

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
VILLAGE OF ADDISON
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2021

The Planning & Zoning Commission meeting of the October 13, 2021 meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m. by Chair Fotopoulos.

Present: Ariano, Cargill, Fotopoulos, Schmitt, Turk
Absent: Kamide, McComb
Also Present: Mike Crandall and Jennifer Henaghan, Village of Addison and Village Attorney Freeman

PUBLIC HEARING

I. CALL TO ORDER – ROLL CALL

II. CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 11, 2021 AND SEPTEMBER 8, 2021 P&Z COMMISSION MEETING

Mr. Cargill made a motion to approve the August 11, 2021 minutes, seconded by Mr. Turk. Chair Fotopoulos asked if there was any discussion. There was none. Roll call was taken. Mr. Schmitt abstained.

Motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Cargill made a motion to approve the September 8, 2021 minutes, seconded by Mr. Schmitt. Chair Fotopoulos asked if there was any discussion. There was none. Roll call was taken.

Motion passed unanimously.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. File #PZ-21-13, consideration of approval of a pre-annexation agreement, annexation, rezoning from the R1 Single Family Residence District to the R3B Multiple Family Residence (Low Density) District, a plat of resubdivision, and a special use for a planned development with variations and exceptions. The property is located at 5N151, 5N141, 5N109, 5N085 and 5N0611 Medinah Road in Addison, IL 60101.

P.I.N.: 02-13-302-008, 010, 011, 012, 018 and 019

Petitioner: Medinah Road Development Company, LLC

This file was advertised in the September 20, 2021 issue of the Daily Herald Newspaper.

Ms. Jennifer Henaghan, Village of Addison stated that Staff has prepared two staff reports, one dated August 11, 2021 and one dated October 13, 2021, both of those reports are submitted to the record in their entirety. To summarize, the petitioner is proposing to develop xix parcels along Medinah Road immediately south of the Nicola Court into a 67 unit luxury townhome development. This development will require annexation, rezoning

to the R3B Multiple Family Residence District, a Special Use for a Planned Development and a Plat of Resubdivision. The Planned Development would include exceptions to allow a 20 foot rear yard, 3,523 square feet of lot area per unit, an increase in maximum parcel coverage from 30% to 50% and variations to right-of-way requirements. The subject property consists one single family parcel that was annexed in 1994 and five unincorporated parcels immediately to the south. The Comprehensive Plan does not address the unincorporated properties, but recommends that the one incorporated lot be developed with compact residential land uses, meaning primarily multi-family housing. The proposed rezoning to R3B would be consistent with the surrounding zoning as well as the recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. The adjacent Villa Torino Townhome Development on Nicola Court was annexed in 2007 and also zoned R3B. That development received variations to allow reduction in right-of-way width and pavement width as well as reduce building setbacks.

The proposed public improvements, for utilities, Public Works would need a 20 foot easement for utility access in those areas where water and sewer enter the development and this will need to be incorporated in the final engineering plans. The petitioner has represented that they are fine with that requirement.

This property is currently outside of the Village's Facility Planning Area for wastewater treatment and planning which means that the property will need to be transferred from the Glendale Heights FPA to the Addison FPA in order for the Village to provide sanitary sewer service to the property. Historically, this process has been governed by the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning, however CMAP has provided documentation that the formal amendment process is no longer necessary, however prior to the issuance of any permit, the petitioner will need to provide written evidence from the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency confirming that this transfer can be done by agreement between the two municipalities. The petitioner will also need to obtain written authorization from the Glendale Heights FPA to proceed with the transfer.

We have received one public comment related to utilities. Mr. Rob Van Zandt of 4N584 Medinah Road requested that the overhead lines along Medinah Road be buried as part of the development of this property. He noted that there have been power outages in the neighborhood due to trucks running into the low-hanging lines that are adjacent to Nicola Court, and the petitioner had represented that they are open to exploring this with ComEd.

Stormwater detention will be provided in two dry bottom detention basins at the northeast and southeast corner of the site, as well as three underground detention systems in the center. The area above the underground detention will serve as a grassy courtyard amenity. The petitioner had initially proposed variations to three stormwater design specifications, but after speaking with the Village's Engineering Staff they have revised there preliminary drawings to meet the Village's requirements. The petitioner's original submittal had also proposed a private drive, but it appears from a comment in there September 8 statement that the petitioner is now seeking a public right-of-way with variations to allow a reduction in pavement width from 66 feet to 44 feet and a reduction in pavement width from 30 feet to 24 feet. Both of these variations would be slightly less than what was granted for Villa Torino. The petitioner is proposing to install water and sewer mains directly underneath the street pavement which is typically not allowed on a public right-of-way due to maintenance concerns. Engineering has requested that the development agreement include the establishment of a dormant SSA to protect the Village in the event the homeowners' association disbands or otherwise fails to maintain the roadway, detention areas and other common elements similar to what was recently done with The Highlands development. The staff report contains some detail comments on the preliminary engineering drawings along with the petitioner's responses to those comments.

General notes on the Planned Development. The petitioner is proposing three possible design concepts as shown on the provided elevations. Option A has white masonry on the first level with white siding on the upper levels and a hip roof; Option B shows reddish brown brick and gray siding with a dormered gable roof; and Option C presents varying earth toned brick colors with a flat roof. We request that the Planning & Zoning provide some feedback on which of these Options would be preferred. The individual units within the development would be approximately 24 feet wide by either 38 or 40 feet deep with a two car garage and bonus room on the ground level, kitchen, living, dining room and library on the main level and two bedrooms plus home office space on the upper level. The Building Division noted that a full fire sprinkler system will need to be installed and full depth brick masonry veneer shall be required. Rear patios and decks will not be permitted to encroach into the 10 foot

public utility and drainage easements along the perimeter of the site. Also, the Police Department noted that rentals should be prohibited as part of the Development Agreement, although the petitioner would like to retain the possibility of allowing rental units.

Parking: Each unit will have two interior garage parking spaces meeting the Zoning Ordinance requirement for parking. There will also be four dedicated visitor parking areas with a total of 13 spaces. The petitioners June site plan showed sufficient driveway space to allow for two additional guest vehicles to be parked in front of the units, however the September plan now shows sidewalk on both sides of the main drive. This has reduced the driveway space in front of each unit to only 17 feet which is slightly less than the Village's standard parking stall depth of 18 feet. Although this parking in front of the units is above and beyond what is required by Code, if it is provided it should meet the Village's requirements to ensure that cars are not blocking the sidewalk.

Density: The petitioner's proposal meets the requirements for an R3B Planned Development if the Village Board chooses to approve an exception to allow a 15% reduction in the lot area requirements, however such a reduction must be approved by the Village Board and is not mandatory. The proposed development is for 67 units which is 12.4 units per acre. The R3B District without the 15% exception would allow 57 units. The adjacent Villa Torino development was developed at 8 units per acre. If the proposed development had the same density as Villa Torino it would only have 43 units. The current proposal is for 67 units. Although the petitioner is not requesting any relief for the 40 foot height limitation, the proposed three-story buildings will have much greater bulk than the adjacent two-story buildings at Villa Torino.

Parcel Coverage: We do not have an accurate number for the amount of parcel coverage within Villa Torino because there is no such requirement in the R3B District, that is only requirement within Planned Developments, however at a glance both the existing Villa Torino and proposed Medinah Road Townhomes have approximately 65% impervious area.

Staff does not recommend approval of the requested zoning actions because the resulting density would be out of character with the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed density is significantly greater than the adjacent townhomes and single family residences, however if the Planning & Zoning Commission wishes to recommend approval of the requested actions, Staff recommends that the following conditions be added: no more than 57 units be permitted, that no private streets shall be allowed and all public streets shall comply with all requirements set forth in the Subdivision Control Ordinance, the petitioner shall agree to a dormant Special Service Area, no rentals shall be permitted, no permits shall be issued until the petitioner has provided a blanket easement plat with maintenance by the homeowners' association for stormwater, water and sanitary and that no permits shall be issued until the petitioner has provided written authorization on letterhead from the both the Village of Glendale Heights and the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency authorizing the Village of Addison to provide sewer service to the proposed developments.

Chair Fotopoulos asked Ms. Henaghan about the email she received dated August 14, 2021. Attorney Freeman stated that the record should show the email she received from a Martha Schulkins. Ms. Henaghan said on August 14, 2021, she received an email from Martha Schulkins who lives at 359 Donna Lane, Bloomingdale, IL 60108. She indicated concerns about traffic resulting from the proposed development, as well as some existing issues with litter and landscape maintenance. She noted that she is against any development of this sort on Medinah Road.

Ms. Henaghan stated she received an email today, October 13, 2021 from an attorney representing numerous objections to the proposed development and it is our understanding that they are here tonight to present a power point presentations summarizing the content of that letter. Village Attorney Freeman asked that is a letter from the law firm of Day & Robert, is that correct? Ms. Henaghan stated yes.

Mr. James Gray, representing Medinah Road Development Company was present and sworn in.

Mr. Gray stated this development is six lots on 5.4 acres on Medinah Road. Mr. Gray thanked the Staff and the members of the Committee for the time that you have taken to review this. Mr. Gray said they are seeking the approval as outlined by Ms. Henaghan. We have been back and forth on this for a number of years. We are

proposing what is consistent with the Village of Addison Comprehensive Plan, which was really what we are taking as the direction for it. The zoning is consistent with what is adjacent to the north. The project that they are proposing we believe is very consistent with what is in the area. It is very much a luxury product upscale.

Mr. Gray showed the different elevations, engineering, site plan, utility plans, landscaping and floor plans on the overhead.

Mr. Gray said the approach we take with these projects is we like to think long term. We understand what is designed and built can have a significant legacy and we take that very seriously. We seek to build that it can be beautiful and enhance experience of those that would utilize the property. The one thing that we are able to achieve at this property is a fairly generous large open green space at the center of the project, because we have the quantity of acreage that we have. There is a lot of comparisons that is being done both with this project and the projects to the north as well. This particular one in the proposal that we put forward we do have this amenity of the green space which we think benefits the community as well, not just this specific development. We have also designed this in a such a way that we have two streets that are on Medinah Road and obviously that assists with managing some of the impact of the ease of entering and exiting the development.

Mr. Gray said they started this project in 2019. We started with 82 units and reduced them down to 72, then down to 69 and then working on 67 which gets us to the R3B with the Planned Development. Mr. Gray said you will see the west elevation on Medinah Road and some of the buildings are in the background as opposed to the foreground. The design does demonstrate a level of sophistication and the strength of the uniformity and materials, the repetition of the historically accurate architectural language that is being utilized.

Mr. Gray addressed Ms. Henaghan that the utilities being put under the street, that was something our civil engineer had put forward and again I don't think that is something we are necessarily committed to acquiring that it is there. I think from a best engineering practice that is what we are proposing for that.

Mr. Gray said the intention is to be able to create a community of beautiful luxury townhouse residences that will endure long term and make a positive contribution to the existing neighborhood. The development will utilize a master plan that is pedestrian friendly with amenities that enhance the resident's enjoyment of their properties. With regard to the project timeline, the consideration was originally the 82 units when John Berley was Director it was redesigned to 72 units then down to 60 and now finally 67. With the regard to the project green space we actually did do an analysis on that and by percentage comparing it with Nicola Court townhouses, we talked about this idea of the density, I think it is a little bit of a misunderstanding in regard to this of talking about density and acres per unit. Because ultimately what it comes down to is how the project is designed, and as we have demonstrated we feel pretty accurate that the proposal we are putting forward actually has more pervious or green surface to the site then what the project does to the north. In addition to that then we do also have that large amenity with that central lawn in the center of the project.

Chair Fotopoulos asked if the Plan Commission had any questions.

Mr. Schmitt said you mentioned there is a common space where you have created some elements that are benefit to the overall community, can you describe how that works and where people would park to take advantage of that and what is in those features that are useable. I barely see enough space between the buildings to really just be a visual separation. Mr. Gray said when we have 5.4 acres, 610 feet it is a pretty good distance between the two buildings. The center space between the buildings which is effectively the center of the site has a large green open space between there. The thought was that people would be able to either walk there or use that space. There are guest parking spaces there. The green space does go both east and west as well. We also got the green spaces in the northeast and southeast portion of the site as well.

Mr. Schmitt asked what are the elements that you have between the two buildings that are facing Medinah Road and there is another one in the back that is just to the west of the two parking spaces, are those meant to be a screen wall. Mr. Gray said he is not sure if he could quite tell, but adjacent to Medinah Road and parallel with Medinah Road. Mr. Schmitt said between buildings 103 and 107 and then again in the back between 105 and 109. Mr. Gray said it is just a hedge and that comes through on the landscape plan as well. It is not intended to

be an actual wall. Mr. Schmitt said there is really no access to any of that, it is really just space for separating the buildings. Mr. Schmitt said you mentioned that the landscape is very lush and there is a lot of it, but it looks like you treated the ends of the buildings a little bit but the rear of the buildings that face the adjoining properties there is not really even trees between that and it looks like it is pretty much all a utility easement. Even along Medinah Road there is not a lot of parkway trees or planting materials that are in there. Between the two buildings with the green space between 104, 105, 108 and 109 buildings, all the space between there does not really have plant materials, is there any thought besides just the ends of the buildings in terms of the landscape. Mr. Gray there is and some of that is shown both on the elevations and landscape drawings as well. There are preliminary but you can see particularly in that view as well. It is also a situation where we have a fair amount of existing vegetation as well particularly along the parkway. Mr. Schmitt said you mentioned that you weren't opposed to moving the utilities out of the street, where would you put the utilities in that case. Mr. Gray said he is not a civil engineer and may not be the best one to answer that questions, but as that needed to be accommodated we certainly would be willing to make that accommodation. Mr. Schmitt said from a standpoint of the architecture, you are representing in plan pretty much flat boxes, there is not really much articulation, the only thing I can see is really the entry features that the one element that sticks out yet in some of the renderings, you are showing a lot of shadowing lines and things where is has some depth to it, how do you plan to achieve that. Mr. Gray said we think the strength of the architecture can really be achieved by the buildings being well proportioned and designed and often repetition can provide great strength if that is done well. I think we could find if we analyze the historically architecture this idea of a lot of changes to the plains of the facades could be somewhat short lived. We like to be very intentional and sensitive with that aspect of when it's appropriate. If we look at an historical example you can certainly can see in various parts of the world but this idea of that strength of that repetition and really some of that beauty that comes through with that.

Mr. Gray wanted to go back to one of the comments Ms. Henaghan made. Mr. Gray said they left 1 foot between the edge of the sidewalk and the right-of-way and then 17 foot to the building giving us the 18 feet. Ms. Henaghan said the 17 feet is on the private property and then the additional 1 foot is within the public right-of-way but before you get to the sidewalk, so it is a total of 18 feet, 17 feet around the private side, 1 foot on the public side.

Chair Fotopoulos said knowing that one parcel has been annexed, have you or anyone in your organization have ever brought this to Bloomingdale. Mr. Gray said yes we have. Chair Fotopoulos said you have presented to Bloomingdale? Mr. Gray said he had conversations with the Planner at Bloomingdale going back a number of years now. Chair Fotopoulos said obviously going back a number of years to Mr. Berley this plan still never made it to us. Mr. Gray said that is correct. Chair Fotopoulos said as a result, the Bloomingdale people never brought it to their Planning & Zoning Commission. Mr. Gray said correct because we never took it to that level. Chair Fotopoulos said it is one parcel for us. Mr. Gray said yes. Chair Fotopoulos said unincorporated Addison 8% of us would receive taxes and the rest would be Bloomingdale. I am trying to understand why you came to us. Mr. Gray said because it is already annexed in. We would have to go through de-annexation. We all know that all these things take time. When we met with John Berley and numerous conversations with Jennifer Henaghan with regard to this project, we never seen any resistance to the idea of it being annexed into Addison. In many ways we think it's just simpler. It was not going to be an easy process to annex it into Bloomingdale because there were going to be issues that would have to be dealt with regard to the utilities as well. It was going to be an ongoing issue. Chair Fotopoulos said Glendale Heights has already offered us the sanitary, why wouldn't they offer Bloomingdale the sanitary? Mr. Gray said he spoke with Joanne Chultbrenner from Glendale Heights and had numerous conversations and email exchange and she confirmed in an email that she indicated that Glendale Heights did not have the ability to service this specific property, nor did they have a hesitation to change it from the Glendale Heights FPA to the Addison FPA. I have worked with Joel Melin from Addison to confirm that there was adequate capacity in Addison for the connection of the sanitary and potable water supply. Chair Fotopoulos said did you ask if Bloomingdale could take it. Mr. Gray said we did have conversations with Bloomingdale but there are issues with regard to how some of the billing works. It is my understanding that it was going to be kind of an ongoing issue and it seemed like this made the most sense in terms of pushing it forward. Mr. Gray said it already appears on your Comprehensive Plan. Chair Fotopoulos asked Ms. Henaghan and Mr. Crandall, so it's annexed but yet it is Bloomingdale Township Schools, Fire and Park District and everything belongs to Bloomingdale except the sewer, am I wrong? Ms. Henaghan said schools and other taxing districts don't change hands when a property is annexed. Chair Fotopoulos said so it is all Bloomingdale.

Ms. Henaghan said yes it would be whoever it currently is.

Chair Fotopoulos said do we know the reason why Mr. Berley never brought this forward over the years. Ms. Henaghan said we did not have an application from the petitioner until this year. Chair Fotopoulos said it was only a discussion over all these years. Mr. Gray said yes.

Mr. Turk said he notices there are four spots for visitor parking and let's just say you can fit four cars in there that means 16 cars for visitors in this whole complex. Mr. Gray said we did the analysis which is in the report based upon the required number of spaces and we then did the calculation and were far in excess of the required number of spaces for Ordinances because we have provided the parking in front of the units and that is the way the site plan lays out.

Chair Fotopoulos said as a courtesy to the people in the audience, they don't get to see the staff reports, so if there is a question that somebody asks, it is perhaps because we would like to make sure they know the answer.

Mr. Cargill asked about the spacing between the buildings and what is considered to be the parking area. You stated that there was two spots outside of each building that people could park. Mr. Gray said yes. Mr. Cargill said how wide between 104 and 103 is that space? You will have possibly 24 cars parked there. Mr. Gray said it is 58 feet between 103 and 104. The east side of 103 and the west side of 104 is 58 feet, and what that is is a standard parking configuration for a 90 degree in with a two-way. Between 103 and 104 on the south side there is a small turnout area and then on 107 and 108 side there is also a small turnout area as well. Mr. Cargill said what does the engineer say a typical parking space should be? Mr. Gray said he believes it is 18 foot in length. Mr. Cargill said theatrically if everyone is parked outside as you are using those parking spaces that is going to be a pretty congested parking area. Chair Fotopoulos said we do not have the Bloomingdale Fire Department here, can they make the radius and those tight turns. Mr. Gray said the document that is shown is an industry standard radius, so they have software that you basically punch in the widths of the streets and the radius' and then software creates those documents. Chair Fotopoulos asked if we have any comments from the Bloomingdale Fire Department. Ms. Henaghan stated Bloomingdale Fire did review the plans and did not notify us of any issues.

Mr. Schmitt asked do you know where the condensing units would be located. Are they going to be roof mounted or in the backyards? Mr. Gray said we thought that they would probably be in the backyards. In some locations on some of the buildings they may need to be roof mounted.

Chair Fotopoulos asked if you have ever built a property with this courtyard setup. Mr. Gray said we certainly design them. Chair Fotopoulos said with all that green space, I happen to have some experience and it's lovely to look at and horrible to maintain. Mr. Gray said we have certainly have done projects where we have green space and where it's been successful. Most of this comes down to the maintenance issues, so I'm not sure what those issues were with your experience, but there are actually some of these even nearby that was in Wheaton in a much more dense situation but it is well maintained and enjoyed by the residents.

Questions from the Audience

Robert Taylor, 2472 Nicola Court, Addison, stated as a homeowner to the north, I am against any rental properties at that location. Mr. Taylor said he knows the layout at Nicola Court and we have big problems with the snow. All the parking spots that they have, are they accommodating for any of the snow that will build up and they are going to push it somewhere. Will they haul it away or push it into someone's sport? Mr. Gray said we have analyzed that and the intention is that it would be able to be placed in those open spots around the property. Mr. Taylor said so then around the visiting parking spots. Mr. Gray said no on the green spaces. Mr. Taylor said you are going to push it on the lawn. Mr. Gray said yes and we are talking about impervious space because it's a similar situation. Mr. Taylor said we have a problem over at Nicola Court, we push the snow in our visitor's spots so it's very minimal spots during the winter times. **Mr. Taylor said he is not against a good project but against having rentals; there just needs to be a good plan.**

Mr. Mike Crandall, Village of Addison stated the snow removal was a concern of our Village Engineer as well as it is in the staff report as far as the interdepartmental comments. Our Village Engineer had a similar concern

based on the landscaping and how it is laid out and the green space and how that is going to get to that point. In fact he thought that you would have to bring a truck into take it off site. Chair Fotopoulos said they don't see the staff report and the comment was made that the Village wouldn't put it in parking spots. It is not our responsibility to plow your streets, so we wouldn't be putting it in your parking spots. It is your responsibility to plow the streets not us. Mr. Crandall said if we approve the development with private streets, if we approve the development with public streets we would be plowing it but it would affect the whole design of the subdivision with public streets with the 66 foot right-of-way. Mr. Gray said our proposal is for public streets. Chair Fotopoulos said your proposal is for public. Mr. Crandall said it wasn't initially proposed as public, it was originally proposed as private and I believe the September 8 changes that were made look like you are coming in with public streets, but they don't meet any of our requirements for public streets or the right-of-way requirements with regard to the parkway and utilities. Mr. Gray said we have received feedback on all of this and have been working on it for a long time. We have a civil engineer who does a lot of work in Addison and we try to address these issues. We did modify some of the location and landscaping so it would be easier to push the snow around and set it where it needs to be set without taking the visitors parking spaces. With regard to the streets, there was a request that we went to the public streets. We looked at the engineering and spent more on our civil engineer saying what would need to do to make it public streets. We looked exactly at the same requirements and utilized a right-of-way that was 44 feet instead of 45 feet, and 45 feet is what the right-of-way is at the public street that is at Nicola Court. We feel the world is moving toward less pervious space. Cars are not getting bigger but smaller and people are driving less.

Attorney Scott Day of Law Firm of Day & Robert PC, 300 E. 5th Avenue, #365, Naperville, IL. Attorney Day addressed Mr. Gray and said you indicated that you have designed this product previously but am I correct that you have never been given approval to build this anywhere. Mr. Gray said it is a unique design and correct. We have been designing similar townhouse projects for decades. Attorney Day said you have never constructed this project anywhere. Mr. Gray said we have never constructed two projects in two different locations ever. Attorney Day said I am asking about this design. Mr. Gray said they have and have constructed things that are similar to this. Attorney Day asked for the addresses of projects that are like this that you have constructed and what community they are in so we can look at the adjacent land uses. Mr. Gray said yes he can get a list to him. Attorney Day said the product that Ryan Company constructed that you modeled this project on, can you me where Ryan Homes has constructed that project and what the surrounding uses are. Mr. Gray said that he can get that information to you. Attorney Day asked where the detention is in your site plan. Mr. Gray showed the site plan on the overhead. Mr. Gray said we have it in several different locations. The primarily location is underneath the formal lawn area that is in the center area. Attorney Day said the generous green space where people will be walking is a detention pond. Mr. Gray said no it is not. Attorney Day said is that the vaulted area? Mr. Gray said yes. Attorney Day said where is the unvaulted detention? Mr. Gray said is occurs in various areas with regard to how the site is graded. We are actually accommodating and our Engineer has worked with the Village Engineer as we are accommodating some of the run-off from the south because there is run-off that is coming from the south and makes it way to the west and then to the north. Attorney Day said he is just asking where the detention ponds are located. Mr. Gray there are not any detention ponds on the site. There are small detention areas in the southeast and northeast areas of the project. Attorney Day said so the green spaces where you would be putting the snow are the areas where you are storing stormwater. Mr. Gray said those areas also have a setback so you can't take the detention area directly up to the edge, there has to be an offset area. Attorney Day said he is just asking if that is where they are going to be located. The northeast and the southeast corners are where you are going to put your stormwater storage other than the area that is underneath the generous walking area. Mr. Gray said that is correct.

Mr. Schmitt asked if Mr. Gray could show the drawing on the overhead. Attorney Day said that depicts it in the northeast corner, there is none in the southeast corner. Mr. Gray said it is graded as such. Attorney Day said on the site plan you can see the home that is to the south of your proposed development, what is the distance those townhomes are backing up to that lot line, adjacent to the single family home to the south. Mr. Gray said about 20 feet. Attorney Day said units are 40 feet in wide, correct? Mr. Gray said they have scaled those back to 38 feet. Attorney Day said the lawn is about half of that? Mr. Gray said the residents to the south but he would have to look at his notes, but thinks that the property is only about 17 feet off the property line. Attorney Day said the landscaping that you are proposing adjacent to the single family home is that depicted on the exhibit? Mr. Gray said that he didn't know if it is but there is some. Attorney Day asked if they had a revised landscaping

plan that has been submitted to the Village. Mr. Gray said it doesn't show all the existing landscaping either which you might be aware that there is a fairly significant quantity of vegetation on the perimeters of all the parcels as well. Attorney Day said are you suggesting that your landscaping plan does not depict the landscaping that you would leave after development. Mr. Gray said it doesn't necessarily show all the existing landscaping though. Attorney Day said there might be some that isn't on this exhibit. Mr. Gray said correct.

Mr. Cargill said there a central detention basin and a self-detention basin and a north detention basin, are they sub-surfaced and if so how are they constructed. Mr. Gray said they are. It is a vault system, Mr. Cargill said under the grass? Mr. Gray said yes. Mr. Cargill said is it a concrete vault and what kind of product is it. Mr. Gray said it is an open vault. It depends, it can either be a heavy duty plastic which is what they put under roadways or a concrete type system. Mr. Cargill said the water goes in there and hopefully percolates away? Mr. Gray said the concept of stormwater detention is there is an area of where the water is held and there is a specific release rate, and that was part of our first round of comments back and forth, I believe was meeting some of those specific aspects of some of the engineering components. Effectively all of the water goes away to the west and the north. Mr. Cargill said out of these big basins, it is piped away to where? Mr. Gray said yes and with all development, you can't impact adjacent properties by the water that falls on your property from the rain events so you will have to hold it for a period of time until it then can be released. The stormwater system has been designed in a way that not only through those chambers but also through the pipes themselves. Mr. Cargill would like to see some kind of representation of these big basins. Mr. Gray said he feels they are great. Mr. Cargill said he doesn't feel sure that the homeowner would think they were great to have those. Mr. Gray said what you would rather have, a basin that has a lot of vegetation in it that is wet a lot of the time or a basin like this which is a lawn that is maintained that you can actually utilize. Mr. Cargill said dark spaces that can contain stagnant water are breeding grounds for all kinds of things and that is what I see this as. Mr. Gray said there is a system at Nicola Court that is at the south. Mr. Crandall said that he believes Nicola Court project has underground detention basins which might be in the street or under the street. It is a common practice. There are several other buildings in town that utilize an underground vault for their stormwater. How this one is actually connected and where it is discharging too. These are just preliminary drawings and we don't have final engineering drawings on this as with many other components of these plans. We don't have a street lighting plan, subdivision plat, stormwater report that has been provided to our Engineer to review. They are very preliminary at this point. Mr. Gray said we have run through all of it and there has been a lot of conversations back and forth making sure we are within a couple thousand feet of getting it. We have shown street lighting it just wasn't indicated very well.

Kristen Lopez Geen, 5N057 Medinah Road stated she backs up to the property. Her concern is these townhomes will back up into her property line. There is an empty lot that is adjacent to her property. Will there be garage of what will be in the back of these townhomes? Mr. Gray said the intention was that we would have some fencing that would be privacy, similar to what occurs on the north portion of the lot where Nicola Court meets the property. Mr. Gray said there is a significant vegetation along the property line. Where will the garbage be? Mr. Gray said the garbage will be at the street.

NEGATIVE TESTIMONY: Ms. Geen said this will destroy the whole ambience of the neighborhood. This looks very militant. There is a lot of people that will be moving in to a very dense area. She is concerned for her safety and it is very unnerving of what you are proposing to do. My biggest concern is bringing in a lot of people into a small area. The appearance of this an eyesore. What you are showing here does not fit the neighborhood.

Ms. Geen said if this was your neighborhood would you want this? Mr. Gray said yes the key to all of this is maintenance and the key to maintenance is really how the HOA is enforced. If it is designed in a beautiful way, built so that it can endure for centuries. Ms. Geen said there are other places where you can put this development.

Parag Kshatriya, 364 Dublin Road, Bloomington, IL asked what the target price for these townhomes is. Mr. Gray said about \$300,000 - \$400,000 or more per the market. Who do you target for people to buy? Mr. Gray said they don't necessarily target a specific type of owner so we keep an open mind to all people. Mr. Kshatriya's concerns looking at the plan is that there is no park built into the plan, is there one? Mr. Gray said there are several areas where it has the green space and in fact one area directly to the east edge of that lawn area that we think would probably get a lot of use. Mr. Kshatriya said is that the area with the retention underneath where you

plan on putting the snow. Mr. Gray said the snow will go in a number of different areas. There are the setbacks so there should be adequate accommodation for that. It is on that eastern portion of that open grass lawn area. Mr. Kshatriya said there is a park there and have concerns about 67 homes, parking, snow and garbage. The parking you mentioned 13 total spots. Mr. Gray said you can't really segregate the parking that way because if you look at the way the zoning code works, anyone can park anywhere that is not in a garage space and that is the way the calculations are done. Chair Fotopoulos asked can people park on street or any street? Ms. Henaghan said yes people can park on street just not overnight. Chair Fotopoulos said there is space if someone wanted to park in front of a townhome to get around. If I went to visit someone in a townhouse and instead of finding one of these designed 13 spaces, could I park on the street in front of that townhome? Ms. Henaghan said yes. Chair Fotopoulos said and there would still be space for people to drive around it. Mr. Crandall said that would be tricky just based on the fact that they are proposing a 44 foot right-of-way as opposed to a 66 foot right-of-way. So if you are parking on the street that will limit access around the project. Mr. Kshatriya said the parking would be on the street or would it be in the driveway in front of the garage. Is the drive in front of the garage private or part of the public road? Chair Fotopoulos said your driveway is private, 17 feet of that driveway is private. They are allowing one foot on the public, is that correct? Ms. Henaghan said yes. Mr. Kshatriya said so everyone can fit two cars in front of their own private driveway. Chair Fotopoulos yes said in front of your garage. Chair Fotopoulos said have we determined if these are public or private streets yet? Ms. Henaghan said the petitioner has stated they are requesting these to be public streets. Chair Fotopoulos said we are saying they are not in compliance. Ms. Henaghan said they would require variations for the right-of-way width and the pavement width. Mr. Gray said the Ordinance requires two parking spaces per dwelling unit, 134 spaces, our plan provides 279 spaces including the two garage spaces and the two spaces in front, and then thirteen additional that aren't assigned. The Code doesn't discriminate against what type of parking space it is. Ms. Henaghan said the Code only requires two parking spaces and for the purpose of the zoning analysis those two parking spaces are the ones located within the garages. Mr. Kshatriya said the two spots in front of the garage on the private drive wouldn't block the sidewalk. Mr. Gray said no. Mr. Kshatriya asked about the snow. Mr. Gray we are not going to be a part of pushing the snow from Nicola Court into the subdivision. Mr. Cargill said if the streets are going to be public then Addison would plow those streets, but who comes in and plows these parking spaces. Mr. Crandall said it would be the homeowner association. Mr. Cargill said so the homeowner's association has to take that snow offsite to a storage space, I don't see enough storage space on site. Mr. Crandall said that is what we are thinking but the developers is saying these other areas on the property and the open green spaces is where the snow would be pushed to. Mr. Kshatriya said why go with the three levels high because that does not fit in the community at all. Mr. Gray said the properties to the north are three levels because they have basements underground. How would this block the light in the community? Mr. Gray said the zoning is for 40 feet, so we are not asking for any kind of a request to exceed that. We think it is a better use of space.

Don DeSanti, 2409 Nicola Court, Addison, IL feels this project is not a fit in the area. It looks like an apartment building and there will be parking problems. This proposed development is nothing like Nicola Court, 19 units versus 67 is a big issue. We talk about just the snow that we have had to deal with on Nicola Court and you proposed two areas where you can put snow. We have a very limited amount of visitor spots at Nicola and we cannot use them in the winter. We have had to haul away snow. With this proposed project, if you put snow on the northeast or the southeast corner being a retention area as it is, a sub-concern is that the current eco system that is there now with the ponds to the south, I'm not sure where that water is going to go. If these sites are proposed not only as a park and according to this proposed elevation of the foliage, I think will be destroyed if you are going to push snow there. I'm not sure what the sewer capacity is going to be once this snow melts in these areas with retention and going back into the city system. As far as the parking goes, we do not have parking on the street on Nicola Court. If you park on the street would block a driveway, there is no set parkway. I see the same problem happening here. Mr. Gray said we can park on the street anywhere where it is not going to be blocking any kind of driveway. There is significant quantity of area where you won't be blocking the driveways. Mr. DeSanti said he only sees that on the center patch of greenery. Mr. Gray showed the plan on the overhead. Mr. DeSanti asked if there are any renderings of any balconies. Mr. Gray said our intention was to have balconies on the rear of the units. Mr. DeSanti asked where the condenser units are. Mr. Gray said the plan is to be on the rear in locations where that wouldn't necessarily be able to easily accommodate and they made need to be roof mounted. Mr. DeSanti said so possible on the roof. Mr. Gray said yes. Mr. DeSanti said esthetically they just look like an apartment complex, I just don't think they fit in with the homes and what Nicola and Annalise Court deliver. I think there is a great challenge as far as space goes and again my concern is

the current eco-system along with the amount of people that are going to live in these properties. I feel this plan needs to go back to the drawing board as to what is going to fit into the community.

Rob Van Zandt, 4N584 Medinah Road, Addison, IL. gave negative testimony.

NEGATIVE TESTIMONY: Mr. Van Zandt is against this project and ask that no extra things be given to the developer for consideration like setbacks or variations. There is not enough parking spaces and open space. Mr. Van Zandt said the road has issues. It is basically a two-lane residential road and there is no parking up and down Medinah Road. It was originally a Bloomingdale Township Road and was turned over to the County for snowplowing purposes. The vaulted stormwater retention is maybe ok for industrial areas but for residential areas there should be some sort of a pond. The property should go to Bloomingdale not Addison.

Meena Patel, 179 Michigan Court, Bloomingdale, IL. said in the study that was stated there were two external retention reservoirs and three below ground reservoirs, is that correct? Ms. Henaghan said two dry basin detention ponds and the one underground vault area. Ms. Patel said the underground vault area, how big are they and how much rain can them handle? The pond next door and the underground reservoir that is for the other property on the north side, the retention pond is full all the time and if rains a lot it is at the top level. So if you are telling us that this going to hold all the rain and if we have heavy rains that property can flood, the property next door and our property can flood. Has there been a water study for sewage and for rain? Mr. Gray said there are specific industry standards with regard to stormwater and so you are not allowed to let the water exit your property any faster than what it is right now, so that is how they determine how much stormwater capacity. Ms. Patel said that she is aware of it. How much of that rain can it hold before it floods? Mr. Gray said all of it. Ms. Patel said it is a reservoir that you have to release at a certain level and how big are those reservoirs. Mr. Gray said they are industry standards and so the process is, our civil engineer will design to those standards and then this is checked by the Village Engineer. Mr. Crandall said their engineer will design a system that is going to comply with the DuPage County Stormwater Ordinance and the Village of Addison stormwater requirements, so they will submit that to us, our Staff will review it and make sure it complies to that. Ms. Patel said how big are those reservoirs, how much water can hold. Mr. Gray said about 90,000 cubic feet. Ms. Patel said for one or all three. Mr. Gray said he believes that is what the site is requiring. Mr. Crandall said at this stage because they are preliminary drawings, our Staff hasn't looked at this thoroughly. They may have had some conversations with regard to the design standards that the engineers trying to comply with but at this stage I don't think we have had anything definitive that you have to comply with based on this much impervious area you have to provide this much volume and release rates. We have not received the stormwater report yet which is something that we will look at. Ms. Patel said there is very little green space and the likelihood of this large property consuming all of the open land and nowhere for the rain to go and has there been a study done for 67 homes for sewage and where it will go and be managed? Ms. Henaghan said he petitioner is proposing to connect to the Village of Addison's sanitary sewer system. Ms. Patel said the volume of that many homes. Ms. Henaghan said our engineers have represented that there is sufficient capacity in the system. Ms. Patel said the study on the traffic and cars even during construction, how you will handle all the construction if there is only a two lane road. Where will the trucks go and all the construction traffic, how will you manage all of that? Mr. Gray said that all has been analyzed as well. We have received the reports from DuPage County with regard to the Department of Transportation and the quantity of vehicles that use Medinah Road and so our engineers have done an analysis on that and they don't see any issues with the current capacity of the road and what we would be producing with the new development.

NEGATIVE TESTIMONY: Ms. Patel said that she is totally against this project, because unless you are building brick based homes which is what is surrounding the property, all the homes are more colonial and you are putting a completely different architecture into those areas. All those brick homes on other side and adding an additional layer to that housing. You are actually one level above everybody else's home. It is a terrible idea to put such a big subdivision. Where will the kids go and play?

Henry Dominicus, 2421 Nicola Court, Addison, IL stated you stated in your presentation that you were going to set a legacy. What type of legacy are you setting? It seems that you are setting a higher density, a mass parking lot, 4-unit buildings to 6 or 7, I don't think that is a pattern or legacy we want to set. The way the buildings are parallel to the road, is a 3-story parallel building going to affect the sound as there is traffic down the road.

NEGATIVE TESTIMONY: Mr. Dominicus feels they are not proposing a legacy that they want. I understand the economics and why you need to go to this number of units, but I can't condone a project like this based on the need to make money on a project to do something there. When I think of the legacy that you are going to set is really a poor one. I am very much against this project.

Rob Van Zandt, 4N584 Medinah Road, Addison, IL said it seems that the plan is to push the snow on all the green space, so that in the winter time whenever it snows there won't be any ball or soccer playing or any place for people to walk their dogs. It is going to be a snow pile.

Natalie Stec, 5N041 Medinah Road, Addison, IL said the number of lots that are going to be developed is six lots, is that correct? Mr. Gray said yes. Do you currently own six lots? Mr. Gray said no. Ms. Stec said you are member of LLC. Mr. Gray said Medinah Land Development, LLC. Ms. Stec said Medinah Road Development owns which lots? Mr. Gray said all five to the north and we have purchase sale agreement in place for Lot 6, so we have the option to acquire Lot 6. Ms. Stec said Lot 6 at this point though has yet to be acquired? Mr. Gray said that is correct. Ms. Stec said is Lot 6 the lot that is owned by the Bloomingdale Township Assessor John Dobrowski? Mr. Gray said yes. Ms. Stec said there is a contract pending for that or its contingent upon Addison approving your development? Mr. Gray said that is a private agreement and I cannot say much other than yes there is a contract in place and no John Dobrowski has no hesitation with us seeking approval for this development which essential to the approval of the development. Ms. Stec said when you say it is a private agreement, the lot that is owned by John Dobrowski who is the Bloomingdale Assessor that was never publicly placed for sale. Is that fair to say? Mr. Gray said he doesn't know the history of the lot. Ms. Stec said the lot that is immediately south of Nicola Court, that lot still actually has a for-sale sign in it. Mr. Gray said he believes there may be a sign there. Ms. Stec said the real estate company, Land Partners, if you go on their website they are actually advertising 5.5 acres currently for-sale. I'm confused about is who owns the lots, why are they still advertised for sale, there is still a for-sale sign existing in one of the lots and apparently one of the lots has yet to be purchases. Mr. Gray said we are here to look for zoning approvals for this specific land, we are not talking tonight about ownership structures. If you want specific information on ownership structures we can certainly have that conversation. We control the right to acquire the six lot. We have invested financial resources and have a legal agreement that we control Lot 6. It is the southernmost lot of the project. It is issue of ownership not zoning. Attorney Freeman said it is not unusual for real estate developers to enter into contracts with property owners on a contingent basis because they don't want to buy the property then find out they can't get it zoned properly or get their development plans approved. Then enter the contracts assuming that I can get my project approved will go ahead and purchase the property. That is not unusual. With regard to the seller of the property, the Bloomingdale Township Assessor that really has nothing to do with this. We have no idea what the agreement is between the owner of that property being the Assessor or somebody else has any ideas with regard to the owner of the property or his agreement or not agreement with the developer, that is a totally different issue. With regard to the developer potentially not yet owning the six lot that is not unusual with the development project. Ms. Stec said it being that it is not unusual it is just from our perspective there is this project being proposed and if people are trying to figure out what is going on and you are trying to understand and lots are still listed for sale there was some confusion when the original zoning signs went up that it related specifically. Attorney Freeman said it's not unusual with regard to the purchase of property on a contingent basis. Ms. Stec said another concern is the experience in building these types of developments and that the projects going to be able to be seen through. You were asked to provide specific examples of where developments were done, I'm assuming for the purpose of observations to be made either immediate addresses or things couldn't be provided and that is a concern. The not having a project that sits there or a phased development because you need to have so many resources to keep the project going or a development that takes five years to complete. Is there a reason why you couldn't just in asking the question provide examples that someone could go and observe the work you had done in the area? Mr. Gray said we are talking about zoning. We are not trying to pre-qualify who might build the project. We are not really talking about who owns the project. We are talking about how this parcel is going to get zoned and what is it going to get zoned for. That is what this process is for. Can we provide those

and other similar examples? Ms. Stee said you specifically talked about quality of construction, legacy and strength and I think those representations do tie to who is going to be doing these projects and whether or not they are going to have the ability to complete them with what is being represented.

NEGATIVE TESTIMONY: My concerns are consistent with the rest of the statements that have been made. It clearly does not fit with the community, architecture and design. It is a very dense project. If people are supportive of positive investment and positive development but if you even just hearing what people are saying today, the reception is telling us do your research if you were willing to be a good neighbor, the reception would have been I hear your concerns, let me think about them and address them.

Ashish Desai, 177 Michigan Court, Bloomingdale, IL stated that he lives directly across the first entrance for this development.

NEGATIVE TESTIMONY: I oppose of this development. It would be nice to have something nice and beautiful to be developed instead of just having a lot of open space. I think this development is trying to just fit in the parameters of what they are giving. You going from 67 homes and with three stories getting to the exact 40 foot height limit, we are just trying to stay within the exact parameters. I think you could come up with something that is a little bit more fit to the community. You want to build this legacy which is great but we all know what happens with the housing market, it goes up and down. With 67 homes how can you say that the legacy will live on if we start having these foreclosures becomes rental units. We all agree it is not a right fit, something like this would make more sense in a much more open space.

Chair Fotopoulos asked for positive and negative testimony.

POSITIVE TESTIMONY: None

NEGATIVE TESTIMONY: Attorney Scott Day representing Natalie Stee and Scott Benz, 5N041 Medinah Road, Addison, IL, gave a power point presentation. Attorney Day gave a brief history on the property. Attorney Day said you can see your Comprehensive Plan wedges this development property between two of your orange blocks. This is the northwesterly corner of your Comprehensive Plan from 2013. The northerly parcels is depicted at compact residential, that is the Villa Torino in the middle, to the south of the proposed development is also an orange block that is depicted as the compact residential. What is that supposed to be? Recognizing that the Villa Torino development was listed at compact residential it is supposed to be like Villa Torino, and these parcels are described as they accommodate primarily multi-family housing type including condominiums and apartments. Certain parcels within this distinct district can accommodate neighborhood parks and recreational amenities, religious institutions and neighborhood uses that serve the neighborhood. This particular area is a very anti-quoted development pattern. This particular Plat of Subdivision for Medinah Lake Estates dates back to 1947.

Attorney Day said that Mr. Gray is suggesting that this 5.42 acre parcel which has come down from 90 units over the course of two years, down to 67 units and he is essentially proposing not 4-units per acres, 7-units per acre but 12.36 units per acre and he is saying it is the same as Villa Torino. He is saying it the same zoning as what is immediately to the north. Those are two different things, one of them is density and the other zoning. He is asking in an annexation petition, he can select from whatever zoning he thinks would be appropriate for this development and he has selected low density residential development. He is seeking low density residential development, he is asking you're for exactly the same thing as Villa Torino.

Attorney Day showed the site plan. On the site plan you can see a total of 10 unit's right up against Mrs. Jean's house. You can see the back of those units are 3-stories tall and they are overlooking her fence line from 18 feet away with balconies, but that is going to improve the value of her home.

Attorney Day showed the floor plan. There is no basement floor plan, these are slabs. These are 2800 square foot townhomes. Those are huge townhomes on a slab foundation. You need to look at the floor plan itself, if you look at the first level there is something called a bonus room on the first floor. It is a room that is quite large,

almost the same size as the garage area and it includes a bathroom. It has plenty of space to add additional partitions and walls. When you go up to the third floor, you can see two rooms that are actually identified as bedrooms, but there is also a room that is identified as a home office. It is a very large home office in the area of the bedrooms and is adjacent to the hall bathroom. On the first floor of living there is also a library. This 2800 square foot townhome has a home office on third floor where the bedrooms are located, a library on the first floor and then a bonus room on the lower floor that also has its own bathroom. These are homes that he is proposing to build at 2800 square feet between \$300,000 - \$400,000. Attorney Day said 2800 square feet at \$300,000 is \$107.00 per square foot for the finished construction, so ask your Building Commissioner how many homes of any size of any kind have been constructed in Addison in the last five years for \$107.00 per square foot. The Addison Multiple Family Residential Zoning density is defined by lot area per bedroom. They are asking for the R3B Zoning. They are providing 3500 square feet per unit. You don't even allow that for inefficiency. It doesn't fit into the R3B. We are asking you to give him R3B zoning, remember he can select any of your R3B zoning because this is an annexation. He knows what he wants to build. He can ask for anything in your zoning ordinance. He is asking for low density zoning but is immediately turning around and saying I can't possibly develop low density zoning at this location. I must be able to build these and only provide 3500 square feet per home. That is a density that doesn't fit in the low density district.

Attorney Day said to the west of this development is a bunch of homes that are in Bloomingdale. Is it any wonder that the Village of Bloomingdale doesn't want this project? They can imagine what their voters in those homes across the street would think if this was proposed and approved by Bloomingdale as part of their community and Bloomingdale said no.

Attorney Day said his clients respectfully ask the Village of Addison to reject annexation and proposed planned unit development as being excessive density for the two adjacent land uses. My clients ask the Planning & Zoning Commission to recommend the Village advise the applicant the townhome development at the proposed location will not be considered further unless and until the applicant proposes a density no higher than the 7.4 units at the Villa Torino blending down and essentially providing a soft transition where it suddenly butts up against one unit per acre. I want to compliment Mr. Gray. He clearly believes in his development. The neighborhood senses it to be highly inappropriate.

Mr. Gray said that they have spent many years on this project and with Village Staff going back and forth on the details. The R3B zoning was what was recommended on the northern parcel of the land that we already own. As we approached the Village and we talked to them about what do they think would be appropriate that is what we put together. This whole idea of talking about density versus zoning, I am disappointed to hear you speak that way because really what the issue is, is the zoning of the R3B and if that is what you are looking at rather than trying to build some kind of straw man case. Mr. Crandall and Ms. Henaghan have been spending a lot of time analyzing this. We have gone back and forth with the Planning Department and have looked at this and spent years working on it. We made the decision not to pursue annexing it into Bloomingdale, not because of any conversations or any specific aspects. Bloomingdale certainly did not reject our project. If anyone can find any specific information on that as it has been alleged, I would like to see it but it has not occurred. With regard to the planning side of this and the zoning that they have recommended for this parcel and we have tried to be very diligent in responding and respecting to be the R3B zoning that is clearly what it is. We are not asking for any grand exceptions. Mr. Gray said that he is disappointed for the response and our goal is to provide something that will endure well long term and also by some of the comments that were mentioned.

Attorney Freeman asked Ms. Henaghan to address the density one more time. Ms. Henaghan said the proposal is for a density of 12.4 units per acre which is in excess of what the regular R3B District allows for two bedroom units which is 10.6. This is representing their request for a 15% decrease in the minimum lot area that is required. Attorney Freeman said in terms of numbers what does that mean? Ms. Henaghan said they are proposing 67 units with the R3B District by itself would only allow 57 units.

Mr. Schmitt made a motion to close the public hearing, seconded by Mr. Turk. Roll call was taken.

Motion passed unanimously.

Consideration of File PZ-21-13 as described above.

Mr. Schmitt said from his point of view, I see a Planned Unit Development as something that enhances and provide relief on street widths and setbacks where there is a benefit and where there is actually some amenities are being provided that enhance the overall plan and I just don't see those kind of developments happening. It is maxed out from side to side and front to back. The same between the buildings is really more a buffer between buildings and is not creating any sort of amenity that is a useful element. I think they missed the target in terms of the overall density of it and just the planning of it.

Mr. Cargill said it is much too much and too small of space and can't imagine moving snow or garbage pickup. Planned Unit Development was set up in this Village so that you can work with the developer to enhance the property, get the best use and amenities. There are no public amenities in this development or contributions to the Park District. Mr. Cargill feels it isn't the best use of the land.

Mr. Turk said there was a lot of reference to Nicola Court and is of the opinion this nowhere near what Nicola Court looks like and doesn't think it's a good match at all.

Chair Fotopoulos said as much as she appreciates Public Works, I would not like to put the burden of this project on our Public Works. I would like not to put the burden on not having that the petitioner wants rentals, I don't feel if you build luxury apartments, condos or townhomes that are subject to rentals. We have all lived through an economy where we watched people go underwater.

Mr. Schmitt made a **negative** recommendation for the proposed annexation of File #PZ-21-12 with all the negative comments that were made tonight, seconded by Mr. Ariano. Chair Fotopoulos asked if there was any discussion. There was none. Roll call was taken.

Motion passed unanimously.

IV. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION

None

V. OTHER BUSINESS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRMAN

Chair Fotopoulos stated that we will be having a November Planning & Zoning meeting on November 10, 2021.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Cargill made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:00 p.m., seconded by Mr. Turk.

Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Georgianne Jakubowski
Georgianne Jakubowski

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION, OCTOBER 13, 2021

PLEASE SIGN IN

NAME	ORGANIZATION AND/OR ADDRESS
Parag Kshetrija	364 Dublin Rd Bloomington, IL
Apelsin Patel	354 Superior Dr. Bloomington IL
Ashish Desai	326 Clare Dr. Bloomington IL
Santosh Mehta	175 Michigan Ct Bloomington, IL
Christine Lopez Green	51057 Medinah Addison
Scott Benz	51041 Medinah Addison
Ralph Mendicino	158 Annalisa Ct. Bloomington
Natalie Stec	51041 Medinah.
Bill Belmonte	115 Windsor of Bldg Dr
Jorge Ocampo	177 Annalisa ct. Bloomington
Robert Taylor	2422 Nicola Ct Addison
Janine Mirzhi	1114 Denro
ROB VAN ZANDT	MEDINAH LIFE ESTATES HOA
SCOTT DAY	DAY & ROBERT PL.
DOU DE SANTI	2409 NICOLA CT ADDISON
Marybeth De Santi	2409 NICOLA CT ADDISON IL
Ashish Desai	177 Michigan Ct. Bloomington IL
Math Deinling	4125 17th Medinah Rd 60144
Rick Harig	4128 BRISTOL, NORTHBROOK

