

**VILLAGE OF HUNTLEY
VILLAGE BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
April 28, 2022**

CALL TO ORDER:

A meeting of the Village Board of the Village of Huntley was called to order on Thursday, April 28, 2022 at 7:00 p.m. in the Municipal Complex, Village Board Room, 10987 Main St., Huntley, Illinois 60142.

ATTENDANCE:

PRESENT: Mayor Timothy Hoeft; Trustees: Ronda Goldman, Mary Holzkopf, Niko Kanakaris, Curt Kittel, Harry Leopold and JR Westberg.

ABSENT: None

IN ATTENDANCE: Village Manager David Johnson; Deputy Village Manager Lisa Armour, Director of Finance Cathy Haley, Director of Public Works and Engineering Tim Farrell, Senior Planner Scott Bernacki, Economic Development, Marketing & Recruitment Specialist Melissa Stocker, Management Assistant Barbara Read, Information Technology Manager Karl Schmidt and Village Attorney Betsy Gates-Alford.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Mayor Hoeft led the Pledge of Allegiance.

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS:

- i. Recognition of Tom Kibort, Plan Commission Chairman

Mayor Hoeft recognized and thanked Mr. Tom Kibort, Plan Commission Chairman for his 23 years of service to the Village of Huntley.

- ii. Arbor Day Proclamation

Mayor Hoeft read the following proclamation in honor of the 150th Anniversary of Arbor Day.

150th Anniversary of Arbor Day; April 29, 2022

WHEREAS, in 1872, the Nebraska Board of Agriculture established a special day to be set aside for the planting of trees; and

WHEREAS, this holiday, called Arbor Day, was first observed with the planting of more than a million trees in Nebraska; and

WHEREAS, Arbor Day is now observed throughout the nation and the world; and

WHEREAS, trees can be a solution to combating climate change by reducing the erosion of topsoil by wind and water, cutting heating and cooling costs, moderating the temperature, cleaning the air, producing life-giving oxygen, and providing habitat for wildlife; and

WHEREAS, trees are a renewable resource giving us paper, wood for our homes, fuel for our fires and countless other wood products; and

WHEREAS, trees in our Village increase property values, enhance the economic vitality of business areas, and beautify our community; and

WHEREAS, trees, wherever they are planted, are a source of joy and spiritual renewal.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that I, Timothy J. Hoeft, Mayor of the Village of Huntley declare April 29, 2022, as Arbor Day in the Village of Huntley, and I urge all citizens to celebrate the 150th Anniversary of Arbor Day and support efforts to protect trees and woodlands, and participate in Huntley's Arbor Day Tree Planting on April 29, 2022. Signed Timothy J. Hoeft, Village President.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: Mayor Hoeft announced that public comments pertaining to the Regency Square petition will be heard when the petition is presented. There was one public comment. Mayor Hoeft invited Megan Erickson up to make her comment. Ms. Erickson requested the Village Board to consider amending the ban on backyard chickens rule in the Village. She stated that there are many benefits to having your own chickens and using the fresh eggs instead of buying them. Mayor Hoeft thanked her for her comments. There were no other public comments at that time.

AGENDA AMENDMENT

Mayor Hoeft asked for a motion to amend the agenda to bring item 7e earlier on the agenda before item 7a.

A MOTION was made to amend the agenda to bring item 7e before item 7a for discussion and consideration.

MOTION: Trustee Leopold
SECOND: Trustee Holzkopf
AYES: Trustees: Goldman, Holzkopf, Kanakaris, Kittel, Leopold and Westberg
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None
The motion carried: 6-0-0

CONSENT AGENDA:

All items listed under Consent Agenda are considered to be routine by the Village Board and may be approved and/or accepted by one motion with a Roll Call Vote. If further discussion is needed, any member of the Board may request that an item be moved off of the Consent Agenda to Items for Discussion and Consideration.

- a) Consideration – Approval of the April 14, 2022 Village Board Meeting Minutes
- b) Consideration – Approval of the April 28, 2022 Bill List in the Amount of \$486,318.42
- c) Consideration – Approval of Appointments to the Plan Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals:
 1. Appointment of Joseph Holtorf
 2. Appointment of Dawn Ellison as Chair
 3. Appointment of Richard Zydorowicz as Vice Chair
- d) Consideration – Proposed Vehicle/Truck Weight Roadway Restrictions Ordinance
- e) Consideration – A Resolution Waiving the Bid and Approval of the 2022 Edge Mill & Overlay Program to Geske and Sons, Inc. in the Amount of \$653,987.80
- f) Consideration – A Resolution Approving a Professional Services Agreement with Christopher B. Burke Engineering, LTD in an Amount Not to Exceed \$98,500 for Eakin Creek Sanitary Interceptor Sewer Construction Engineering
- g) Consideration – A Resolution Approving a Bid Award to Martam Construction, Inc. for the Eakin Creek Sanitary Interceptor Sewer in the amount of \$1,089,583.05
- h) Transmittal of First Quarter for FY2022 Financial and Investment Reports
- i) Consideration – An Ordinance Amending the fiscal year-end December 31, 2021 Budget

Mayor Hoeft asked if the Village Board had any comments or changes to the Consent Agenda; there were none.

A MOTION was made to approve the April 28, 2022 Consent Agenda.

MOTION: Trustee Leopold
SECOND: Trustee Kanakaris
AYES: Trustees: Goldman, Holzkopf, Kanakaris, Kittel, Leopold and Westberg
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None
The motion carried: 6-0-0

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION:

- e) Consideration – A Resolution Approving a Contract with The Retail Coach for Retail Market Analysis and Recruitment Services

Deputy Village Manager Lisa Armour said the Village Board approved the 2022 Economic Development Work Plan, which included as an action item seeking proposals for retail sector analysis and recruitment services. Work to be performed includes conducting a site assessment of the Village’s market trade area and profiling the customer’s buying habits, lifestyle characteristics and media habits. The results of the assessment will be used to guide decisions and use of resources to grow the Village’s retail sector and to shape goals for the recruitment of new retail businesses.

STAFF ANALYSIS

On February 10th, the Village Board authorized staff to distribute the Request for Proposals (RFP). The RFPs were distributed on February 11th, with a due date of March 11th. Four responses were received from the following consultants: NextSite (Birmingham, AL), Place Dynamics (New Berlin, WI), Retail Strategies (Birmingham, AL), and The Retail Coach (Austin, TX/Tupelo, MS). Staff reviewed the responses and arranged for a brief meeting by Zoom to discuss each respondent’s proposal. The meetings were conducted by the Mayor and Staff. Based upon the discussions, Staff is presenting the proposal from The Retail Coach for consideration by the Village Board. A summary of the proposals is provided below.

PRICING	<u>NextSite</u>	<u>Retail Strategies</u>	<u>The Retail Coach</u>	<u>Place Dynamics</u>
Year 1	\$25,000	\$45,000	\$47,000	\$30,000
Year 2	\$25,000	\$45,000		
Year 3	\$25,000	\$45,000		
	Minimum 3-year agreement	plus travel after 1 trip	includes travel costs not to exceed \$2000	does not include outreach to businesses or developers or representation at industry events

ALTERNATE	Success fee option	Optional 3-year agreement	Optional 2nd and 3rd year contract extension	
Year 1	\$15,000 + Success fee	\$45,000		
Year 2	Success fee	\$40,000	\$30,000	
Year 3	Success fee	\$40,000	\$30,000	
	3-year retainer plus success fees not to exceed \$100,000			

One of the unique services offered by The Retail Coach is a retail workshop for existing businesses to provide retail trade area findings, demographic and psychographic profiles, and specific retail sector opportunities. The workshop is designed to help existing business and entrepreneurs enhance their business opportunities.

The Retail Coach has worked with more than 650 communities in 40 states throughout the country over the last 21 years, with references and testimonials provided in the proposal.

2022-2025 STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

The Strategic Plan identifies “Strong Local Economy” as a strategic focus and the following goal: “Location of Choice for New and Expanding Businesses of all Sizes.” The retail market analysis and recruitment plan will assist in attracting new businesses and also provide resources for existing businesses to help grow.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The FY22 Budget includes funding in Economic Development Line Item 100-70-00-6387 for this work. The initial agreement with The Retail Coach is in the amount of \$47,000, with options in years two and three to continue market analysis and recruitment services at an annual cost of \$30,000 per year.

LEGAL ANALYSIS

The Village Attorney reviewed the RFP terms and conditions for approving an agreement with the selected consultant.

Deputy Village Manager Armour asked Mr. Kelly Cofer to discuss The Retail Coach company and to review the proposal before the Village Board. Mr. Cofer reviewed a presentation outlining the experience his company has in performing market analysis and recruitment services all over the country. Mr. Cofer spoke about specific areas throughout the Village that will benefit from having this study completed.

Trustee Goldman asked Mr. Cofer if the varying interests and views of all of the Village Board members will be taken into account before marketing a certain area. Mr. Cofer said that is accomplished by holding stakeholder meetings as a group, but if the Village Board would like to meet individually, they could certainly do that. Trustee Goldman also asked Village Manager Johnson if staff would continue to do the annual resident survey and if the previous year’s comments from the surveys would be provided to The Retail Coach. Village Manager Johnson confirmed that the resident surveys would still take place and the results would be provided.

Trustee Westberg stated that it would be wonderful if a major retailer would also draw attention to and enhance small businesses nearby but if that major retailer is not going to partner well with our smaller businesses, is it worth having the major retailer in town. Mr. Cofer stated that is one of the things they do focus on. They will work with the current businesses in town to make sure they carry a different level of merchandise that is conducive to what is being sought by local residents.

Trustee Holzkopf said she was very impressed with The Retail Coach's willingness to work with existing businesses. She added that she is fine that there are duplicate businesses in town because it shows that each business can be sustained by the residents and that is great for the community. Trustee Holzkopf questioned if their company would work with just the company or the company and a land broker to move them to Huntley. Mr. Cofer said there are a couple of different ways they go about working with a retailer. They do utilize a brokerage company in assisting retailers if possible. There is the possibility of a developer already owning the land so the retailer would simply have to sign a lease and construct on the property. Another possibility is if there is a land owner, but not a developer of the property, his company can introduce the retailer to the landowner through a brokerage firm that may assist in helping the landowner work with a developer to secure the retailer. The main component is having the knowledge of each site available for development so The Retail Coach will know how to market and address the positive and negative of each site and which site may work best for each retailer. Trustee Holzkopf asked if they find that land value increases if there are more retailers onto the property. Mr. Cofer said not really because each site is looked at differently. Some sites need more work and development than others and may not be cost effective for every retailer. It depends on each site. Trustee Holzkopf concluded by asking about the average time it takes from the company being hired to finding a business for the community. Mr. Cofer said they would hope to have someone interested within the first three months. He added that Huntley does not have a lot of space available for an immediate move in retailer but stated that the most interest early on will most likely be from food related businesses.

Trustees Kanakaris and Leopold stated they were anxious for The Retail Coach to get started bringing more retailers to Huntley. Trustee Kittel told Mr. Cofer that he appreciated the presentation and also looks forward to seeing what the company can do for Huntley.

Mr. Cofer thanked the Village Board for their input and said that he and his staff look forward to working with the Village Board and welcomes the opportunity to work in Huntley.

Mayor Hoeft asked if there were any further questions or comments. There were none.

A MOTION was made to approve a Resolution Approving an Agreement with The Retail Coach for Retail Market Analysis and Recruitment Services.

MOTION: Trustee Kanakaris
SECOND: Trustee Holzkopf
AYES: Trustees: Goldman, Holzkopf, Kanakaris, Kittel, Leopold and Westberg
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None
The motion carried: 6-0-0

- a) Consideration – An Ordinance Approving (i) A Final Plat of Consolidation; and (ii) Site Plan Review, including any necessary relief, for the construction of a new ±15,654 square foot Gerber Collision and Glass, northwest corner of Kreutzer Road and Raymond Court

Senior Planner Scott Bernacki reviewed a power point presentation and said the petitioner is proposing to construct a Gerber Collision and Glass at the northwest corner of Kreutzer Road and Raymond Court. The ±1.62-acre lot is zoned “M” Manufacturing District. The Zoning Ordinance includes *Automobile Repair, Major* as a Permitted Use within the “M” Manufacturing District. Gerber Collision and Glass is a nationwide auto restoration company that performs both minor and major body repairs, auto painting and glass replacement. Nearby Gerber locations include Crystal Lake and Elgin.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Site Plan

The petitioner proposes to construct a new 15,654 square-foot automobile repair facility with an outdoor storage yard. Access to the site is provided off Kreutzer Road through a shared private driveway which runs between lots 102 (Goodwill) and 101 (Proposed Gerber Collision and Glass). Kreutzer Road currently supports both an eastbound and westbound dedicated turn lane onto the private driveway. Vehicles in need of service can cycle through either of the two entrance aprons on the west side of the lot and through the covered entrance canopy.

A 6’ high privacy fence, which is comprised of composite horizontal wood slats with black painted steel posts, will be installed in the required front yard along Kreutzer Road and in the corner side yard along Raymond Court. The lot is divided by the fence which separates customer parking from the vehicle storage lot. The west side customer parking lot supports 28, 10’ x 19’ parking spaces. The east side lot supports 41 parking spaces and will be used to store vehicles awaiting repair. The dumpster enclosure is located at the northeast corner of the lot and remains behind the privacy fence and will be constructed of the same building materials as the building.

Elevations

The proposed building is constructed using light gray split face CMU with a dark gray split face CMU accent course. The upper quarter of the building uses gray painted prefinished metal paneling and serves as a parapet to screen any rooftop mechanical units or exhaust hoods. The south elevation utilizes an offset blue painted metal paneled feature wall to provide height and depth variation along Kreutzer Road. The south elevation also supports two drive in overhead service doors, which provide access to the garage area. Two additional overhead service doors are located on the east elevation and one is located on the north elevation. The west elevation features the same blue and gray painted metal paneling on the covered canopy main entrance. The front of the canopy is clad with prefinished storefront glass with two matching glass overhead doors on either end of the drive through entrance canopy.

Landscaping

Landscape plans have been submitted which comply with the Village’s landscape ordinance. The pre-existing trees along the Kreutzer Road and Raymond Court street frontages are to remain. Ten additional shade trees will be planted in the parking lot and along the north lot line. The plan proposes 154 shrubs offering eight different deciduous and evergreen species as well as groundcover perennials and ornamental grasses to be planted on the street side of the proposed fence and near the monument sign.

Lighting

The petitioner has submitted light fixture specifications for both the wall and pole mounted lighting. The proposed fixtures match the fixture style and mounting height as used in the neighboring Goodwill development. The photometric plans reflect that the lighting levels do not exceed 0.5 foot-candles at the property line.

Signage

Wall Signs

The petitioner proposes a compliant ±150 square-foot wall sign on the south elevation, facing Kreutzer Road. The proposal also calls for the installation of a second ±90 square-foot wall sign on the west elevation, facing the private access driveway. Both signs are to be illuminated channel letters on a backer panel. The lot has frontage upon two streets allowing for two wall signs; however, relief from Sections 156.123(C) has been requested by the petitioner for the installation of the second wall sign upon an elevation with no street frontage.

Monument Sign

The petitioner has proposed a standalone monument sign located near the southwest corner of the lot. The 13'-3" tall 167 square-foot monument is constructed of light gray split face CMU with a dark gray split face CMU accent course to match the principle building materials and features an internally illuminated sign with a compliant face area of 40 square feet per side. The sign will be installed no closer than 10' from the south or west property lines and complies with the visibility triangle requirements.

Required Relief

As proposed, the plans will require the following relief to be approved as part of the site plan review:

1. Section 156.123(C) requires the location of the wall signs be limited to the street frontages of the building. The site has frontage on Kreutzer Road and Raymond Court, therefore allowing two wall signs. Relief is required to allow the second wall sign to be installed upon an elevation with no street frontage, facing the private access driveway.
2. Section 156.078(C) requires that no accessory structure be located in a required rear or side yard except as provided by the Zoning Ordinance. Relief is required to allow the dumpster enclosure to be located within the platted 30' corner side yard along Raymond Court.

Plan Commission Recommendation

The Plan Commission conducted a public hearing to consider the petitioner's request on April 11, 2022, and, with no members of the public offering testimony in favor or opposition to the request, unanimously recommended approval of the petition by a vote of 6 to 0, subject to the following conditions:

1. All public improvements and site development must occur in full compliance with the submitted plans and all other applicable Village Municipal Services (Engineering, Public Works, Planning and Building) site design standards, practices and permit requirements.
2. The petitioner is required to meet all development requirements of the Huntley Fire Protection District.
3. All repair work shall be performed inside the structure.
4. Outside storage of vehicles, awaiting or following repair or service shall not be stored on site for longer than five days. No vehicle awaiting repair shall be stored within the customer parking area.

All vehicles with visible body damage or in need of frame or fender straightening shall be located within the vehicle storage yard, completely concealed by the privacy fence.

5. The proposed fence shall utilize composite wood slats, rather than stained wood as specified on the plans.
6. No building plans, permits, sign permits, or Certificates of Occupancy are approved as part of this submittal.

2022-2025 STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

The Strategic Plan identifies “*Strong Local Economy*” as a strategic focus and the following goal: “*Location of Choice for New and Expanding Businesses of all Sizes.*”

FINANCIAL IMPACT

None.

LEGAL ANALYSIS

The required public hearing was conducted by the Plan Commission.

Mayor Hoeft asked if the Village Board had comments or questions.

Mr. Paul Fashingbauer, Construction Manager for Gerber thanked the mayor and Village Board for their time and said they are excited to be part of the Huntley community.

Trustee Westberg questioned if the signs were backlit like box signs and if the signs would have a three dimensional type of element included. Mr. Fashingbauer stated that the signs are a channel letter type of sign on an ornamental steel backer and lit on the side.

Mayor Hoeft asked if there were any other questions. There were none.

A MOTION was made to approve An Ordinance Approving (i) a Final Plat of Consolidation and (ii) Site plan approval for the construction of a new ±15,654 square foot Gerber Collision and Glass generally located at the northwest corner of Kreutzer Road and Raymond Court.

MOTION: Trustee Goldman
SECOND: Trustee Kanakaris
AYES: Trustees: Goldman, Holzkopf, Kanakaris, Kittel, Leopold and Westberg
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None
The motion carried: 6-0-0

- b) Consideration – An Ordinance Approving (i) A Special Use Permit for Automobile Repair Minor within the “B-3 (PUD)” Shopping Center Business District – Planned Unit Development; and (ii) Final Planned Unit Development, including any necessary relief, for the construction of a new ±10,000 square foot Belle Tire in Huntley Crossings Phase II, Southeast Corner of IL Rt. 47 and Regency Parkway

Senior Planner Scott Bernacki reviewed a power point presentation and stated that the petitioner is proposing to construct a Belle Tire on Lot 7 of Huntley Crossings – Phase II Plat II. The ±1.81-acre parcel lies on the southeast corner of Route 47 and Regency Parkway and is zoned “B-3 (PUD)” Shopping Center

Business District – Planned Unit Development. Belle Tire performs a number of auto related services including the sale and installation of tires, alignments, oil changes, suspension, battery replacement, and brakes. The Zoning Ordinance includes *Automobile Repair, Minor* as a Special Use within the “B-3” Shopping Center Business District. Belle Tire has over 125 locations throughout Michigan, Ohio and Indiana and is currently expanding in the Chicago market with new locations in Villa Park, Naperville and coming soon to St. Charles and Shorewood.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Site Plan

The petitioner proposes to construct a new 10,000 square-foot retail and auto repair facility with ten 10 repair bays. Access to the site is provided by the private service road, which runs parallel to Route 47 and connects Regency Parkway to Powers Road. The proposed building is sited to comply with the platted building setback lines and maintains the required 100’ greenbelt across the Route 47 frontage. Plans show that eight repair bays will be located on the south elevation and two additional repair bays will be located on the east elevation, facing the private service road. The main retail entrance will face Route 47 with storefront glass positioned toward the intersection of Route 47 and Regency Parkway. Forty-one 10’ x 19’ parking spaces are provided along the perimeter of the site. The dumpster enclosure is proposed to be located at the southeast corner of the lot.

A 60’ tall flag pole is proposed to be installed at the southwest corner of the parking lot just outside of the 100’ greenway. Installation of the flag pole will require relief from section 156.039(C)(5) of the Zoning Ordinance which allows a maximum height of 35’ in the B-3 District.

Elevations

The proposed building materials include earth toned brick veneer with clear glass storefront windows in aluminum frames. Building dimension is provided by offset brick piers capped with precast stone as viewed at the main entrance facing Route 47, and along the north elevation facing Regency Parkway. The eight repair bays on the south elevation and two on the east elevation are made up of aluminum overhead doors with tinted acrylic panels separated by painted steel columns. Pre-formed EIFS is proposed for the cornice and frieze to cap the building. The entry tower and the retail portion of the building are capped with blue metal seam roofing which also serves as a mechanical screen. The dumpster enclosure consists of the same brick veneer material over concrete block with painted steel gates.

Landscaping

Landscape plans have been submitted which show a mix of landscaping elements along all lot lines and foundation plantings where possible along the north and west elevations. The plan proposes 24 deciduous trees, 14 evergreen trees and 8 ornamental trees offering nine different species as well as 180 shrubs of nine different species. Plantings have been placed along the south lot line to screen the repair bays and the dumpster enclosure.

Lighting

In compliance with the Commercial Design Guidelines Section (B)(7)(d), the petitioner has agreed to submit light fixture specifications for the LSI Lexington style decorative lights with a pole and mounting height that matches the neighboring developments in the Huntley Crossings Phase II outlots.

Signage

Wall Signs

The petitioner is permitted to install one wall sign per street frontage. Given the building will have street frontage along both Route 47 and Regency Parkway, a total of two wall signs are permitted to be installed upon the building. The petitioner proposes a code compliant ± 89.53 square-foot illuminated wall sign on the west elevation, facing Route 47, and a ± 69.49 square foot illuminated wall sign on the north elevation, facing Regency Parkway.

The proposal also calls for the installation of a third ± 89.53 square-foot illuminated wall sign on the east elevation, facing the private access road, and a fourth ± 167.86 square-foot illuminated wall sign on the south elevation. Relief from Sections 156.123(C) and 156.123(D) has been requested by the petitioner for the installation of the two additional wall signs upon the elevations with no public street frontage. Relief from 156.123(A) would accommodate the proposed wall sign area overage of ± 207.91 square feet.

Monument Sign

The petitioner has proposed a standalone monument sign sited near the northwest corner of the lot, within the 100' greenway buffer. The 10' tall, 145 square-foot monument is constructed of the same brick utilized on the principle building and features an internally illuminated sign with a compliant face area of ± 78 square feet per side. The sign will be installed no closer than 10' from the north or west property lines and complies with the visibility triangle requirements.

Directional Signs

The petitioner proposes to install two freestanding directional signs near the lot's entrance and exit. The proposed directional signs are 3' in total height and the signage does not exceed 6 square feet in area as required by the Zoning Ordinance. The same brick will be used at the base of the two signs, which offer the name and logo of the business along with a directional arrow. The signs shall be installed no closer than 5' from the property line.

Required Relief

As proposed, the plans will require the following relief to be approved as part of the Final Planned Unit Development:

1. Section 156.123(D) of the Zoning Ordinance, allows one wall sign per public street frontage. Section 156.123(C) requires the location of the sign be limited to the street frontage of the building. Section 156.123(A) states the total surface area of all wall signs on a building shall not exceed one square foot for each lineal foot of the building frontage. The site only has frontage on Route 47 and Regency Parkway and the building's frontage measures ± 203.5 -feet, therefore allowing two wall signs measuring up to 203.5 square feet. Relief is required to allow a total of four wall signs totaling ± 411.41 square feet, with the third and fourth wall signs installed upon the south and east elevations without street frontage.
2. Section 156.039(C)(5) establishes a maximum height of 35' for the B-3 District. Relief is required to install a 60' flag pole, which will accommodate a flag 20' x 30' in size.

Special Use

A Special Use Permit for an *Automobile Repair, Minor* use in the "B-3" District is requested to accommodate the proposed retail and service facility. The petitioner's responses to the standards identified in Section 156.068(E) of the Zoning Ordinance are provided as an attachment to this report. The Plan Commission

considered both the public benefit and mitigation of adverse impacts when evaluating the petitioner's evidence.

Village Board Concept Review

The Village Board reviewed conceptual plans for Belle Tire on January 13, 2022 and provided the following comments.

1. Concern was expressed regarding the location of the business in Huntley Crossings Phase II. Some believed the use would be better suited for alternative areas in Huntley such as east of the Route 47 frontage along Kreutzer Road or north of Main Street. Other members stated that the location was appropriate and offered residents a variety of sales and services on both the north and south ends of the community.
2. It was recommended that the monument sign be located near the outer edge of the detention area to provide greater visibility to the sign. *As proposed, the full brick surround monument sign is located 10' off the west property line near the corner of Route 47 and Regency Parkway.*

Plan Commission Recommendation

The Plan Commission conducted a public hearing to consider the petitioner's request on April 11, 2022, and, with no members of the public offering testimony in favor or opposition to the request, unanimously recommended approval of the petition by a vote of 6 to 0, subject to the following conditions:

1. All public improvements and site development must occur in full compliance with the submitted plans and all other applicable Village Municipal Services (Engineering, Public Works, Planning and Building) site design standards, practices and permit requirements.
2. The petitioner is required to meet all development requirements of the Huntley Fire Protection District.
3. All repair work shall be performed inside the structure.
4. Vehicles awaiting or following repair shall not be stored outside on-site for longer than 24 hours.
5. The lighting fixture shall be selected to match that of the neighboring development and the photometric plans shall be resubmitted and approved by the Development Services Department.
6. No building plans, permits, sign permits, or Certificates of Occupancy are approved as part of this submittal.

The Plan Commission added the following conditions:

7. Further evaluation shall be given to the existing condition of the detention basin. If determined necessary, additional native plantings shall be added.

2022-2025 STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

The Strategic Plan identifies "*Strong Local Economy*" as a strategic focus and the following goal: "*Location of Choice for New and Expanding Businesses of all Sizes.*"

FINANCIAL IMPACT

None.

LEGAL ANALYSIS

None.

Mayor Hoeft asked the petitioner to please come forward. Ms. Alison Souter, Cage Engineering, thanked the Village Board for their consideration and was available to answer any questions.

Trustee Goldman asked if St. Charles or Huntley was first. Ms. Souter said that St. Charles construction had just completed and should be opening soon. Trustee Leopold commented that this will be a nice addition to Huntley. Mayor Hoeft asked if there were any other questions or comments. There were none. Mayor Hoeft thanked the petitioner and welcomed them to Huntley.

A MOTION was made to approve An Ordinance Approving (i) A Special Use Permit for automobile repair, minor within the “B-3 (PUD)” Shopping Center Business District – Planned Unit Development; and (ii) Final Planned Unit Development, including any necessary relief, for the construction of a new ±10,000 square-foot Belle Tire on Lot 7 of Huntley Crossings – Phase II Plat II.

MOTION: Trustee Leopold
SECOND: Trustee Westberg
AYES: Trustees: Goldman, Holzkopf, Kanakaris, Kittel, Leopold and Westberg
NAYS: None
ABSENT: None
The motion carried: 6-0-0

- c) Consideration – An Ordinance approving an Amendment to the Site Plan Approval for Lot 2A of Regency Square Phase 2A within the “C-2 PDD” Regional Retail – Planned Development District, for the construction of two accessory structures for Rookies Bar and Grill, 12220 Princeton Drive

Senior Planner Scott Bernacki said that Lot 2A of Regency Square Phase 2A is a ±1.81-acre parcel located in the Regency Square outlots fronting Route 47. The property is zoned “C-2 PDD” Regional Retail – Planned Development District. Ordinance (O)2012-08.34 authorized the original site plan approval allowing for the construction of the 7,977 square-foot building which is now home to Jimmy John’s Sandwiches, Little Caesars Pizza, and Rookies Bar and Grill. Both end cap units have an existing open air paver patio which supports customer seating. The petitioner, Rookies Bar and Grill, is proposing to amend the site plan to allow for the construction of two accessory structures within the front patio area upon the property located at 12220 Princeton Drive.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Site Plan

The Petitioner proposes to construct two accessory structures within the front paver patio seating area of Rookies Bar and Grill.

Pergola

The Petitioner proposes a ±25’ X 14’ cedar pergola. The pergola will stand ±13’ tall with 9’-6” of clearance between the paver grade and the lowest beam. The pergola is positioned directly adjacent to the existing storefront glass windows with 10’ of separation between the principle building and the accessory structure. The pergola will remain “open” to the sky. Electrical switches and receptacles will be added to support the installation of lighting and outdoor fans.

Performance Stage

The petitioner also proposes a ±50 square-foot triangular performance stage. The stage is positioned on the northeast corner of the patio and will be enclosed on both the north and east elevations. The performance stage is comprised of a 6” raised paver platform, ±2’ tall paver walls and columns, and cedar siding which encloses the “back” of the stage. The stage will remain open facing the restaurant seating area. The ±12’ tall structure will be capped using a red metal seamed roofing system.

Landscaping

The existing landscape area is proposed to be updated to complement the new additions to the patio area. The perimeter of the patio will re-use the existing ornamental grass and daylily, with the addition of nine little lime hydrangeas facing the east parking lot and five Autumn Jazz Viburnum facing the Starbucks drive thru on the neighboring lot. New foundation plantings include 17 little bunny fountain grasses planted between the building and the pergola. The existing planter at the entrance will be rebuilt and repositioned to feature annual plantings.

Recommendation

Staff recommends the following conditions be applied should the Village Board motion to approve the amendment to the site plan review:

1. All public improvements and site development must occur in full compliance with the submitted plans and all other applicable Village Municipal Services (Engineering, Public Works, Planning and Building) site design standards, practices and permit requirements.
2. The petitioner is required to meet all development requirements of the Huntley Fire Protection District.
3. No building plans, permits, or Certificates of Occupancy are approved as part of this submittal.

2022-2025 STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT

The Strategic Plan identifies *“Strong Local Economy”* as a strategic focus and the following goal: *“Location of Choice for New and Expanding Businesses of all Sizes.”*

FINANCIAL IMPACT

None.

LEGAL ANALYSIS

None.

Trustee Goldman asked if the request could be separated by pergola and stage. She said she did not care for the stage concept because it will make too much noise for that area but did like the idea of a pergola. Trustee Westberg said the stage is only big enough to have one or two people on it at one time, the speakers seem to be facing in towards the building and he did not think there would be a noise problem. Trustee Holzkopf was in favor of the pergola and stage since when the petitioner appeared before the Village Board in February on another item he stated that his business was not doing well and she thought this could help his business. Trustees Kanakaris, Leopold and Kittel all were in favor of both components of the request saying there is a need for outside seating and did not think the stage would cause a noise problem at all.

Mayor Hoeft asked if there were any further questions or comments. There were none.

A MOTION was made to approve an Ordinance Approving an Amendment to the Site Plan Approval for Lot 2A of Regency Square Phase 2A within the “C-2 PDD” Regional Retail – Planned Development District, for the construction of two accessory structures for Rookies Bar and Grill.

MOTION: Trustee Kanakaris

SECOND: Trustee Kittel

AYES: Trustees: Holzkopf, Kanakaris, Kittel, Leopold and Westberg

NAYS: Trustee Goldman

ABSENT: None

The motion carried: 5-1-0

- d) Conceptual Review – Proposed Rezoning of 45 Acres at Regency Square from “BP” Business Park and “C-2” Commercial to “MF-2” Multi-Family Residential to Develop the Property with 94 Townhome Units and 296 Apartment Units at the Southwest Corner of Charles H. Sass Parkway and Princeton Drive

Trustee Kanakaris asked to make a statement regarding the petition. Before the Board begins this agenda item, I would like to disclose that I have an indirect interest in the application for rezoning and development of Regency Square. The applicant and property owner is BO2 Investments LLC. I am a member and have 25% ownership share in BO2 Investments LLC. Because of this, I am recusing myself from participation in all Village Board discussions regarding this matter, and I will abstain from all votes or other official Village actions relating to the development application.

Trustee Kanakaris left the meeting at 8:08 pm.

Mayor Hoeft noted that Lynd Living, the contract purchaser of ±45 acres at Regency Square appeared before the Village Board on February 24, 2022, for initial concept review of a proposal to develop 94 townhome units with two-car garages (15 six-unit buildings, one four-unit building), and 296 apartment units in two buildings with covered parking. The total number of proposed units is 390. In addition, plans included an approximate nine-acre prairie preserve is proposed immediately adjacent to Sun City Neighborhood 7.

STAFF ANALYSIS

Lynd Living has submitted a revised site plan and updated apartment building elevations based on feedback received during the Village Board’s conceptual review on February 24, 2022 (an excerpt of the February 24, 2022, meeting minutes are provided for reference). The petitioner has stated the revised site plan reflects the following modifications:

1. An entrance has been added at the northwest corner of the site utilizing the existing curb cut on Charles H. Sass Parkway.
2. A gated access for emergency vehicles is proposed at the terminus of Regency Parkway.
3. A gated access for emergency vehicles is proposed along Princeton Drive. This was previously shown as a full access for residents.
4. A turnaround area has been added to the south of the townhomes.
5. A sidewalk connection has been added from the terminus of Regency Parkway to Charles H. Sass Parkway.
6. A sidewalk has been added along the Charles H. Sass frontage of the property.
7. The petitioner is making five percent (5%) of the apartment units within the two apartment buildings available for use by individuals or families whose income is not more than 80% of median area income (i.e.—income-restricted units). The petitioner explains “the mix of these units will be in proportion to the general mix of all apartments within the two buildings, and these income-restricted units will be scattered throughout the two buildings”.

The petitioner has submitted a traffic impact study that was prepared based on the previous site plan. The Village’s traffic engineering consultant will review an updated version of the petitioner’s traffic impact study should they proceed with a formal development application.

The formal entitlement process will include, at a minimum, the following:

- Amending the Comprehensive Plan to identify the property as planned for residential use; It is currently shown as Business Park and Mixed Use (Commercial/Office)
- Rezoning (Map Amendment) to “MF-2” Multi-Family Residential
- Amending the existing Special Use Permit for development of the property
- Amending the Regency Square Design Guidelines (no residential component is currently included other than institutional uses); The design guidelines address bulk regulations (setbacks, building height, lot coverage, etc.) and design standards for building, landscaping, signage, and required amenities.
- Approving a preliminary/final plat of subdivision for the property
- Approving a development agreement for the property (if necessary)

Mayor Hoeft asked Mr. Eric Brorson, Development Manager, Peter Bazos, Attorney, Anthony Tiritilli, President of Development and David Lynd to please come forward.

Mayor Hoeft reviewed the protocol for the petition presentation. He said that Lynd Living (Lynd) will make a presentation and provide an overview. Members of the audience signed in for public comments will be called to address the Board in the order they are signed up. Mayor Hoeft asked if there was anyone in attendance that had not already signed it; there was no one. He said Lynd will monitor the audience comments for responses and supplement information following public comments and when public comments are over, Lynd will have a chance to address the crowd. After the Lynd presentation and public comments, the Village Board will discuss the proposed development as a concept. He added that Lynd has not yet filed a zoning application and that this is for conceptual review only. There will be no vote taken. Mayor Hoeft said Lynd has requested the Village Board to review conceptually and to discuss the proposed rezoning to the subject site. The Village Board is not required to provide a formal position statement on the proposal, and Lynd shall not be required to comply with any position statements that are offered this evening. The concept review shall provide Lynd with comments and concerns that should be considered if they proceed in the formal application and review process. The Village Board and its individual members are not bound by any comments made during the discussion, and Lynd acknowledges that it cannot claim any future any reliance whatsoever on these comments. Mayor Hoeft said that the Village Board is in receipt of all written and emailed comments since the February 24th Village Board meeting. He said that if Lynd submits an application for zoning and development relief, then there will be a formal public hearing conducted before the Plan Commission and then following the Plan Commission meeting, the application would be formally considered by the Village Board. Mayor Hoeft asked Lynd to please begin their presentation.

Peter Bazos, Attorney representing Lynd, began the presentation and introduced Mr. David Lynd, the CEO and son of the founder of the company; Mr. Tony Tiritilli, President of Development; and Mr. Eric Brorson, Development Manager the petitioners. Mr. Bazos said Lynd was before the Village Board on February 24th for concept review and are before the Village Board again this evening for a second concept review. He said that Lynd took notes, heard the Board’s comments and have been keeping up with the comments made online. Mr. Bazos said that the Village Board will see a substantial number of changes have been made to the plan based on comments and concerns. Lynd is seeking direction from the Village Board as to whether this Board likes the concept of this \$125 million investment in the community that will bring residents who will shop and perhaps help the job of the consultant that the Board just hired to attract retail here. Mr. Bazos introduced Mr. Tony Tiritilli, President of Development to review the project and outline the changes made since the first concept review.

Mr. Tiritilli reviewed components of the development that have been changed since the previous meeting in February. He said Lynd had a meeting with the Fire Department after the February meeting and have incorporated some of their comments as well. Mr. Tiritilli reviewed the access points off Charles H. Sass Parkway as well as the emergency access off Princeton. He added that some of the buildings had been moved around to accommodate traffic flow but no more units had been added. The access on Princeton will be an emergency access that will be gated but the emergency vehicles will have the ability to open the gate at arrival. Mr. Tiritilli discussed removing the homes from the western portion of the site and creating a reserve area of green space with a walking trail. He said Lynd will landscape the area to make it a nice addition to the development. Lynd will add a continuation of the sidewalk throughout the development and along Sass Parkway to get the residents to Princeton. He said pathways could be included that would be wide enough for golf carts to help travel around the project to get to Princeton. Mr. Tiritilli address the parking component of the plan showing that the streets are designed as a 66' wide roadway that would be similar to most suburban streets. The roadway would be wide enough to have parking along the curbs and allow 2-car parking in front of every 2-car garage. Mr. Tiritilli said the 77% open space exceeds what is required with the site able to support the density being proposed. He said that Lynd is willing to incorporate an affordability component into the project saying that 5% of the units could be reserved for residents that meet 80% of the median income level. Mr. Tiritilli concluded his presentation and asked Mr. Lynd to speak in regard to the Lynd company.

Mr. Lynd thanked Mayor Hoeft and the Board of Trustees for allowing him to address the Board and citizens attending the meeting. Mr. Lynd provided a background of Lynd noting that his father founded Lynd in 1980. Lynd has projects throughout the Chicagoland area, 17 states, and 62 metro areas across the United States. Mr. Lynd said they have chosen Huntley to build next because it is a beautiful community and they are excited to bring a quality project to the Village. He addressed the concerns regarding the ratings by the Better Business Bureau saying that with overseeing 20,000 units throughout their current projects, unfortunately there are times where residents do not pay their rent, damage property and are evicted. These are the residents that will post on social media, apartments.com or the Better Business Bureau. He added saying that the happy residents unfortunately do not post to these sites. Mr. Lynd said that Lynd has a five star rating and would never be able to build a project of the year if they did not manage quality projects and take care of the residents that live there. Mr. Lynd added that they manage their properties very well, but do not manage all of their properties, some are managed by another company. He also said Lynd does projects for nonprofit veterans groups that would be homeless today if not for Lynd. Mr. Lynd said that he understands that change can be uncomfortable and difficult to accept because of traffic concerns, potential crime and other alterations being made to the community. He stated that Lynd is very good at building these properties and hopes that the Village Board welcomes them to the community.

Mr. Bazos continued by thanking Mayor Hoeft and the Village Board concluding the presentation and said Lynd would take notes and respond following public comments.

Mayor Hoeft said the public comments would now begin and called forward Mr. John Piwko.

My name is John Piwko, 11082 Preston Parkway. I know that address is not near this place, so I am not directly affected by it; however, I do go visit businesses on Princeton. In short, my comments are this, 296 apartments - that's a lot. Does Huntley need that many? Probably, but not there. Same thing with the townhomes. We are looking at different things to attract younger people to come here and townhomes are one of them, obviously, apartments are another, but again, I think this location is the wrong place for it. Then in the town's earlier plans, there were plans to have this type of housing behind the Walmart. That

whole area was designated as apartments and townhomes. They would have probably been much better to have placed them there. I bid you good luck.

My name is Pat Runtz I live at 11451 Windsor Drive. I would like to address two points. Based on tonight's presentation, I want to clarify that the property we are talking about is to the west of Walgreens on Sass Parkway. The second point is that the only access to Regency Parkway is emergency vehicles only. It is my impression that this property is basically behind Alden behind the Fire Department. Those pieces of property I just want to clarify that. Mayor Hoeft responded by saying yes.

My name is Sandy Deacon and I live at 12166 Tuliptree Lane, which is in Neighborhood 7, which backs right up to this development. A lot of the residents in my neighborhood are really concerned about this. The comment that was just made is of all the areas in Huntley that would be perfect places for apartments and for rentals in this kind of population, we do not believe this is the correct place. There is so much other land that would be better. We know that you want to do what is best for the Village of Huntley, but we also want you to consider Sun City. We are one-third of the population of Huntley, and to put this development with all the noise, traffic and concerns that we have talked about in the past yet you are going to put it right down in the middle of a 55-plus aged community. A community where we are living our dream, in Sun City. You are also putting it right where you have assisted living in places that just do not fit with something like this development. We have given all these concerns in the past about safety and traffic, noise, taxes, things like that we are concerned about. One of the things that has come to my attention is the walking path that they are talking about. It sounds all wonderful and pretty, but to me, it is going to be where the people that live in these apartments or duplexes are going to come right across the street and it is going to be the same problem that we were afraid of with the houses there. They are going to be roller skating, playing games, walking their dog, things like that, and it just invites them to come over right in our backyards. Who is going to maintain this? You are going to have kids and residents over there with trash and garbage and dogs and things like that. Who is going to take care of that? Mayor, during the last few months we have accumulated signatures for this project. We have over 1,000 signatures saying that we did not want this development. We wanted to keep it zoned commercial. *Ms. Deacon presented the Mayor with the petitions.* Ms. Deacon continued saying all the signatures and the people are real. We are out there and we are real and we want you to listen to our concerns and do what is best for Sun City. Thank you.

My name is Ron Saballus and I live at 12773 Eagle Ridge Lane in Sun City. I am a civil engineer and have worked on developments like this throughout the United States, from Minnesota, to Maryland, to Ohio, to Illinois, to Florida, and 10 Mile Beach in the Cayman Islands. I have seen many of these developments. I have sat on building planning zoning boards and I have been a trustee of a village. I have been watching this development for over two years and to me it is absolutely shocking. One thing we talk about is what is going to be. We do not talk about how this was designed. Back in 1998/99 when this property was annexed, there were Regency Square Development guidelines. This is a 186-page document that I have read every single page of. It is very particular, showing the type of lighting that should be used in the area, what kind of parking, landscaping species of plants that can be planted. This document applies just as much today as it did when it was adopted. Surrounding this piece of property, you have a senior community of 5,500 homes with 9,500 people in Sun City and all these assisted living developments going along Regency Parkway. We have these people that are driving these motorized wheelchairs in the road to meet their basic needs. They have to cross Route 47 in their electric powered wheelchairs. That is unconscionable. This is a development right here. A commercial development that does not have big retailers; It has small retailers. It has a good restaurant. It maybe has a shoemaker, a flower shop, some other things. What could be in here, that has not been talked about. We have all these older citizens, they cannot go great distances but they can get in

their wheelchairs and golf carts and visit the commercial areas. We need this commercial area. Now there is another thing that has not been discussed but it ought to be addressed by the village not only here but in other places. People want to come and visit their older adults and their seniors. They want to celebrate their birthdays and things. I have also read the 302 pages of your zoning code and it is unconscionable to me that you would not allow me to speak at the last presentation at length before you approved that motion. That structure is permanently attached to the building, which encroaches on the setback that is part of the zoning code. That should not be allowed, but it is already done. Now let's talk about the great green space. Lynd talks about 77% being green space, that leaves 23%. This buildable area, when you take the 39 acres and you multiply to 23%, the entire housing is being built on and less than nine acres - 8.94 to be exact. When you divide that by the number of units, you get 48 units per acre. You have Sun City sitting alongside at less than four units an acre. Does that make any sense? When you look at something, it is what's the highest and best use for the people in the village, not the highest and best use for the developer. Have the developers walked this land? It has unbelievable difficult topography; almost 1/3 of that land appears to be in wetlands. The wetlands go from the pond by the Fire department all the way through to Charles Sass Parkway. The commercial and the BP zoning in the original document basically separates the two parcels and there is no land bridge between them. They talk about all this open space. This development must be developed as a planned unit development otherwise known as a PUD that requires 50% open space. It says the open space cannot use wetland and it cannot cover any pavement, it cannot cover the houses and it cannot cover any hard surfaces. Also when you develop a building, before it's developed, the ground is open and it can rain and there is percolation. When you put hard surfaces on there, there is no percolation. So there is runoff and that runoff goes into detention ponds. There is not a single detention pond shown on this development. If they are likely to possibly develop this under a multifamily development, they are in violation of your zoning laws. The zoning laws say the maximum height of the building can be three stories. They are talking about five stories. You are going to set precedent by approving this for everyone else. These are some very serious problems. If you build in the floodplain, you must get the approval of several bodies and you have to actually have the approval before you even file the application. Approvals include the Soil and Water Conservation District, Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Natural Resources and the Army Corps of Engineers. It is unconscionable what these people are trying to do and to say they are 77% open space, when in reality according to your definition for open space, read pages 134 to 137 of your zoning ordinance section 156. It says open space is not in to be included; wetlands are not to be considered open space. It is blatantly a distortion of the facts. Do not make any decisions here. You listen to the concept and you give us an opportunity to talk. When the rubber hits the road is when we go before the Plan Commission and Zoning Board. I can go on and on about things that are not right with this development. This development should be left as was originally planned in 1998 and still holds good today. Thank you.

My name is Charlie French and I live at 12619 Mulberry Court in Sun City. We are not against adding multifamily units in Huntley. We are not against that. Ours is a simple request. The Mayor has assured us nothing will be done in Huntley that is not consistent with surrounding properties. However, the Mayor says this multifamily proposal is consistent because there is another area of Del Webb that borders with single-family homes. We asked you to honestly reconsider if this project feels consistent with current surroundings, the existing base case has nice single family owned homes backing up to Del Webb. The proposed project will have multi-family units and apartments and these rally units would be next to the Del Webb senior community and next to Deer Path a community for adults with physical disabilities and next to Heritage Woods, which serves adults 55 and older who need some help to maintain their independence and next to Alden Estates, which offers orthopedic, cardiac and short term rehab. This proposal is not consistent with the existing properties. To say this is consistent is to ask us to not believe our eyes are the

facts. Do not bastardize the definition of consistent. Review the facts and acknowledge this project is not consistent with surrounding properties. Live up to your promises and keep the respect of Huntley residents. Thank you.

My name is Jim Uszler and I live at 12481 Cold Springs Drive in Del Webb. I just wanted to stress that where this development is being considered by these homes in our Neighborhood 7, there is currently a berm and if this were to go through, it would be suggested on our behalf to make sure that more trees be put in there to make a barrier, something to prevent people from walking through into our neighborhood. That would be the number one concern for people in this community in terms of their respect. The other thing is, as Charlie French said, it's not consistent. You look at the properties that are there – Heritage, Deer Path, and Alden are all brick structures. These other structures that they are considering doesn't have any brick. So with that, also the park that they are considering, if this project were to go through, I would hope that in part of this zoning that you would make that Park land permanent, so that could never be changed by this company. Thank you.

My name is Tom Gillespie and I live at 12266 Tuliptree Lane. I am going to make this short. That was a beautiful video you showed. The only thing I know about Lynd, is that this is going to be in my backyard and I went to one of your buildings in Woodstock. I was not that impressed. I noticed something someone had said last meeting. It was a Class C in Woodstock and this is a Class A. What if you don't get the type of people you want renting in here? What if you only get 20% and gives us all high rent? What do you do? Does it turn into a class C? I would just hope the Board does their homework and really looks into Lynd. The only other thing I know about you is the Better Business Bureau gave Lynd a D minus. It would be up to the Board to really look into what Lynd is all about. Thank you.

Good evening, my name is Ray Spoke and I live at 12316 Hickory Court. Most of my concerns were addressed. The big thing is the traffic that it is going to cause on Cold Spring Drive which we already have. I drew up a little plan on what we can do about it. That is all I have to say. I will submit it to you so you can see it is cheap. Draw a white line and put up a sign so we can turn left off Cold Springs Drive. Otherwise you have to wait in line.

Good evening. My name is Anjali Peterson. I live at 12575 Elmwood Court in Del Webb. I am a recent resident. This is a home that I have purchased as my second home. In full disclosure, I work for the Oak Park Police Department. In addition to that, I serve on the LaGrange, Illinois Zoning Board of Appeals. My primary residence is in LaGrange. I bought here because you are the friendly village with country charm. I wanted a second home. I come out here a couple days a week. In addition, I have already begun to contribute to this community. I have now enrolled in your Citizen's Police Academy and I am going through that course. I have nothing against Mr. Lynd, his development and any of the wonderful pictures he showed. My background is in commercial development. I recently assisted a client purchase a building across from Willis Tower that he has converted into two beautiful Hilton Hotels. I am 100% for commercial development. I do want to point out some things. I closed on my home August 3rd and I come out here a couple of days a week. I was out here last Friday night, and I turned on Regency Parkway and I saw a woman in a wheelchair with her dog in a motorized wheelchair. I was here last night for the Citizen's Police Academy training course, stopped at the gas station on the corner of Route 47 and Regency Parkway, turned around to go to my house to spend the night here, and as I'm pulling out at the gas station to go to my house, I see two people in dark clothing in motorized wheelchairs heading eastbound as I'm heading westbound on Regency Parkway. I have to be honest, I came very close to hitting them. My concern is not that we do not allow multi-family development. As I said, my background is in commercial development, I have done hundreds

of feasibility and market studies, primarily for hotel developers. Yes, there are a ton of reviews out there. My hotel clients get the same thing; they deal with negative reviews all the time. My concern is where this development is being considered. The BP district zoning there, you know, in addition to four intents, the fifth intent, which states to locate business park uses on lands suitable for those purposes, but at locations that would not be harmful or disadvantages to nearby or adjacent property. Number six, to encourage the grouping of compatible business park activities, thereby promoting convenience, efficiency and safety in transportation. Now, as I said, I am new to this community. However, when I engaged my realtor from LaGrange to assist me in buying out here I closed in three weeks cash. My house has appreciated almost \$75,000 since August 3. Now it will depreciate. If I see a development like this in my backyard, and it is not conforming as we all know, when you have a development you want to have conformity and consistency. By this development coming in this location, it is not conforming to the neighborhood. There is a reason that the Huntley Village Board back in early 2000's, or whenever the zoning code was put together, came up with this business park. It was to service the residents of Del Webb, those one story medical office buildings, dental building, physical therapy, etc. are there for the residents. If you change that, you have permanently changed the structure of the neighborhood. I have nothing against Mr. Lynd or his development. I would encourage them to stay in this area and to come into this area. There are a number of other sites that could work for them, including right across on the east side of Route 47. I have had a chance to look at your zoning map and I see several sites over there that would be absolutely perfect. I see the Hampton Inn that is going in over there. I will say that at this point, what they are asking to do is to change the conformity of the neighborhood. I am asking the Village Board, as someone who does still sits on the Zoning Board of Appeals in the Village of LaGrange, to consider that you are changing the conformity of the neighborhood and you will forever if you allow this development to come in there. There is not even a chance that down the road that we can have, let us say a doctor's office in another medical office. I also did request and received for a report from Fox Lake for the development in Fox Lake, I would like to put that into the public record (the information was handed to staff). I am also waiting for two other FOIA requests. I would like to conclude and just say, I know you have a very difficult job ahead of you. Being in public service myself, I know what it takes in order for you to consider these options. I just ask you that if Mr. Lynd, and I would like to address him personally, if you truly want to be in this town, Mr. Lynd, you will find a way. This is a great town to be in. I bought here, and this is a great place to be. I encourage you to be here, if this is what you are showing us as your product. Where you are requesting to locate is not the right place. I think my house will be affected very little. However, I am concerned for all the other residents and my friends that I am starting to make in the area. It would affect all of us with the market value of our homes. So yes, Del Webb makes up basically a third of Huntley, and I want you to take that into consideration. I do want to thank you very much for going through this whole process. I know it is very time consuming, but again, if they want to be here, they will find a will and a way to be here. So thank you very much. I appreciate your time and we look forward to working with you in the future.

Kevin Irving, I live at 12419 Black Oak Trail Huntley. I am not going to take long because most of my questions were already talked about. First of all, I want to thank the Board. I love your questions. You ask good questions, especially the last meeting Ronda, because those questions actually spell it out. I want to thank you. You have a big task ahead of you. The other big question that I have is these emergency exits that are going to be closed off. I am concerned with that because if you have a roadway there how are you going to stop people from using them. You need to look at those emergency exits because if there's a roadway there people are going to find a way of getting in there and getting out. Lastly, I told my wife Kathy that when we get older, all we have to do is come out the back way because we have everything down Princeton Drive; Walmart, Jewel etc. and we don't have to leave the confines of this area. There is going to be a point where I am not going to want to leave the confines of this little area and to have this little

honeycomb around here is awesome for the people in Del Webb and we do not want to mess it up. This will mess it up. That is all I have to say I thank you.

Mayor Hoeft thanked all the public commenters for their comments and asked the petitioner to respond to the questions that had been asked by the public.

Mr. Bazos continued on behalf of Lynd to respond to the public commenters. Mr. Bazos said that Lynd would not argue if this is the right or wrong place for the development, but to answer the questions posed by the comments. He confirmed that the site for the development is west of Walgreens on Sass Parkway and that the only access on Princeton is for emergency use which has been added since the original plan presented in February. He added that the way to keep drivers from using the emergency access on Princeton would be to have it gated, which is the intention of Lynd. Mr. Bazos answered the questions as to whom would maintain the open space next to the development by saying since the property will be owned by Lynd, they would manage the open space next to Neighborhood 7. Mr. Bazos then requested Mr. Lynd to address the question about what would happen if this project turned into a Class C development. Mr. Lynd said first and foremost Lynd does not subscribe to or utilize the Better Business Bureau (BBB) for settling disputes with their residents and because of that, the BBB will automatically issue a D or F rating. He said that when residents do file a complaint with the BBB, Lynd will contact the resident personally to resolve any issue. He added that the only way this Class A project being proposed for Huntley could become a Class C project is if the project fails completely. He stated that Lynd is not a huge corporation, they are a family run business that is investing \$125 million in this project and based on the market research Huntley is ready for a project like this with residents that can afford to pay the rent and enjoy living in Huntley. Mr. Lynd also addressed the veteran's project that was mentioned. He said that building is owned by a veteran's nonprofit organization and Lynd is the fee manager. The building houses veterans that would not otherwise have a place to live and Lynd is happy to assist in whatever way they can.

Mr. Bazos addressed the Board requesting clear direction as to how to proceed because Lynd will need to spend a lot of money to prepare the formal application. He said he hoped the Village Board would be excited to have the project.

Mayor Hoeft thanked Lynd for their feedback and addressed the gentleman in the room that had earlier requested to be heard in public comments but had not signed in. Mayor Hoeft said the Village Board had received his email and it will be entered into the official record of the meeting.

*Email to Village Board received from Mr. Ari Karenshtok; 13452 Wildwood Lane; Huntley.
Will the Village of Huntley consider implementing a rental inspection program? I have attached a survey that was prepared a few years back by the Village of Carpentersville. I also spoke to Mr. Craig Martin today, April 28, 2022 he has been managing this program for the Village of Carpentersville for over a decade. According to Mr. Martin the program pays for itself, it helps control and enforce compliance with interior and exterior codes, village ordinances and requirements. It has been extremely beneficial for the owners, renters, the village and all of its residents. If needed Mr. Martin is willing to share information and answer any questions in person. Licensing survey attached.*

Mayor Hoeft said the only comment he would make at this point is that the Village Board has been involved in this discussion for a year. He added that this is a conceptual review and anyone that wants to do a rezoning has to go through this process. The Village Board has been responsive, received every email from

residents regarding this project and listened to all the comments. Mayor Hoeft said there will be no vote at this evening's meeting. The petitioner will hear the comments and decide whether they will move forward with the project. Mayor Hoeft thanked everyone for their comments made thus far and asked Trustee Kittel to begin the Village Board discussion.

Trustee Kittel thanked Lynd for their beautiful video and presentation and the residents for their input. He said that he tries to keep emotion out of his thought process but does take into consideration all the comments and suggestions that have been brought to the Board's attention. Trustee Kittel said he does believe there is a need for a development like this in Huntley and appreciates the investment Lynd is willing to make. He acknowledged the changes Lynd made to the project including the reviews with the Better Business Bureau and moving the entrances to Charles H. Sass Parkway. Trustee Kittel questioned if the sidewalks could be continued along Princeton and the southern portion of the development and suggested that a stop sign be installed at the three-way intersection by Starbucks. He added that he would like to see the fence along Sass Parkway continue to the retention pond with additional landscaping. He also questioned the elevations of the 5-story buildings saying they look different than originally presented. Mr. Brorson said that the different elevations were included to show the flexibility of the project and that different elevations were an option. Trustee Kittel said he was in favor of the emergency access being gated but would like to see either an eyebrow or cul de sac of some sort to create an easier turn around. Trustee Kittel concluded by saying it is a beautiful product and thanked Lynd for their cooperation.

Mayor Hoeft asked Trustee Leopold to continue. Trustee Leopold questioned if the Better Business Bureau review was for a Texas development or one more local. Mr. Lynd replied that he did not know which review the commenter was referencing but said it was a general review posted with the Bureau. Trustee Leopold continued saying he did not care for the elevations of the townhouses and said they need shutters. He questioned the access onto Sass Parkway being a full access for the residents. Mr. Tiritilli stated that was a change from the previous plan. Trustee Leopold then questioned the installation of a water detention area. Mr. Tiritilli said that water detention is included in several areas of the development. Trustee Leopold asked if Lynd had flipped any properties that they built or remodeled. Mr. Lynd responded that yes, because they buy and sell real estate they could resell the property in two to five years, it just depends on each project.

Mayor Hoeft asked Trustee Holzkopf to continue.

Trustee Holzkopf started by addressing the walking path and questioning if perhaps a time limit could be placed on when users can be on the path. She said this could cut down on noise and bothering neighbors throughout the day or evening. Mr. Lynd said Lynd would be willing to look into something like that. Trustee Holzkopf addressed a resident concern about the height of the buildings saying the Village does currently have buildings that are taller than 3 stories and the height of the building is not a concern of hers. She did question the Village Manager if the Village would consider creating a landlord tenant ordinance. Village Manager Johnson said if it was the direction of the Village Board, staff could draft an ordinance for Village Board review. Trustee Holzkopf said she was very concerned with the negative reviews with the Better Business Bureau. She disagreed with a previous statement from Lynd stating the negative tenants tell more people but the happy tenants don't tell anyone. Trustee Holzkopf asked about the property manager and what exactly are the duties and expectations of the manager. She asked if the property manager lived onsite, what the typical response time would be and do they tend to the outside of the buildings as well as the inside. Mr. Lynd explained the technology used for tenants to register their concerns. The tenants would file their concern electronically which creates a tickler file for the manager. The manager would then respond within 24 hours. Mr. Lynd stressed the importance of keeping the

tenants happy by responding quickly to their concerns to keep the turnover rate low. He continued saying that the property manager does not always live on site but they do have a maintenance person always on call.

Trustee Holzkopf questioned the length of a lease and how much security deposit is required. Mr. Lynd said most leases are for a year, but sometimes they will allow a six month lease and that one month's rent is required for a deposit. Trustee Holzkopf asked if Lynd had ever built a Class A project like the one being proposed that did not succeed because of not having enough renters. Mr. Lynd said that Lynd has never lost a project. She discussed the affordability housing unit component of the project and told Lynd that she appreciated the fact that they are willing to incorporate it into this project. She asked for clarification as to whether they mean Lynd will reserve 5% of the housing for residents that make 80% of median income or are you going to reduce the rent to be affordable for residents that make 80% of the median income. Mr. Lynd said that typically you make a project affordable within those income guidelines, and make it available for people of those income. If for some reason, there's not enough people showing up that can actually afford to pay that rent, then we would look at reducing that rent, so it could meet their needs to fit that. He said that Lynd would be willing to work with the Village to make either way work for the project.

Trustee Holzkopf asked about the entrances and exits for the project and how the gate will work to allow tenants into the complex. Mr. Lynd said that it is smart technology, very secure and that tenants would enter using either a key fob or an app on their phone. She asked Lynd why they chose the location near Sun City. Mr. Tiritilli said that he hadn't been to Huntley for a long time and when he came back to see the property he drove around with the property owners and left determined to build there because it is one of the best suburban multifamily sites that he had been to in a long time. It has everything to do with what is happening with the market by providing developers the chance to develop the type of quality product we want and to have that product in an area with great amenities already there like Walgreens and Starbucks without having to cross Route 47. Mr. Tiritilli said that if the Village Board does not wish to support the location for this project, they would most likely move on; they would not build east of Route 47. The importance of having a development be walkable to stores is significant and this location fits that criteria.

Trustee Holzkopf concluded saying that when looking at land use, there is criteria to look at before making a decision. She stated that Lynd would have to meet those criteria in order for her to vote yes in support of this project. She added that they do a beautiful product and thanked Lynd for their time and financial investment in looking at Huntley.

Trustee Westberg pointed out that because of the current zoning on this property, there could be a Menards or Home Depot. He referenced a traffic study adding that the traffic impact from a big box commercial building like the Menards would be significantly higher than that of what is being proposed. The traffic for the Lynd development would be considered low impact. He concluded saying there is definitely a need for a project like this for our residents and for people employed in Huntley that would like to move here.

Trustee Goldman said she would like to address the location and the management of the project. She mentioned that at the February meeting Lynd said there would be an onsite manager and did not like that now Lynd is saying there may not. Trustee Goldman said the location is bad. She said she does not believe Lynd will be able to find 400 people to rent their units. She said there will be added people in the area during the weekend visiting the renters causing more traffic and activity and said the development just

should not be that close to the commercial businesses. Trustee Goldman said she is concerned with the impact for the school system, especially since the renters won't pay taxes. She said she would prefer to see Lynd look at the northern portion of the Village, perhaps near Talamore. Trustee Goldman said she is advocating for the safety of all drivers in the Sun City area and the entire Village and would not like to see the development in that area.

Mayor Hoeft asked if there were any more questions or comments. Trustee Kittel asked what the closest property in the area would be that is similar to a Class A property. Mr. Tiritilli said Lynd is currently constructing a site in Willow Springs that is due to be completed later this year.

Mayor Hoeft said he had a couple of questions and in particular asked about flipping the property. He said he knows there is a possibility of Lynd building the project, flipping it and being out of Huntley in three years and Huntley is left with whatever remains. Mayor Hoeft said he understands that Lynd is in real estate and it does happen, but he asked the question direct and asked for a direct answer if Lynd has ever sold a Class A development like what is being proposed for Huntley or if they plan to keep it and manage it.

Mr. Lynd responded by saying that Lynd always aspires to keep and manage their properties. He said their investor group puts the equity in the development with Lynd and that drives the decision of keeping the property or not. The intent at this time for this project is to keep it for three to five years, which is fairly standard for most of the projects by Lynd. When Lynd sells the property and a new buyer takes over, Lynd tries to stay on and manage the property for as long as possible. Mayor Hoeft thanked him for his honesty. He asked Mr. Lynd if he had any data of the percentage of children that would affect the school system. Mr. Lynd said it varies throughout the country and he did not have the numbers right now, but would be happy to provide them.

Mayor Hoeft stated that he would like to address one public comment made about him saying the development is similar to everything around that property. Mayor Hoeft said he meant the buildings are the same style, not that it is the same type of business. Mayor Hoeft concluded by thanking Lynd for their time and interest in the Village of Huntley. He told the Lynd representatives to please listen to the resident and Village Board comments provided this evening to help make their decision to move forward or not.

No action was taken on this agenda item as it was conceptual review only.

Mayor Hoeft continued with the remaining agenda items.

VILLAGE ATTORNEY'S REPORT: None

VILLAGE MANAGER'S REPORT: None

VILLAGE PRESIDENT'S REPORT: Mayor Hoeft announced several upcoming events including the Arbor Day Tree Planting event at the Municipal Complex green space Friday May 29th at 4:30, the Kite Fest at Warrington Park Soccer Fields Sunday May 1st from 11am – 3pm and Ladies Night Out downtown is on May 5th including a mariachi band that will be playing in the gazebo from 5:30 – 7:30. He also announced that curbside branch pick up starts Monday May 2nd for all roads north of Kreutzer/Charles H Sass Parkway and Monday May 9th for all roads in Sun City.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

NEW BUSINESS: None

EXECUTIVE SESSION: None

POSSIBLE ACTION ON ANY CLOSED SESSION ITEM: None

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further items to discuss, a **MOTION** was made to adjourn the meeting at **10:12 p.m.**

MOTION: Trustee Westberg

SECOND: Trustee Holzkopf

AYES: Trustees: Goldman, Holzkopf, Kittel, Leopold, and Westberg

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Trustee Kanakaris

The motion carried: 5-0-1

Respectfully submitted,

Rita McMahon
Village Clerk