no matter how high and how far away, nobody wants to look at a parking garage and you can't do much with it architecturally.

So, you know, I guess what I'm saying is if you're going to develop this and it's going to reach levels of density, then you better plan on going down to get the parking out of sight.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, I think that's the outcome, right?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: That in itself, it's just the outcome that would help everything.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right. You avoid the headlights, you avoid the big, blank facade, you avoid all that.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: All the negative stuff that comes with raising things up --

MR. LYSICATOS: To your point, Commissioner Jensen, on what we're

APPROVED

trying to do here, I think I've finally kind of found a fine point on it is to really guide us on the outcomes. So, I think you started with the best question of the night which is what are we trying to do, and I think what we've kind of come to is what are our preferred outcomes when these things develop.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Now, the Village has been here a couple of times. It wasn't that long ago, however long it was, a decade or two ago, when Thomas on Evergreen going up to whatever that street is where Walgreen's is, there were a lot of small ranch houses, and somebody built a McMansion. The whole issue which set the Village afire was what is the character of that area, that neighborhood. The small ranch houses thought the character of the neighborhood was small ranch houses.

MR. LYSICATOS: That's right.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And so, a lot of these folks were here and they helped try to, you know, some guidelines, rules and restraints and so forth that allowed it to evolve and so forth. If you go down Evergreen today, it is not small ranch houses.

MR. LYSICATOS: No.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: It's McMansions and so forth.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: We've got a similar problem here. What do we want, what is consistent with the neighborhood, the character of the neighborhood. You've got an unusual situation because you have a highly dense downtown area and you don't have to go very far out here before you're down to some of the single-family dwellings.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right, a block or half a street, right?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: It's a little hard to decide what do you want the character of the neighborhood to be for that very thin area between the downtown area and the houses. I don't know whether you take the golden mean and you just kind of scale things down from the business district or what. I mean, a lot of these answers would fall out of that. But other than doing that, you know, making sure that the density is not as high as the downtown area and is certainly more than single-family dwelling, you know, you set in place some things that actually do make a step-down.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I think that's all you can do in terms of either strict, you know, guidelines or regulations or whatever, because quite frankly we have too small of an area now to have a sufficient transition area.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, it is going to be a little challenging for the Village to decide what should be the character of this small area. Obviously, the people who have the single-family dwellings do not want to be overshadowed by another Downtown Central Business District with all the mixed density and height and so forth. But we've got to, at least for the areas that look like they're going to be redeveloped in the near future, say in the next 10, 20 or 30 years, we should put some guidelines in that try to create something that balances out the character of the single-family part of the neighborhood and the more densely populated area there.

I think that's the best you can do. I don't know if you're going to be able to put too fine a point on it. It would be nice to have a much bigger transition area and then we wouldn't have this problem.

MR. LYSICATOS: But I think what you just kind of alluded to was the

APPROVED

outcome, right? The outcome is to try to find a way to balance it and, you know, maybe that means higher on one side than is normally allowed and lower on the other side than maybe they intended. So, but I think that outcome, talking more about those outcomes is going to allow us to at least kind of paint the picture if you will.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Since you're going to have to ultimately do it case by case, it's a little hard to see what kind of a general regulation you would put in place.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Other than take the mean, the golden mean, you know, you scale down from a certain height that's in the Central Business District and it's got to be higher than what you'd have in a single-family, two-story neighborhood. But I don't think you're going to be able to solve with a lot of precision things that are going to be have to be dealt with case by case, like we did with Eastman.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right, but I think, yes, what we'll do is we'll hear these conversations and at least, you know, whether we have to change anything, we don't know, but if we do change something, speak to those considerations. I think that's where we want to go. So, I think this is a good conversation. It's probably the largest property that we're going to consider so I think it's really appropriate because I think that this is, we're talking about the largest potential development and the largest potential impact to the neighborhood, to the developer. So, I think getting through this is really valuable.

I'll move to the second one which is, although not as large, but it's been there for quite sometime. I think they manage a lot of their fiber optics through here, AT&T, though again we have not been able to get a hold of them. It's been this way for quite some time, but as we know, things change, you know, needs change, technology changes. This could get redeveloped.

I think it's, so I just want to hear kind of the same thing. You know, what are the concerns or your opinions on the outcomes if this does get redeveloped that we should be adhering to or really cognizant of? I'll leave it to you, Chair, I really want to roll through it and I'll put this up just to give you a sense.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Yes. Just do any of my fellow Commissioners have comments on this property that are different?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, I can comment on it. I think that this is going to be the same, I could say ditto.

MR. LYSICATOS: And that's fine.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It's the same --

MR. LYSICATOS: Same discussion.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: -- massive piece of property if you will that incorporates three sites, but it's going to be the same concern, I think.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, that's fair enough.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Would you say that this is the most likely piece of property in this consideration you've got going on to be redeveloped? So, is this the one that's probably going to get something done first or is there other places that are going to be redeveloped? Because you're going to actually have to create a model. I mean, if this is the place where you're going to take this, you know, parcel and it's going to be redeveloped, I think what the Village is going to have to do is there'll be a lot of case-by-case discussion, but the very first one, you're going to almost have to use that as a model as to how you balance off the competing needs --

APPROVED

MR. LYSICATOS: Well, I think that's a good point. I think Eastman, the process we went through, is a good model, right? I think when that does get developed, we'll be able to see that, right, in real life. Because renderings are great and the discussion was great, but until something gets built and we live it and we see how it functions, I think that will give us a real sense of how it works. Obviously, you're not building more next to it so there's a, you know, there's a different effect every time something new comes in.

I don't know what the prospects of the redevelopment are here. I mean, for all we know AT&T might say we need that dark fiber for 100 years, you know, they might say, yes, we don't use it that much. We haven't heard from them so we don't know the prospects of a redevelopment at this point. Boy, if I could answer those questions, I would be a very rich man if I could tell you what was going to redevelop first.

The markets are fickle, and that's the other piece, too. Markets can drive a lot of this stuff and drive the values of properties, but as far as a model, I think Eastman will give us a sense of how that works, and I think they give us a framework for how we look at it. We just don't want to have that back and forth, to Commissioner Green's point, during the process, right? We want to put some of these considerations possibly into some of our code where at least we discuss them or say we don't want these aspects so we avoid, and some of that can really drive the way the whole project is envisioned, like the underground parking and things of those nature.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Or even if you just alert the developer that there's going to be considerations based on what we did next door --

MR. LYSICATOS: Right. Right.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: -- and they can see that and they can read the minutes of the --

MR. LYSICATOS: Right. We heard from the HANA neighborhood and they put a great sort of framework to it as no surprises, right? Having these discussions and putting people on notice from the development and the neighborhood side that this is going to be a discussion, we're having these discussions to get a little bit clearer sense of, yes, we're comfortable with this density, but we want these considerations taken into account. Everybody kind of knows these are going to be the ground rules for the discussion as we move forward. So, I think that's what we're trying to do here.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Especially on these two pieces of property, they have to be compatible.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, exactly.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: My only consideration here, and this would potentially be, you know, a variation Plan Commission kind of thing is that it's kitty corner from the library, and safety is just my biggest issue there.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Any other Commissioners?
Lorenzini? Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: As you mentioned, probably the first model is the Eastman project. There must be something you can distill from what we did there, where we did scale some things more appropriately in terms of what the neighborhood thought should be done. Probably, we clearly didn't give them everything that they wanted, and we didn't give the developer everything that he wanted.

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct.

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, probably, I think it's going to be very hard to get generalized regulations that even provide much guidance here. I think it really is truly going to be case by case, and you're going to evolve the regulations as some of the pieces start falling in place.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: And it's quite a balancing act, but since we do have the Eastman project, and we did have some setbacks at different levels, you know, the first level, second level and so forth, and we allowed densities in some places and to avoid having them in other places, and setbacks were different.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I think I would begin by trying to distill what you learned there and try to do it in the more specific, because I don't think you're going to get the general statement of regulations or limitations or whatever that is going to help the development of this very narrow transition.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right, right. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: In terms of architecture, things change so quickly. I mean, what we think is classic now and is desirable, you know, what's modern now might be the desirable for then.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: So, I am, yes, I don't want to restrict on architecture.

MR. LYSICATOS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I might push towards a more traditional approach.

MR. LYSICATOS: That's all right. Everyone has opinions; that's okay.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Only because the modern to me just looks cheap.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: But once again, that's a personal --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I get it's a personal opinion.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: The residents may not be of your generation and may think that traditional looks stuffy. So, yes, I think it's --

MR. LYSICATOS: But I think the outcome there is that it should be of high quality regardless.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Correct, right.

MR. LYSICATOS: And I think that's something we do pride ourselves on. I think that's where our Design Commission comes in and is unique, I think from other municipalities, that that's where they really focus, you know, is the quality aspect of the architecture. No, these are all really great comments. If nothing else, I'll move to property three?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Sure.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, this one is a little bit of a mixed bag in that they're all in, so I'll go back to this map, they're all in the high-density land use designation which is the dark brown where you see number three. The recommendation from December 18th was to go to the moderate density, and so go back to the picture. When we heard from the property owners on the bottom right, 315, if we put them in R-6, that building wouldn't be as big as it is now. They're grandfathered in, there's no issue with it, but they didn't have an issue with it necessarily

APPROVED

becoming that more moderate density.

I think, you know, what we heard from the neighborhood is the balancing out of this kind of different prototypes. But I want to hear from you guys as to, from a long-term standpoint, if and when these properties redevelop, what you think is most appropriate there. Is it the moderate density? Is it townhomes? What kind of architecture or density do you think works there?

I know that's a loaded question, sorry. You don't have to answer per se. You could just talk about those outcomes, what you think the appropriate outcome in the street is.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: I think the outcome, if I envisioned it, would be someone who lived in the higher density apartment building, taking a step-down in density, but maybe not being able to move to a single-family residence at that point. So, giving them options for that step-down.

MR. LYSICATOS: Somewhere in that, that kind of moderate density, right?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: I don't have any problems with the 315 West Park Place as it stands now. It's a quad, it's not --

MR. LYSICATOS: Oh, it's beautiful. It's very well done, but --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Right. So, I don't have any --

MR. LYSICATOS: -- I shouldn't be injecting my personal opinion. Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Right, I don't, you know --

MR. LYSICATOS: You did a great job approving that project.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Yes, so I'd be fine with that density as it stands now and not, you know, have to have something more restrictive that they'd have to be grandfathered in.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right, and from an architectural standpoint, I think, you know, there's different styles here, but is there any specific sort of feedback or outcome from an architectural standpoint that the Commission thinks is appropriate here?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Well, I don't know if I'd change the density on any of them, but if 301 and 303 ever gets redeveloped, it probably should look more like the other ones to fit the neighborhood better, but the density is what it is.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: I certainly don't think any architect today would design that building as it is now.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Does the term barracks mean something?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: A little bit.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: My opinion is, looking at these five lots, that there was an attempt by 402 and 315 to keep it very residential looking. I think there was, you know, obviously 315 is a little more successful in that there's more roof on it, more house-looking roof, but you can see that there was an attempt to keep the scale of that block to what it was and limit the height to whatever it is.

I have no problem with the density at 315, I think it works for this. I think if there was enough care, if 307 and 309 were to turn into something else, then we would like to see, I would like to see something similar to what we're doing. The density can be whatever the density is, that's the size of the lot, but to keep the Design Commission busy, they would have a model to look at here.

MR. LYSICATOS: Okay, great.

Any other comments?

APPROVED

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I'd be interested in Bruce's comment about if we were to make a decision and somebody wanted to do something in this area that looks like 301 through 303, would you say we shouldn't allow that to happen?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Whatever the density is going to be for whatever size lot that there is, you could take the 301 there and make it look a heck of a lot better than they did in the 50's or 60's, whenever this thing was built.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Right, right.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, that's what I'm saying. Yes, I have no problem with the density. This is more of an architectural solution.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, this would be the Design Commission trying to make something look --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, I think that you would just naturally want to do that.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: Great.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: At least I would.

MR. LYSICATOS: Thank you.

No, I think we've heard the outcome is that density, this mix is fine, but it's more about architecturally being consistent with the neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Right, you just don't do that and you do something like, you know, the 315 building, it's looking at the 309 and the roof lines and the porches and everything that goes with that residential, and they put it into a little bit higher density residential.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I like it.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I kind of think what we're all saying is we don't want to penalize the landowners --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Right.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: -- with a density decrease, but at least try to make everything look like it fits in there.

MR. LYSICATOS: Great, thank you.

So, our next one is number four, property four, which I'll bring up the map. Did it have a map? No, it didn't. The map here which is the B-3 on the top, you see the B-3 a little easier. It's number four. So, this is a number of lots, I believe it's six lots. Yes, I believe it's six lots, owned by the same owner, two properties though.

On the top left, so your top left, you'll see the auto use on the front, and then there's another auto use on the back with a parking lot in the back. The bottom picture shows you the parking lot and some of the garage bays, and then the second use which is a freestanding building to the east of it with its own parking lot. So, those are currently conforming in terms of their use, their auto use is in the B-3.

The December recommendation that the Board had discussed, that Staff had presented to the Board, was potentially going to a B-2, which is the same exact density requirements. These are the requirements that are there. This is something that, there were plans to redevelop it that ultimately didn't come to fruition. So, we had a number of discussions with the property owner.

This is probably more, a difficult one, not necessary from step-backs

APPROVED

and things of that nature, but what we believe is appropriate for the future in redevelopment here, especially in light of the residential properties to the north. Maybe even specific aspects, what's the outcome on that corner of Fremont, I guess it's Fremont as it hits Chestnut, and what do we think is appropriate. What you think is appropriate I should say.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I've got a question. The comment on the bottom?

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: About the Comprehensive Plan, to change the back half of the property from commercial to moderate density multi-family, what is the back half of the property?

MR. LYSICATOS: So, you can see my cursor, right? So, you see, if you took number three where the dark brown was?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Right.

MR. LYSICATOS: And you just kept that going northwest so that half the block was brown and half the block was red, that's essentially what that means. So, if you look at the top, it would be those top two parcels and half of the left parcel, whether, you know, what the Plan Commission feels about those.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I'd have to ask. We don't want the higher density, higher heights and so forth, encroaching on what should be family dwellings. Do we really want to have family dwellings come all the way up to Northwest Highway? How much encroachment do we want to have to what now is largely commercial?

You might want to redo it, and I would suggest we take a look and see if there's any lessons to be learned from the South Arlington Heights Master Plan that you guys have just developed, because you've got the same issue. You've got a bunch of strip malls, but you want it to look different. There's been a lot of work that's been put into that, and it seems to me you might be able to get some ideas from that.

But does it make sense to reclassify what is now essentially commercial to get it back to residential so that it runs all the way right up to Northwest Highway? I'm not sure that that's a good direction to go.

MR. LYSICATOS: I don't think we're recommending that the residential goes all the way down to Northwest Highway, just the northern half of the block as it cuts to Chestnut, but then the red part that fronts Northwest Highway stay commercial. Is that what you feel is appropriate?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: That I think you ought to take a look at what they did in South Arlington Heights, the Master Plan for that, but you're running into the same problems. You're going to have high density in what is now four on Northwest Highway, and then you've got this, you can have some increased density beyond single-family dwelling, but is that, that's pretty, is the step-down what you want I guess is what I would ask in that area.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right, I think as they are now, again it's really driven by the size of the parcel, so if the parcel is not that big, you don't end up getting that much density by code there. Say like two-and-a-half stories, depends, and it's the unit mix that drives it. That's where the code, it's a little complicated, but let's say you're doing all single bedroom units, that's where you need 600 square feet per dwelling unit, not to get to the zoning, again. But as it's zoned, it's probably that two, two-and-a-half-story, that's kind of what you're looking at there right now based on, even if you combined all the properties together. So, is that --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: We don't even have occupancy in

APPROVED

what we have, and we're talking about, you know, making more commercial. That's my concern.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, is that a concern for the Plan Commission?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: That is a concern for me, I mean, things are going away from storefront and to online business. So, really considering what are future uses that make sense there?

MR. LYSICATOS: I mean, is there a feeling about we should look in a certain direction? Not necessarily prescribe anything at this point.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Well, I'm just thinking, you know, instead of a two-and-a-half-story building that's, what, medical or office or something, you're looking at a Starbucks because you've got a mixed use building a couple of doors down or, you know, something like that.

MR. LYSICATOS: Okay, any other comments or questions on this one?

(No response.)

MR. LYSICATOS: Like I said, the next two are really more, what we believe are more housekeeping comments. We did hear different comments, but this is again making certain recommendations just to make the zoning and Comprehensive Plan consistent with what it is which is the Village bought it to expand the parking lot. The recommendation is just to make it Government Institutional.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: My recommendation would be to make it look better.

MR. LYSICATOS: Look better.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: That's my, you could keep it as a parking lot, but make it look better.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: I mean, it's where we hold our Farmer's Market. It looks really --

MR. LYSICATOS: Okay, all valid comments. Then the last one is this parking lot that's on the corner of Campbell and Chestnut, and also the single-family home, whether there's any comment. The recommendation at that point was to turn it to the moderate density kind of land use instead of the high-density land use. This is across from what the, oh, the 425 property is the light blue to the east, so that's the recommendation. I don't know if there's any comments or concerns when it comes to that recommendation.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, just extend the brown all the way through?

MR. LYSICATOS: Correct. Yes, that lighter color just all the way to the corner.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: To me that seems to make sense.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: The orange --

COMMISSIONER GREEN: That orangey brown.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Where the brown is now, extend the orange out there.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, I meant the orange, sorry.

MR. LYSICATOS: Right, the orange. So, just make the whole block consistent.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: The whole thing makes sense.

MR. LYSICATOS: There are smaller lots over here.

APPROVED

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: I go past there all the time. I'm like, well, how would that ever come about?

MR. LYSICATOS: I don't know exactly what the history of that is. So, I don't know.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Back then they said let's just build it over here and they point and they would build. That's what happens.

MR. LYSICATOS: So, first of all, thank you for indulging me in the conversation. I think this is a lot of value. The process that you were able to navigate through Eastman is a credit to where we got with that. I think, so the point was made earlier, it does give us a model, but it also gives us a model for having the conversations before we get to that point. It won't answer everything, but I think the big picture and the talk about outcomes tonight is important.

We'll follow-up with, what we'll do is we'll take all this back, try to kind of put it into where we think those outcomes are and the priority outcomes that we've identified through the landowners, through the public comment, and through your feedback tonight. Feel free to send me anything here in the next few weeks if you have any specific ideas. I know this is a lot to chew on and I threw a lot at you, and also we have more of you to talk to, so we might follow-up to kind of progress the conversation a little bit further. Just like I said, if we get more people in attendance, we can kind of further it along.

At this point, we do need a public comment on it, and then I'll wrap it up to kind of talk about our next steps.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, sounds good.

So, yes, I'm going to ask anyone who would like to speak to come forward. When you do come forward, we'd ask you to say and then spell your name. You can or you are not required to provide your address. Please, you know, consider our time here and keep it brief, but we do want to hear, you know, all your perspectives, but just try not to, if somebody talked before you, try not to repeat the same thing that they said.

So, less people here, I'll start on this side of the room. Do either of our attendees on my left want to come forward and speak? No? Okay.

So, starting in the second row, Mr. Moens, would you like to make comment?

MR. MOENS: No.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, the next, third row down.

MR. GAYNOR: Hi, greetings. I'm Tom Gaynor, G-a-y-n-o-r. I live at 208 West Fremont, and I'm currently serving as the HANA Board President. We've spent many a time together. Thank you very much for all your support in the down-zoning, which was recognizing the very special situation that we're discussing here today. We do have a very unique circumstance that I think those warrant our best thinking here. So, I appreciate your thoughtfulness and time spent on this.

The Eastman project was quite a lot, as we all know. The fact that you guys bounced it back based on, not zoning, not on building code, but based on public sentiment and the issues that we brought up I thought was a really good thoughtful way of thinking through a complex situation where we don't have the luxury of setback over a big space. So, I think the collaboration that we've demonstrated is something that the Village Board took up on and launched the Red Flag Ordinance, saying that rather than back to the no-surprises

APPROVED

approach, the Eastman project, you know, Joe could have, based on zoning and the building codes, could have put something right up to the lot line which would have been just an awful addition to the Village.

I think we did the right thing. We didn't get everything we wanted. The developer didn't get everything they wanted. Given the circumstances we had, I think we did a fine job. So, I think the Red Flag Ordinance, you see that the audience is not packed like you know we can do. There's a degree of confidence that the approach that we're taking will come up with a thoughtful approach towards handling this special situation. That's I think what the Board was looking for, so we don't have to do an Eastman, you know, drill every time. That was just a lot, as you guys well know, right?

So, obviously, I think the philosophy of the Red Flag is really what we're looking for, you know, we've got, our neighborhood is really solid, as you're probably well aware. We know everybody. Back when a lot of the Master Plan/Comprehensive Plan was done, this neighborhood was not necessarily what it is today. It was in transition.

Every one of the homes in the neighborhood is totally solid. They're all being rejuvenated, they're all updated, they're being spent a lot of money on because, guess what, it's an amazing place to live. We're near all the stuff you talked about, near downtown, right? So, the people who built houses here 140 years ago said, hey, you know, this is a good place to build a house, right? That way of thinking applies probably more now than ever. It's a terrific neighborhood.

I won't go on, I know you want to, I'll keep it quick. We did have an amazing meeting I thought with Michael and Haley and Dan who did a great job of capturing the neighbors' thoughts. They did a great job summarizing it. Very efficient. So, I think that worked out really well.

Just a couple of comments on the specifics. Village Bank is probably the biggest concern. If they do a 90-foot thing, with maybe up to 140 based on zoning, it would just be a train wreck. That would just be a disaster for the triangle that we live on.

The AT&T building is, you know, who knows? It's probably the CIA for all we know.

But the fact that there's zero lot line setback on the Eastman project, I think this is something that is just going to be awkward. I think if they build an Eastman project next to the Eastman project, you're going to be able to shake hands on the sixth floor with your neighbor, and I think just think that would just make us all look silly. So, that one I think should be taken into consideration as to how do you handle that very unique situation. There is not another downtown high rise that is touching the next-door neighbor. That was just an awkward one.

The last comment I want to make is on the, I haven't heard the word preservation yet, and I think that actually should be a part of the vocabulary for this committee in our discussions about Red Flag. The two properties, single-family homes on Park Place, should be single-family homes. They've been that way for over 120 years. They both sparkle. They're amazing historic properties, and I think the town should celebration preservation as something that's part of the character.

This Chapter 6 of our Comprehensive Plan, we don't have a historic preservation ordinance yet. We're going to be working on that. I do think that that's something that should be actively embraced saying this is key to our character of our town that we celebrate the history of where we've come from, especially with homes that sparkle. These are not derelict homes. These are really terrific homes across from, you know, Memorial Park. It would just be a

APPROVED

crime not to preserve the character that has been in place for coming up on a century-and-a-half.

So, with that, I want to thank you again for all your thoughtfulness in getting us to a wrap. The HANA neighborhood is obviously very interested in continuing to collaborate to come up with the right solution here. You can call on us, you've noticed that we've never come up here with pitchforks and an antagonistic approach, right? We tend to want to work to get to the right solution, and I think that's really what the goal is here. This really warrants our best efforts. So, thank you again.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, anyone else?

MS. MENZIES: Hi, my name is Vivian Menzies, M-e-n-z-i-e-s. What I have to say really is pretty similar to what Tom said. I think the historic preservation aspect of it is a big part.

The historic homes in Arlington Heights for the most part are kind of scattered, somewhat close to downtown, but there is a lot of mix of the ages of homes, but in our little area, that's four blocks that surround Memorial Park, is the most consistent sort of historic area. Because we're so close to Downtown Arlington Heights and all the amenities, we know that we face some hurdles and some issues that not every homeowner faces, that we're always going to have this issue of development close at hand, and having a lot of traffic on our street, and parking on our street every night and those things. We're fine with that, we love where we live.

But what we need from the Village is the continued support and sensitivity to give us that protection and some certainty that we don't have to wonder what's going to happen next, that we know clearly how things are zoned near us and immediately adjacent to us. Because things that we just thought would be there forever, like the commercial buildings where the Eastman project is, well, that's all changing and it needs to change, but we want it to change in a way that isn't going to be harmful to our property values at the same time.

So, I just would like to see the area where we live, this Memorial Park triangle, looked at as kind of a unit, not just, well, there's these blocks here and there's these houses here, but there is, it's kind of a unit. We're bounded by Northwest Highway, by Euclid, by Walnut. So, we're a very self-contained little area.

I think the key to it is the properties on Park Place. Those two homes that are, they are single-family homes in between the quad and the apartment building, and that area is, I think it's R-7 now and wanting to go down to R-6, but I would like to see those two single-family homes be R-3 and stay R-3 because we need to have this anchor of these all single-family homes surrounding Memorial Park.

The quad is fine. It was a single-family home and it makes me sad that it's not anymore. I'm sure where that apartment building is was a single-family home, and that that slipped in at some point in the 50's and 60's, but keeping the continuity of that neighborhood as a whole is what's really important to us. So, I just hope we can find a solution.

Just as a comment about the Red Flag Ordinance in general, I think that's what's so unique about it is just to help us deal with, like if another situation, another development comes up, whether it's at the Village Bank or AT&T or the commercial on Northwest Highway or whatever, that it's not just a given that because it's zoned a certain way, that you get the maximum. Just as with Eastman, they had to give in and make some compromises. I think we'd like to just have that protection continue. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Anyone else?

MR. MESKAUSKAS: My name is Mark Meskauskas, it's M-e-s-k-a-u-s-k-a-s. I represent the site number four of 380 and 400 Northwest Highway. You know, we certainly

APPROVED

had worked with HANA. We had looked to redevelop our sites, I don't know, five years or so ago. You know, we had owned that site as well as own the shopping center across the street.

You know, I think that, you know, we had decided not to go ahead with it for many of the reason that I think, you know, zoning and it not being clear. So, I would ask and I think, you know, I've heard it a few times as hey, don't penalize the people that are currently at the zoning. You know, we have B-3 Zoning now. We had asked for R-7. I think R-7 is a good transition from B-5 throughout the neighborhood to a single-family.

I guess the biggest thing that I kind of reflected on after going through that with HANA was right now our two properties are right on the lot lines. They're very narrow sites. They're irregularly shaped. I would ask, or if you had talked to Michael, you know, on overlay zoning is making some changes would be to allow zero lot line along Northwest Highway. That's what we have now. You know, just because again the green space to the transition to the neighborhood, those kinds of things, if it were to be redeveloped, we don't have any plans to do so now.

You know, the other thing would be, as I kind of heard from HANA a ton is Ridge and Walnut right there has a stop light, and obviously Fremont just as a natural cut-through, I would ask if the Village would have any, you know, desire to vacate the street and cut off that natural cut-through that happens when there is a train and a stop light. I think it would, you know, certainly cut down on traffic in the neighborhood and, you know, allow for potentially better development if that was the case. So, you know, that wasn't proposed, either of those items, when we had gone through looking at the multi-family that we were going to. We had certainly tried to step back the setback in the front yard along Northwest Highway versus pulling the building closer to the street, which ultimately, I think would help, you know, the development along there.

So, you know, I would ask that you guys take those, you know, thoughts into consideration. You know, again, we want to be good neighbors as well. You know, and the alternative as I told Michael is they're not making more of, you know, small automotive spaces right now and I get that it might not look the prettiest, but there definitely is a huge need for it and that's why we've continued to operate it the way, you know, the way it is and we're okay with that. You know, so those would be our comments on our site.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Appreciate it.

Anyone else?

MS. COUGHLIN: Hi, Elaina Coughlin, C-o-u-g-h-l-i-n. Just want to start by saying of course thank you to everybody here, especially thank you for your help in the Eastman project. You gave the neighborhood legs. You gave us an opportunity for change. You restored I know my faith in local government, and we really made some progress with that. Commissioner Jensen, thank you so much for your thoughtfulness of the neighborhood.

As you know and as you've heard, and as you've probably put into your own homes, we're putting everything that we have into this. The plan doesn't match what's currently there. Please protect us again. We can't go through another Eastman project.

I think I was here on my due date. This is the first time I haven't had a kid with me because the young families can't show up for all these meetings. But on my due date, I was here when you did not recommend the Eastman project, and I was so happy that we made it happen, that we were here to speak on the neighborhood's behalf.

All I can say is please look at the people who are investing so much into Arlington Heights. Our jobs, our kids, our homes, all of it, keeping it clean, cleaning up the

APPROVED

parking lot. I live next to the Farmer's Market parking lot. I set up a table and chairs in my front yard for people to eat because there's nowhere for anybody to eat.

So, just consider the density. Consider how much our little area can support, and we're happy to do it, but please protect us in the future so we don't have to go through something like that again. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Thank you.

Anyone else? All right, I'm -- oh, you're coming, okay.

MR. LEWIS: Good evening. I'm John Lewis, L-e-w-i-s. I live at 406 West Fremont, so just north of Tracks 3 and 4.

I echo Elaina's comments. It's been great working with you all and we had that good discussion about the Eastman project. I think when I spoke and a couple of other people spoke, we get it. These are very difficult, sometimes intractable issues, but the key is common sense. I mean, that's what I think ruled the day with the Eastman project. Not everybody got what they wanted, but there was some common sense brought in.

Commissioner Jensen, you opened by saying what particular problem are we trying to solve. I think, if you could go back, could you go back to item three to show the homes on Park Street? To me, I think the problem that we're trying to solve, it's not really even a problem yet which is I think where your comment is coming from, if you look at all these houses here, these sort of reflect the character of the neighborhood, that is where a town got it started, right?

You made some great points about the McMansions. I grew up, I didn't grow up, our first house in Arlington was in Ridge Park, and so they had all those old single-family home ranches up and down like Race and all those streets. They started building the tear-downs 25 years ago and everybody is like, oh, can you believe this? It's a beautiful neighborhood now, right, neighborhoods change.

I would submit that this is a little different though, right? The problem or the challenge that we're trying to solve is avoiding putting like 140-foot building next to these, right? So, I think that just because you could do something doesn't mean that you should. So, trying to like start with the Red Flag Ordinance and try to put some guidance there about common sense. Like we're not making any adamant demands, but just like here's what the Village, here's what the will of the Board is in terms of, what common sense is for these particular areas.

I love your comments about sustainability, right, thinking about future generations. None of us are going to be here forever. This is the neighborhood where our Village got it started, right? I think leaving it better than you found it, that's a key concept to stewardship. Looking at these buildings right here, I think all of us some day in the distant future can look back and be proud that we said, hey, leaving it better than we found it was, hey, we said let's not do 140-foot building, but let's do something that sort of blends in with the neighborhood that sort of preserves the character of the neighborhood, because Tom is right. Like 45 years ago, 50 years ago, this neighborhood was decrepit. That's why all these zoning changes were made in the 80's, right? Because we needed to get some development in here to try to rejuvenate Arlington Heights.

It's a different story now, right? I think the wisdom here is to take a little bit of a different tack and think, okay, now we're in a different moment. So, what was adequate and what was maybe appropriate 45-50 years ago, it's a little different now. That's what we're asking for with the Red Flag is just let's put a little common sense into that so we remove some of the uncertainty for everybody, right?

APPROVED

I think, I can't speak for everybody else here, but I think the preponderance of people in HANA are supportive of multi-family. It's just a question of what is common sense multi-family, right? 140-foot, even a 90-foot building, that's something that maybe you could do, but it's not something that you should do, right? That's all we're asking for your consideration here.

So, thanks a lot for your help so far. Appreciate your help going forward. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Thank you.

Anyone else?

MR. SKRUDLEND: Hi, I'm Kurt Skrudlend, K-u-r-t, S-k-r-u-d-l-e-n-d. I'm an architect so I know maybe a little bit more than most about the history. So, the guy who showed who did the surveying for Chicago had a 66-foot-long chain; that just happened to be who the state hired. Anyway, we have a larger right-of-way because of that than most of the cities on the East Coast. So, they have to deal with more of these setbacks of height restrictions.

So, if you go to New York in particular, you know, what they do is they say, well, we've got 30 feet on this side, we're going to have 30 feet on that side even though the zoning is higher when you do an overlay. We do an angle, slope up 45 degrees angle from there, and that's how we mitigate the fact that, you know, we've got a smaller scale, you know, zoning on this side than on this side. It's just that we have a couple of problematic, you know, areas or whatever, somebody made a decision that, you know, raised it to encourage redevelopment, I guess. But anyway, to address a developer or an owner's concern, in addition to the 45-degree slope, they said, well, we're going to let you build a story or two or increase the FAR or something so that we're not taking away the value of the property, you know. So, against the higher density you get a higher height limit, and against the lower density you have a lower height limit, and it's not all just one height limit.

I think the Red Flag Ordinance, if the goal is to limit development, then I think that Red Flag Ordinance probably helps because you're adding another layer of meetings and, you know, I mean, it's great to get the community input. You know, I think we're doing that now, but I think you need to make rules or guidelines, everybody wants a guideline. A developer, we have a reputation in the community that it's a difficult place to build in, and that's because, you know, you have to go through this year or two long process to get through this planning, whether it's community meetings or Zoning or Planning or the Design Commission, you know, to come to an agreement. In the end, yes, I think the community is happier with the result, but from a developer's point of view, they've had to spend a lot more time, you know, changing their design over and over. It costs them money, you know, not just the time, but the effort for the architects to start over or redo, you know, major parts of their building. So, it's not, it doesn't work for them.

We're not going to encourage good developers and good builders to come here if that's what we're going to continue to do and do it on a case-by-case basis. I think there needs to be some guidelines and somebody needs to do a study and say, well, what about these various properties? What happens when you set up these guidelines? So that, who knows when the AT&T building, you know, gets redeveloped? But you have to, you know, some worst-case scenario, what's going to happen tomorrow and plan ahead.

So, you know, the idea of building a parking lot underground, I wholeheartedly agree that's better. It's a very expensive thing to do. If you're concerned about the value of the property from a property owner's standpoint, you're devaluing their property by

APPROVED

mandating that if it's not currently mandated. You might as well lop off a story or two from the top of the building because that's less expensive or, you know, it's more costly to dig underground than it is above.

You know, as far as the style goes, I don't think you can mandate style. I think, you know, I agree that, you know, the quality is an issue, but across the board, I mean, classical or traditional or modern, whatever you want to call it, there's a whole huge range in qualities. I mean, obviously, incredible classical buildings have been done, but really crappy ones have been done out of stucco, right, that are awful. I think you can mandate materials. You could say we're not going to allow concrete block; we're going to say it has to be brick for a story or two, something like that, right?

Anyway, thank you. That is all I have to say.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Thank you. Thank you, we do appreciate everyone's input, feedback, perspectives. We're here because we don't want the Village to make decisions in a vacuum. So, that's why we show up here for not much money at all.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Like none.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Like none, to have these discussions. So, yes, we are all invested in making good decisions on behalf of the residents and the government.

I just have one last kind of comment about this. I do understand the unique situation given the location. I just want to make sure we're being equitable when we come up with things like this Red Flag Resolution or Ordinance. If there are other unique circumstances, and they don't have to be the same in terms of height of buildings, that we give those neighborhoods the same consideration.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, I think we want to learn from this process, and I think apply it to where, you know, when we look at our Zoning Code, yes, try to take the opportunity to come up where there might be some of these special circumstances. I think to Commissioner Jensen's point, if we come up with a good process where we have these special conditions where we don't have that transition, I think we're going to try to use it as a toolbox to kind of look at other areas and maybe get in front of some of these conversations. So, I think that was a great way to kind of frame it to build this sort of examples.

So, yes, we try our best. We try to get the development through as much as we can. We do have a number of studies and elements we're working on this year, some zoning tweaks. So, you know, we have new staff, fantastic staff we've brought on, so I think it's a process of bringing in some of these new ideas and fresh approach and as we learn the Village, sometimes it's good to kind of see things anew.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Sure, absolutely.

MR. LYSICATOS: But as far as process, we're going to take all this back and sort of come up with what we think are the logical next steps. I don't know if there's any feedback from the Plan Commission as far as a process. We would recommend that whatever we bring back and we start to consider as far as next steps, we do as a full Plan Commission. You do have a subcommittee structure, but we feel we should sort of work our way down from the big picture down as a group.

I don't know if anyone has any specific, you know, a different opinion about that? No? I think it would be good, I think we have a lot of experience on this Board. I think it's one of our most consistent bodies that we have in the Village, so there's a lot of

APPROVED

experience here.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: We work better as a group.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Yes, and my only request is meeting facilitation really makes a difference, not treating every meeting in the same format. So, thinking about how to present things, how to gain feedback, how to report back on that feedback is extremely important to the process. So, don't just say we're going to have a meeting and just have the usual meeting.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Really think about how you conduct that meeting.

MR. LYSICATOS: Absolutely, and I think that's, when we went into the Red Flag process, it wasn't necessarily very prescriptive of how we were going to accomplish this process. So, having a neighborhood meeting where it was, you know, just information, but really interactive, having one-on-ones with property owners, we're trying to be as effective as we can. So, we're open to any ideas of how the Plan Commission wants us to couch that conversation.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: I've been there. I've done charrettes, I've done visioning.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Yes, that's kind of what I'm thinking, yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, I've kind of done through all those processes and they all have their benefits --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. LYSICATOS: -- and like you said, sometimes it's just a different wavelength, then you get something out of it.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I would argue that you do want to use the full Commission, because we have a lot of disciplines represented on this Commission, probably more than a lot of others. We don't have any lawyers here tonight; we usually have three of those. They're the most represented.

MR. LYSICATOS: Yes, we do.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: You've got a good mix of people with a lot of different backgrounds, and I find our conversations are better when you have all of those reflected.

MR. LYSICATOS: For sure. Yes, we feel very fortunate. I think everybody brings something very unique on this Commission and it's a pleasure to work with you. So, I think, yes, absolutely. So, we'll get everybody here. What we'll do is we'll try to anticipate meetings, throw some dates out possibly and say, okay, does everybody think they'll be here for that date, so we get the full representation or as much as the full representation.

But what we'll do is we'll come back, come up with some of that kind of higher-level discussion of where we think we're landing, and then we can have another sort of, I think if we take it piece by piece and take it down levels, then we'll know, okay, what are we getting into as far as changes. I don't think we're there yet. So, probably towards tail end or into the summer, we'll get back to you and have more discussions with you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Okay, any last comments from my fellow Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I move we adjourn.

APPROVED

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: I have a motion for adjournment.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Second.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: Anyone opposed?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON WARSKOW: All right, the meeting is adjourned.

Thank you, everyone.

(Whereupon, at 9:06 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
COUNTY OF KANE)

I, RON LeGRAND, JR., depose and say that

I am a digital 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.

APPROVED

RON LeGRAND, JR.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO
BEFORE ME THIS _____ DAY OF
_____, A.D. 2024.

NOTARY PUBLIC