

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
MINUTES – April 9, 2019**

**Mayor Prejna called the Council meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.**

**Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag**

**ROLL CALL:**

Present: Cannon, Budmats, Majikes, Gallo, Banger, D’Astice, Williams

Absent: 0

**Mayor Prejna** - With 7 present and 0 absent there is a quorum.

Members of the audience are reminded that these proceedings are being videotaped for current and future broadcast over the City’s cable television channel.

**Staff Members Present:** City Manager Barry Krumstok, Finance Director Melissa Gallagher, Assistant to the City Manager Lori Ciezak, Deputy City Clerk Judy Brose, Fire Chief Terry Valentino, Police Chief John Nowacki, Director Public Works Fred Vogt, Assistant Director Public Works Rob Horne, Business Advocate Martha Corner, City Attorney Jim Macholl

**MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES:**

**Mayor Prejna:** The first order of business is to approve the minutes from the March 19, 2019 Committee-of-the-Whole Meeting. Is there a motion to approve the minutes? Alderman Banger made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Majikes. Are there any corrections, additions, or deletions to the minutes? All those in favor say aye; those opposed say nay. The ayes have it and the minutes are approved.

**MOTION TO DEVIATE:**

None

**MAYOR'S REPORT:**

**Mayor Prejna** – There only couple things that happened this week. For those of you who attended the chili cook-off at Rep’s, Chief Nowacki I am told that you received the gold-medal and I am told that the Fire Department will try harder next year.

I am moving forward with a Restaurant Association with our new restaurants coming in, they will be ran independently just by the restaurant so more of these activities can happen in the City.

**WARD REPORTS:**

**Mayor Prejna** – Are there Ward reports?

**Alderman Majikes** – I just had the pleasure of attending a gathering at Rep’s Place honoring one of our residents that I’m sure most of you know the name Mr. Brian Anderson. He has given a lot of himself and served our country. He’s one heckuva guy and he’s someone that I’m proud to call my friend. He’s being honored right now by USA Cares. I just wanted to give a shout out to Brian and all he's done for the

## **City Council Meeting**

**April 9, 2019**

**Page 2**

City, our country, friends and family. I think that we should all look at him and how he lives his life and try to be like him, he's amazing. I just wanted to thank Brian for everything he's done.

Also, I did receive quite a few emails today as I'm sure other Alderman did, there was one from resident that said that she's not big into public speaking and would not be here and she asked that it be noted that she believes that we should approve the Taylor Morrison plans. I have other emails and I appreciate everybody's feedback whether you're for or against it. I also had someone else who went around and talked to multiple residents and said that about 80% of residents are in favor and 20% are not in favor. Thank you.

### **MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR 20 MINUTES:**

**Mayor Prejna** – The meeting is now open to the public. In order to secure the rights of the citizens of the City to a fair and just representation before their elected officials, and to guarantee to the elected officials an order and dignified form in which to conduct the City's business, no person shall be allowed to engage in any activity that will disturb or disrupt the orderly proceedings of the City Council.

Per Rules of Procedures the public is to address the City Council, and the fact that no member of the City Council responds does not mean that the City Council or any member thereof agrees or disagrees with the comment.

In order to attain this objective the following rules of conduct are hereby established:

1. Any person who seeks to address the City Council at this time for public comments, shall be permitted to speak only upon recognition of the Presiding Officer and such person shall adhere to the following provisions:
  - a. Each person addressing the City Council shall state their name and address for the record.
  - b. Each person shall be granted no more than 5 minutes of the allotted 20 minutes in order to address the City Council.
  - c. Questions and/or commentary shall be limited to City business. Comments supporting or opposing a nominated person's candidacy for elective office of the City shall be out of order.
  - d. Commentary shall be directed to the Presiding Officer unless the Presiding Officer permits the individual to address the Council Members or other City officers present.
  - e. Discussion shall take place in a professional manner which displays mutual respect.
  - f. Profanity shall not be used in any form or manner.
  - g. You will be warned the first time, the second time you will be asked to sit down or leave the proceedings.

## **City Council Meeting**

**April 9, 2019**

**Page 3**

**Mayor Prejna** - The first signatory is Charlotte Rybarczyk.

**Charlotte Rybarczyk – 3000 Owl Drive, Rolling Meadows** – I keep hearing that the residents are against the proposed development of Taylor Morrison Townhomes and that the Aldermen are not listening. I am here this evening to represent those of us who are in favor of the development. Due to a very loud opposition, I feel that we are the ones who are unheard. We have looked at that empty lot for too many years. Though we would love nothing more than to fill it with businesses, we realize this is just wishful thinking. At a time when big box stores are closing left and right, not just in our community but nationwide, it is unrealistic to think we will draw a big box store to our small community. We do not have the population to support a large store nor do we have easy access to and from the expressway. Furthermore, we do not own the land and cannot pick who chooses to develop it. In addition, I have heard that the plan does not have enough green space. Whether it does or doesn't is the decision of the purchasers of these units, not the residents of Rolling Meadows. If someone wants green space, they can buy one of our lovely Rolling Meadows homes or visit one of the many beautiful parks this community has to offer. I have also heard that this development is too dense but it is no denser than the Lexington development and the homeowners there seem to like it. Who are we to decide how close together people want to live? Cities like Arlington Heights and Palatine have built high rise condos, row homes and the like and people do choose to live in those homes. Furthermore, I am aware that there are other ideas out there of what could be done with this property however they are just ideas. There is no actual plan with financial backing to make this happen and I am not in favor of our City purchasing the space to make it happen. Our City has enough projects to take care of without becoming a landlord to this lot. Is this project ideal? Not for everyone, but I would also say that there is no project that will please everyone. Let's move forward, welcome our new neighbors and get those store fronts filled. Thank you!

**Mayor Prejna** – The next signatory is Laura Schillmoeller.

**Laura Schillmoeller, 208 Lexington Lane, Rolling Meadows** – I'm asking the Council to vote to approve the Taylor Morrison plan to build the townhomes at the former Dominick's site. If you look around other northwest suburbs that are redeveloping in a positive direction it's because they allowed new population dense housing into their city centers. This continues around us, Arlington Heights, Mount Prospect and Des Plaines. These other towns are welcoming these developments and as a result their city centers are thriving. In order for a city center to thrive you need population density. I do not understand why this community seems scared by this concept. Just recently, Mount Prospect approved the building of apartments the corner of Route 83 and Central. That land has been vacant for years and was a pain point in their community. They are continuing to add more housing in a downtown that already has quite a few residential dense developments. Notice now they have wonderful restaurants, a successful farmers market, street events and shops, it's because lots of people living in close proximity to support these ventures. This current property in our community has sat vacant for far too long, it's an eyesore and a blight. If this piece of land were attractive for retailers or other types of business it would have been developed in that fashion long ago. Real estate developers aren't going to sit on a piece of vacant land if it were viable to build, they don't make money that way. Let's stop dreaming that retail or entertainment mecca is coming in there the way things currently are. I've heard many in the community say build it and they will come, that is a slogan from a movie and it's based in sentimentality. Real estate development doesn't work that way, developers aren't going to risk spending millions if they don't have the data to back up their plans. I know that Mr. Gallo has intentions of stopping this once he is seated as Mayor, I respectfully disagree with his views on this issue. He has cited an academic paper written by a Harper College economics professor to justify his reasoning of why there should not be residences built there. This paper was written in 2002, 16 years ago and prerecession. Additionally, the data in this paper is all from the state of Michigan, and has nothing to do with our area and the conclusions from it cannot be applied to where we live. I have also heard people comment that additional residences will be a drain on our city services and infrastructure, for every study that says that I can do a Google search to find the opposing data. I have also heard the

## **City Council Meeting**

**April 9, 2019**

**Page 4**

complaint that this is the last piece of land for retail and Rolling Meadows, we have several empty storefronts and retail strip malls along Kirchoff. Additionally, if there was a boom in business in central Rolling Meadows there is room in the Jewel strip mall for out lot development. I'm sure the owners of that property would welcome the chance to build more if there was a surge of business in the area. The bottom line is that we need more people in our city center to attract retail, business and restaurants. Additionally, the housing being proposed set at a higher price point than the existing homes in the Kirchoff corridor. The demographics of these residences will make business and retail development even more attractive for business owners. Many in the community seem to be waiting for Shangri-La to arrive, it is time to face reality and a compromise. Please let the owners of this land build what they have the legal right to do as the current zoning allows. Thank you for my time.

**Mayor Prejna** – The next signatory is Fritz Duda.

**Fritz Duda, 564 Maple St., Winnetka** – Thank you Mayor and Council. I'm with Clark Street Development, as you know we are the owners of the property and we have been for seven years now. When we acquired the property many of you will recall that it was zoned R3 and there was a previously approved PUD for 300 units of residential on the property. Clark Street is a commercial and retail developer and we thought we could defy gravity, we thought we could rehabilitate a shopping center and that failed because of Caputo's bankruptcy. What I want to emphasize to you is that after that for a period of two years we marketed the property for at least commercial, entertainment and retail uses. We used in-house brokers, we used outhouse brokers and we met quarterly with Staff and Mayor Tom Rooney at the time and kept them updated. It was only after that period that we said that there's no commercial demand for the property and we put it up for sale. The property was actually marketed for sale twice with 18 months in between, once was South Bay and the second was Taylor Morrison. Each time there were three categories of buyers, there were no commercial offers. There were senior living offers, there were garden apartment offers and there townhomes offers. You know what happened to the South Bay and the senior living project. It's been requested to me by counsel and we respected to not bring garden apartments. Now we're down to the last bucket. I'm here tonight just to answer any questions. I wanted to mention to you Mayor that I had the privilege last week of speaking at Notre Dame Law School at their property class and we talked about zoning of all things and this was one of the several examples I used. I invited the Notre Dame Law school class to join us tonight and they're watching online.

**Mayor Prejna** – The next signatory is Steve Holish.

**Steve Holish, 4811 Deepwood Lane, Rolling Meadows** – I can't speak eloquently like any of the past two speakers on why Taylor Morrison should go ahead with their plan. I agree with it. We've seen this go on for so long and gone through so many hoops that this is the best advantage and we should let them go ahead. You should approve the second reading tonight and let's get on with filling that property. It's going to make the area look better and improve Rolling Meadows. The thing I really wanted to speak about is on the consent ordinances tonight you have a new regulation for nonunion employees. Hopefully all of you will look at this with a very strong view because it says that the staff brought this up on March 26, 2019. I don't recall much discussion on it but they said they want to avoid first reading tonight and go right to second reading so they could implement this May 1. I don't think that's a good idea, this is sounding very strange, why somebody wants to avoid the process just to get it in by a certain date. I looked at certain things in this and I discussed this with my Alderman and there is certain conditions on it that don't make any sense. The accrual time I don't have a problem with as far as vacations, it's the sick time that really gets the point. In the union discussion it says 180 hours, that's way too much. Most companies and other places say that your accrual rate should be a combination of sick time and vacation time and it should be combined the same way and should not be carried over more than 40 hours from year-to-year. You can accrue 80 hours for your vacation time but you only get carry over 40. Hopefully you'll look at

## **City Council Meeting**

**April 9, 2019**

**Page 5**

this in a really strong view, postpone it, maybe rewrite it and then vote on it so it's in a timely fashion and maybe put it in June 1 instead of May 1. Thank you.

**Mayor Prejna** – The next signatory is Dale Engelking.

**Dale Engelking, 3206 Plum Grove Drive, Rolling Meadows** - I'm here tonight to mainly to thank the Aldermen that did not make it, I want to thank you for your time and the residents appreciate the time that you do devote for us. With that being said, I think that we should wait with the second vote because the residents did speak and I think we should leave it up to the new Aldermen to make the decision because some won, some lost. I think it should be fair to let the new Council make the final decision because they are the ones that won. Mr. Mayor I think you should allow more than the 20 minutes because we do have quite a few people that want to speak and I think everybody should be heard. Thank you very much.

**Mayor Prejna** – The next signatory is Marc Mehlhop.

**Marc Hehlhop, 3003 Hawk Lane, Rolling Meadows** - I'd like to congratulate all the new members of the Council. The reason I'm here is because I vote no for Taylor Morrison. I brought to the City Manager's attention that when it was up for sale by Clark Street you could even get through the phone number. If you're trying to sell something and you can't get through how can you sell it? I do construction and I heard about it through the union that in 2021 the housing market is going to crash and it's going to go down. I vote no for the project.

**Mayor Prejna** – The next signatory is Bob Losh.

**Bob Losh, 2903 Starling Ln., Rolling Meadows** - I'm here to state my support for Taylor Morrison project as it's currently proposed. I think the previous speakers have done a great job of highlighting the pros and cons. My family is for it and I urge the Council to approve it. Thank you.

**Mayor Prejna** – The next signatory is Patricia Callahan.

**Patricia Callahan, 3400 Wellington, Rolling Meadows** - This is the plan for the Dominick's lot, 106 townhomes. This 12 foot gap here is the average gap between the row homes. That's 12 feet so I just want you guys to see that. Where is the green space for children to play, toss a ball, a mom to play with her toddler and a dad to practice sports with their child? The average age of a Rolling Meadows resident is 38 years old. Families will be the core purchase group of these townhomes. Please tell me where the green space is to allow families to play with their children and to enjoy an outdoor lifestyle? A 20 foot gap is from the residential property lines for privacy for long-standing residents. You're going to have two-story townhomes up against their property lines, 20 feet from their property line they're going to have two-story townhome behind them. If you look at the plans you have 28 units to the west and there's just a handful of visitor parking spaces. Taylor Morrison's plan is for nothing but pure profit. It's a disaster for our City. Residential does not bring commerce, it's the other way around. Did commerce come after building Kimball Square? Or Kimball Meadows? Riverwalk Condos, that's where I live, there's 154 units. Did any commerce come after Lexington Crossing? No. Once we fill that Dominick's space where we have a chance commerce or mixed-use. Once we put all residential there or with that small gap in the front for some commerce. That's it we have no place to grow commerce. Commerce creates a stronger tax base than residential. Placing all residential on our last piece of property in the downtown that Kimball Hill built will be destroyed. Rolling condos from Oriole to Owl along Kirchoff, I don't think you guys want that the people that are leaving this Council as your legacy. We had a bowling alley and that's gone, we've had stores and they're gone and now we have rolling condos. All those have been built in the commerce hasn't come. If we build townhouses the commerce isn't going to come because there's no room. Thank you.

## City Council Meeting

April 9, 2019

Page 6

**Mayor Prejna** – The next signatory is Carol Allain.

**Carol Allain, 2302 Oak St., Rolling Meadows** - As I requested in my email this morning to all Council Members, please vote no two issues tonight. No to the lighted sign install and no to the design of the new homes to be placed on the Dominick's lot. In that email I requested that the City Council take a step back and scale back unnecessary future big spending at this time until it is sure that the fire station budgets are not any worse than currently forecasted. Trust me when I know that contracts have been written and measures attempted to be put in place to avoid cost overruns but nothing is ever set in stone with construction. Anything can change so let's be wise about large expenses that really add no return on investment to our City. As for the Dominick's lot, I have been a longtime supporter against so many homes on the Dominick's land and even more so now that I attempted to visual comparison. You are provided in your email and I do have additional marked up copies of what I was attempting to show by comparing the land and building space between the East Park Apartments and the new Meadows Square site. I provided two Google map photos in the same scale of the two land bases. I eyeballed how the land spaces would overlap to better give the gauge of what fits using what I now attempt to be as close as possible. If you overlay what Taylor Morrison has proposed you will see that maybe 16 of the East Park buildings will fit into the Dominick's lot, there are about 22 of them. There are 22 Taylor Morrison buildings, I don't know the square footage of the East Park Apartment buildings but it's only based on the gauge of a visual that I have. There will be no green space. They're going to be so congested with no green space in there. There's concerns about losing a sidewalk type bike path. Are there city legal guarantees that these will not end up as rentals in 10 to 20 years down the road? Do we realize how much competition this site will have against the new Schaumburg/Motorola site? And the downtown Arlington Heights site that they just approved? There are too many questions and unknowns that need to be carefully reevaluated and should be a sideline topic for the next meeting or two down the road. Possibly with the new Council. It needs to truly ensure that this will not be a detriment to the future city leaders and dwellers. We residents have waited a decade plus for this lot to become something great for the City. A few more months won't matter. I know that it was explained to me that the City may have to pay millions in legal fees to cancel this. I'm not meaning any malice to the person who gave me that information and I'm not educated enough on that sort of thing but I'm not naïve enough not to do or have that further researched research to confirm that this is indeed fact based on some formal report by a legal entity. I'm not asking to stop the design phase, sadly that ship has sailed unless a miracle happens tomorrow. I'm only asking that this be sidelined and sent back to the developer to be a much smaller area than it is now. Thank you for your time.

**Mayor Prejna** – The next signatory is Annette Szafran.

**Annette Szafran, 2309 Central Rd., Rolling Meadows** – First of all April 2<sup>nd</sup> was a very interesting day, I'm sure all of you were keyed to your computers and whatnot trying to follow all the details of the election results. For those of you that did accomplish your goal, congratulations we look forward for you to serve our City. For those of you who will be leaving us, we send you a sincere thanks for a great job you have done while you were on our Council. You gave your time, your energy, you gave your knowledge and we appreciate that as residents. We hope in your future that you find other fulfilling things to do with your time and help our City. I also would hope that tonight's Council makes a motion to table the discussion on the second reading of the Taylor Morrison homes. I think we're all kind of resigned one way or another that it's not going to be a big box business area any longer but surely there must be a way that we can look at plans a little more closely and that should be left to the new Council. They will bring new ideas, maybe not change what we're going to accomplish there but maybe give it a bit little bit more planning. As people are saying it is going to be a dense area with a lot of housing. As the previous speakers mentioned, Mount Prospect, Schaumburg, Arlington Heights and Palatine. Yes, they are building a lot because people use those locations to get on the train to go to their jobs. We don't have a train station in Rolling Meadows. People will depend on their cars to get back-and-forth to work. We don't have a great entertainment area

## City Council Meeting

April 9, 2019

Page 7

like all those other mentioned suburban areas. So what is the draw here? We have very little. We will have new homes. We're going to have more children entering our schools, who's going to take that burden on? Residents will have to have their property taxes increased to fund the education of children. 106 homes could mean like 50 more kids, doesn't sound like a large number but it is a big impact on our school system. Secondly, those children from Schaumburg and Arlington and Palatine do come to our schools so that's another impact. More housing everywhere is going to not help us, it will hurt us. So please, present Council members, table the discussion and give ourselves a chance. Residents have spoken for and against. Let us take the time to look at the plan, maybe tweak it a bit. Maybe we don't need 106 homes there, maybe 80 would do fine. We'd have green space, we'd have a lovely little community. Please Council pass it on, pass the torch to the new people. You've done your job. You don't need this to make a legacy. We don't know who you promised things to but let it end tonight. Move on and let the new Council have it say. Thank you.

Mayor Prejna closed the floor.

**Mayor Prejna** - The Council moves on to its first order of business, Consent Ordinance, 2nd Reading.

### ➤ **PENDING:**

#### **A) Ordinance No. 19-25 – Adopt the City's 2019 Comprehensive Land Use Plan Update (2<sup>nd</sup> Reading)**

This Ordinance would adopt the proposed update to the City's Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

The 2019 Comprehensive Plan Update has been prepared by the City's planning consultants, Teska Associates, during a nine (9) month period of time (June, 2018-March, 2019). Public engagement efforts included online web page access, focus groups, workshops, and public hearings. The Plan is intended to be a guide and tool for evaluating future land use, development, and redevelopment proposals considered by the City.

**The document is available for viewing online at [www.plan4rollingmeadows.org](http://www.plan4rollingmeadows.org)**

Is there a motion to adopt this Resolution? Alderman Budmats has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman D'Astice. Is there discussion?

**Alderman Budmats** – At the last reading of this I asked if we could consider bids to get this translated into Spanish. Since then I furnished those to Mr. Krumstok and he's indicated that it could be done after a bidding process for less than \$10,000. So I would like to amend this motion say that we would, in addition to approving this, that we would instruct the City Manager to get bids so that it can be presented in English as well as Spanish so that we can reach even more of the members of our community and they can get this document once every 10 years in their preferred language.

**Barry Krumstok, City Manager** - A new Section 4 would be created stating that the City Manager would be allowed to translate this to Spanish within about \$10,000 giving me that lead way. It would be a new Section 4 and then Section 5 would be where it talks about an ordinance shall be printed covering everything. I just wanted to make that clarification on your motion.

**Mayor Prejna** – Mr. Budmats, are you comfortable with that?

**Alderman Budmats** – I'm great with it.

**City Council Meeting**

**April 9, 2019**

**Page 8**

**Mayor Prejna** - Alderman Budmats has made the motion amend the Ordinance to allow for the document to be translated to Spanish and it has been seconded by Alderman Gallo. Any discussion on the amendment?

**Alderman Banger** – Question, this story unfolded as let’s spend a lot of money translating it and then Google Docs can translate it at a push of a button. Have we looked into Google translate?

**Barry Krumstok, City Manager** - Because of the amount of wordage, verbiage and additional graphics, no it’s just not Google translate that’s why does take professionals to do this. I do appreciate Alderman Budmats and the resident who gave additional information. It’s just not a Google translate document.

**Mayor Prejna** – Further discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll on Mr. Budmats amendment of this Ordinance.

AYES: Gallo, Banger, D’Astice, Williams, Cannon, Budmats, Majikes  
NAYS: 0  
ABSENT: 0

**Mayor Prejna** - With 7 in favor and 0 opposed Amendment is approved.

We now go back to the original Ordinance, is there any discussion? Do I have a motion on the original Ordinance to be passed as amended by Mr. Budmats? Alderman Budmats has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Cannon.

**Alderman Cannon** - I’m confused, didn’t we already voted on it.

**Mayor Prejna** - Mr. Budmats amended this so now we’re voting as amended. We’re voting on the whole thing. Any discussion?

**Alderman Cannon** - I had a discussion with Staff and our lawyer today, there’s a couple of issues that I brought up and they would like to investigate more thoroughly. So with that, I would ask that we postpone this until the next meeting to finally approve it? Just to make sure we get those things worked out. I’m asking to postpone it to our next meeting please.

**Mayor Prejna** – Alderman Cannon made a motion to postpone this Ordinance to our next meeting and it was seconded by Alderman Majikes. Is there discussion on the postponement? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the roll.

AYES: Banger, D’Astice, Williams, Cannon, Budmats, Majikes, Gallo  
NAYS: 0  
ABSENT: 0

**Mayor Prejna** - With 7 in favor and 0 opposed item is postponed to the next meeting.

**B) Ordinance No. 19-26 - Approve Amendment to the Continental Towers Planned Development for Electric Vehicle Charging Stations – 1701 Golf Road (2<sup>nd</sup> Reading)**

This Ordinance, if adopted, would allow an amendment to the existing Continental Towers Planned Development to allow three (3) Electric Vehicle Charging Stations in the parking lot.

Is there a motion to adopt this Ordinance? Alderman Cannon has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Williams. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: D’Astice, Williams, Cannon, Budmats, Majikes, Gallo, Banger  
NAYS: 0  
ABSENT: 0

Mayor Prejna - With 7 in favor and 0 opposed this Ordinance is approved.

**C) Ordinance No. 19-27 - Approve Final Planned Development for 2819-2915 Kirchoff Road – Meadow Square (2<sup>nd</sup> Reading)**

This Ordinance, if adopted, would approve the proposed Meadow Square Planned Development for the 9.5 acres of property currently known as 2819-2915 Kirchoff Road, to allow the construction of 106 townhomes and rowhomes per the Plat of Subdivision submitted by Taylor Morrison, (approved on 3/26/2019 per Resolution #19-R-50).

Before I asked for a motion we have a few changes to the Ordinance. I’m going to ask our legal counsel to explain the changes.

Jim Macholl, City Attorney - starting at about 5 o’clock yesterday afternoon I was contacted by the developers attorney he was looking to add some clarifications to the Ordinance. Today, I had further conversations with the developers’ attorney, the City Manager and also Fred Vogt the Director of Public Works. The changes are clarifications, they’re not substantive. They were distributed to Council tonight. I would like to read in for the record those portions that have been added to the Ordinance that was distributed as part of the packet. There are three changes.

Page 1: (5<sup>th</sup> Whereas clause at bottom)

**WHEREAS, the proposed Planned Development *meets the criteria for approval in Section 122 – 266 of the Code of Ordinances, City of Rolling Meadows, Illinois, and* will not impair...**

Page 2:

**SECTION ONE: The Meadow Square Planned Development, as depicted on the layout plan, prepared by V3 Companies and dated February 22, 2019, with the design criteria as specifically depicted on said documentation is hereby given final approval.**

## City Council Meeting

April 9, 2019

Page 10

*SECTION TWO: The final approval of the planned development herein granted is subject to the following conditions, **which shall serve as the guarantees to the City:***

The developers are asking that the Council approve the Ordinance as proposed and as they have amended and as I have read into the record.

**Mayor Prejna** - As we're going forward with this Ordinance, it's the copy that you had in your packet in addition to what Mr. Macholl read.

Is there a motion to adopt this Ordinance? Alderman Banger has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Williams. Is there discussion as amended?

**Alderman Budmats** - The piece of paper that we received at 6:00 PM originally said 122 – 226 of the Code of Ordinance which would give a height of 45 feet according to the M1 Manufacturing District. I'm assuming that the property is not in the M1 Manufacturing District although I do think that the property based on the scale drawing that I have provided by Taylor Morrison may end up being close to 45 feet. So it's really disappointing to get documents like this one hour or less before the City Council meeting. It seems to be a string of things of this nature on this project. In talking with people on the Planning and Zoning Commission, they said that the plans that they had they felt were, in the commentary they said that they were incomplete and they were uncomfortable in voting for it based on the fact that the plan that they had to review were not complete. I did look at this document for elevation and the scale drawing shows 46 foot in width for the first two left hand sections. If you take that same 46 feet that's exactly how high it is from the street level to the top of the roof. This property has been rezoned R4 per the previous request which offers us no more than 39 foot height. So I'm really confused as to this is moving so fast and it really feels like we might as well write it in pencil and just erase. I would really like to have us get an ordinance that's written the right way and a drawing that really shows what the final height of the property is really really going to be. I don't want to come back later and offer a variance or be asked for variance. When we discussed this property with Taylor Morrison they told us that they were coming with a full baked cake and that there wasn't going to be any discussion and it was take it or leave it. Quite honestly that's the way I feel about it. If we're going to approve this, it's a fully baked cake. If you come back to me later and say that you really need 45 feet because it doesn't fit I'm going to tell you cut the roof off it doesn't matter to me make it flat. Your drawings show that's how tall it is. I would really like to have a done deal on a drawing which shows heights and elevations and not just partials before I could approve it. I'd like to make a motion to table this until we get an ordinance that's not written with red ink that has the wrong numbers on it and drawings that are incomplete. If that can happen by the next meeting I'm all in favor of voting for this and giving it full consideration at the next meeting. In addition, I asked at the last meeting to talk about the width of the bike path and that it be retained. It didn't go before the Environmental Committee, it went before the Traffic Committee as in the packet. The Traffic Committee didn't make a decision about it, they wanted further information from the Police Department and others. We still don't have the information that I asked at the last meeting. I think that if they wanted their property to look further away from the street by cutting down the sidewalk, they can make it look further away from the street by moving it further away from the street. I would really appreciate it if we can get a final drawing put this off until the next meeting. If they want to move quick so do I. So let's get it done. So let's get a final drawing and a written ordinance that's not with pencil and scratch outs, the whole 9 yards. Making a motion to have this tabled until the next meeting.

**Mayor Prejna** - Alderman Budmats has made a motion to table this until the next meeting and it has been seconded by Alderman Gallo. Is there discussion?

**Jim Macholl, City Attorney** - There is no discussion on a motion to table.

**City Council Meeting**

**April 9, 2019**

**Page 11**

**Mayor Prejna** - Will the Clerk please call the roll.

AYES: Budmats, Gallo

NAYS: Williams, Cannon, Majikes, Banger, D'Astice

ABSENT: 0

**Mayor Prejna** - With 2 in favor and 5 opposed the Motion to table has failed.

Is there discussion on the Ordinance?

**Alderman Gallo** - I do want to say that there was a great deal of opinions for this project but I do have to say on record in emails for every one individual that emailed me for this project moving forward, six others voiced their opposition. So it is a 6-1 in writing. The other thing is that some of my comments were taken not necessarily out of context because they are definitely in context in terms of a thesis by a doctoral candidate in 2002. Though the information is from 2002 the equations and formulas that were used to determine whether or not the proportion of residential versus commercial space and its inverse relationship to the amount of detriment it causes for increased expenses on a community are still relevant today. So I do want to make it known that the information though it's a 2002 publication, the equation is absolutely relevant. Though it's in Michigan, the entire thesis was written to discuss what happens in one state based on the research of all 48 states in the contiguous nation. So though it seems it might be small and myopic and scale it's very large. The bottom line is that if we move forward with this we do jeopardize any sort of opportunity to revitalize our downtown location and this will cost us future dollars.

**Mayor Prejna** – Further discussion?

**Alderman Cannon** - I just like to point out the paper we're talking about was written in 2002 but the data behind it was gathered from 1981 to 1995. We all might recall that 1995 the Dominick's store that we had there was considered a state-of-the-art store. Some of you might remember that they actually had video carts in there that were unique to the country. We had people all over the country flying in to see a state-of-the-art future store and you see that they eventually failed. I would just say that when you have data from 1995, does anybody question whether the retail environment has changed at all since 1995? Amazon didn't even exist or they were just a smidgen of what they are right now. I live on the west side of town, there's a strip center on the corner of Quentin and Euclid, right now 2/3 of the old Dominick's store is empty, it's been empty for years now. Besides that there's 12 storefronts that have been empty. At one time that was an ideal setting, they had a flower shop, a jewelry store, a photoshop and they had all kinds of wonderful stores that we would all like. I think every person sitting up here but I won't speak for any of them but myself would love to have commercial there but the reality is we had one of the best commercial real estate guys in the country owning the property and he could get no one that was interested in it. I think we have to be realistic that commercial is not going to come back there. It doesn't make a difference whether you like it or not that's just a reality of the marketplace. I just wanted to remind everybody to think about the data that we're talking about from 1995 and if it's relevant today. Thank you.

**Alderman D'Astice** – I make a motion to call the question.

**City Council Meeting**

**April 9, 2019**

**Page 12**

**Mayor Prejna** – Alderman D’Astice has made a motion to call the question and it has been seconded by Alderman Williams. Will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Cannon, Majikes, Banger, D’Astice, Williams

NAYS: Budmats, Gallo

ABSENT: 0

**Mayor Prejna** - With 5 in favor and 2 opposed, the question is to call the motion for a vote.

Will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Majikes, Banger, D’Astice, Williams, Cannon

NAYS: Budmats, Gallo

ABSENT: 0

**Mayor Prejna** - With 5 in favor and 2 opposed this Ordinance is approved.

➤ **CONSENT ORDINANCES (1<sup>st</sup> Reading):**

**Mayor Prejna** - The next item on the agenda is the Consent Ordinances in for 1<sup>st</sup> Reading. It consists of two (2) items D thru E. Does any Alderman wish to remove an item from the Consent Agenda for Ordinances? Seeing none, is there such a motion? Alderman Banger has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Williams. The question is shall the two (2) Ordinances be moved forward for 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading?

**D) Ordinance No. 19-00 – Amend the City’s Personnel Rules and Regulations – Non-Union Employees (1<sup>st</sup> Reading)**

This Ordinance, if adopted, would amend certain sections of the Personnel Rules and Regulations relating to the earning of sick leave and vacation accrual for “Tier II” non-union and non-sworn employees hired after November 2, 2010 and not covered by a collective bargaining contract.

**E) Ordinance No. 19 – 00 – Amend City Pay Plan (1<sup>st</sup> Reading)**

This Ordinance, if adopted, would approve the classification change for the Assistant to the City Manager position to a C-4 salary range for FY2019.

The question is shall the two (2) Ordinances be moved forward for 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading? Will the Clerk please call the roll.

AYES: Majikes, Banger, D’Astice, Williams, Cannon, Budmats

NAYS: Gallo

ABSENT: 0

**Mayor Prejna** - With 6 in favor and 1 opposed these Ordinances will be moved forward for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading.

➤ **NEW BUSINESS:**

**F) MOTION TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF BILLS ON WARRANT 4/9/2019**

The next item of business is a motion to approve the Warrant from April 9, 2019 as presented by the Finance Department. Is there a motion to approve the warrant? Alderman Banger made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Williams. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the Roll.

AYES: Gallo, Banger, D'Astice, Williams, Cannon, Budmats, Majikes  
NAYS: 0  
ABSENT: 0

**Mayor Prejna** - With 7 in favor and 0 opposed the Warrant is approved.

➤ **CONSENT RESOLUTIONS:**

**Mayor Prejna** - The next items on the agenda are the Consent Resolutions. It consists of four (4) items, Items G thru J. Does any Alderman wish to remove any items from the Consent Agenda for Resolutions?

Seeing none, the Chair declares it in order for one motion to consider all Resolutions in one motion without debate. Is there such a motion? Alderman Cannon has made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Banger. The question is, shall the four (4) Resolutions be adopted?

**G) Resolution No. 19-R-53 – Approve Update to the City’s Investment Policy**

This Resolution, if adopted, would formalize the framework for the City of Rolling Meadows’ investment activities. The City’s Investment Policy has not been updated for some time. This update is to include language to be in compliance with municipal securities rules as well as applicable state and federal statutes that were recently approved.

**H) Resolution No. 19-R-54 – Authorize the Execution of a Property Use Agreement with Rolling Meadows Community Church**

This Resolution, if adopted, would approve an Agreement between the City and the Rolling Meadows Community Church which provides for the City’s use of a portion of the Church property for the 2019 City Market events, one time per month, May through September.

**I) Resolution No. 19-R-55 – Amend the FY2019 Budget – Accept the 2019 General Obligation Bonds – Series 2019 Debt Service Schedule**

This Resolution, if adopted, would amend the FY 2019 Budget to accept the 2019 General Obligation Bonds - Series 2019 Debt Service Schedule and to add the debt service payments to the a newly created 2019 Debt Service Fund.

**J) Resolution No. 19-R-56 – Authorize for the Replacement of the Public Works Safety Trench Shoring Trailer**

This Resolution, if adopted, authorize a contract with Ehrhardt’s RV Trailer Sales, Des Plaines, IL, for the replacement of a safety trench shoring (cargo) trailer (RM105) for the Public Works Department.

Again, the question is shall the four (4) Resolutions be adopted? Will the Clerk please call the roll.

AYES: Banger, D’Astice, Williams, Cannon, Budmats, Majikes, Gallo

NAYS: 0

ABSENT: 0

**Mayor Prejna** - With 7 in favor and 0 opposed all the Resolutions are adopted.

**OTHER BUSINESS & REPORTS:**

**Mayor's Appointments:** None

**Mayor’s Proclamations:** None

**City Clerk’s Report:** None

**City Staff Reports:**

**Barry Krumstok, City Manager went over the following:**

**1) Community Items of Interest:**

- 1) Thank you to those individuals who participated in the Rolling Meadows Chamber of Commerce “Chili Challenge with a Twist” which was conducted on Sunday, March 31<sup>st</sup> at Rep’s Place (3200 Kirchoff Road). Congratulations to Chief Nowacki for winning the best overall chili; the Fire Department chili won for the hottest chili; and Rep’s Place won for the most traditional chili.
- 2) St. Colette School (3900 Pheasant Drive) will be conducting an Antique & Vintage Spring Market on Saturday, April 13<sup>th</sup> from 8:00 am to 3:00 pm. (To attend it will cost \$2.00 for adults & kids are free).
- 3) Anna’s Red Apple, locate at 2121 South Plum Grove Road will finally be open for dinners starting Monday, April 22<sup>nd</sup>.
- 4) The 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Business & Community Showcase will be conducted on Thursday, April 25<sup>th</sup>. This year we will be at the Meridian Banquets (1701 West Algonquin Road). [4:00 pm to 5:00 pm B2B; 5:00 pm to 8:00 pm free and open to public].

- 5) Earth Day activities are set for April 27<sup>th</sup> from 9:00 am to 12:00 pm. Individuals who want to participate should meet at Old Public Works (3200 Central Road). For additional information, please contact Public Works at 847-963-0500.
- 6) Just as a friendly reminder, yard waste collection and street sweeping has started throughout the City. For more information, please contact Public Works at 847-963-0500 or visit [www.cityrm.org/PublicWorks](http://www.cityrm.org/PublicWorks)
- 7) Have you seen the April electronic “News & Views” or “e-News & Views?” If not, visit, [www.cityrm.org](http://www.cityrm.org) and click on News & Views tab. This is the sister publication to the printed newsletter. Reminder that residents will continue to receive printed versions of “News & Views” in March, May, July, September and November. Future “e-News & Views” will be loaded onto the City website June, August, October and December.

**Martha Corner, Business Advocate went over the following:**

## **2) Business Showcase Update**

City Staff is continuing to coordinate the second annual City of Rolling Meadows Business & Community Showcase, to be held on Thursday, April 25 at Meridian Banquets & Conference Center (1701 Algonquin Road). The event, open to the public, free of charge, will run from 5 p.m. to 8 p.m. For the Rolling Meadows business community, there will be a closed business-to-business networking hour for all business and community groups participating, as well as Rolling Meadows business representatives that can visit without prior registration, which will run from 4 p.m. to 5 p.m.

The Showcase is set-up so local businesses can network and show their services and products to residents and other leaders. This is a great way to shop and learn about Rolling Meadows businesses in a relaxed environment.

If you have a licensed business in the City of Rolling Meadows or know of a business and want to attend please contact Martha Corner, Business Advocate. To date, 33 businesses or community groups are currently registered to host displays. Please note that we have as many tables as we need to make this event a success to accommodate every business that’s interested.

To further enhance this showcase experience we have the benefit of the Northwest Concert Band (various style selections including Dixieland), 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. in the Meridian lobby area.

Businesses are welcome to provide various items to the guests including samples, pens, coupons, calendars, etc. The City will also have special giveaway items.

Finally, as always we would like to thank the Community Events Foundation for their volunteer support and time to support the businesses and other activities during the Showcase event.

We very much look forward to seeing everyone there.

**Fred Vogt, Public Works Director went over the following:**

### **3) Traffic Review Committee Monthly Report**

The staff Traffic Review Committee monthly meeting was held on Wednesday, April 3, 2019. The following topics were discussed and are summarized for informational purposes for the Mayor and City Council:

1. *Kirchoff Road corridor traffic signal improvements* – Two controllers were replaced March 26; LED signal head upgrades are taking place this week and should be completed soon.
2. *Hicks Road/Euclid Avenue bike path grant application request* – This proposal was approved by City Council on March 26. City Engineer is preparing a contract proposal for providing Phase I engineering services.
3. *Guardrail request at Arbor Drive 90 degree curve* – The City Engineer is preparing a proposal for studying this roadway layout and developing solutions and cost estimates. For future agenda of this Committee.
4. *Killarney Couty/Wilke Road guard rail and proposed tree removals* – The Committee was provided an update on the public information meeting held on March 20, and input from a site inspection by the Police Chief and Public Works Director.

Accident history at this location showed only one (1) occurrence over the past several years.

While the IDOT highway design guidelines call for the removal of trees within three feet of the back of a guardrail, the fact that traffic volumes on this section of Wilke Road are very low, and that the speed limit is 25 miles per hour should be considered. The guard rail itself is no longer warranted there given the ground topography (changed when the houses were built).

Residents desire the guard rail to remain in place; they feel that it provides security and privacy to their rear yards. Some of the residents in attendance at the public information meeting want all existing trees to remain, while some of the residents prefer that the trees be removed (within three feet of the guardrail) where adjacent to their properties.

A compromise could be proposed where the guard rail can remain in place for the near future, until such time as the roadway is scheduled for pavement resurfacing (estimates 5 to 10 years out). Installation of standard curb and gutter should be considered upon resurfacing, so as to then remove the guard rail. Remaining trees (those that are not removed at this time) may be removed at a later date, if curbs and gutters are not installed with pavement resurfacing. Future consideration should also be made to relocate the permitted side of the street for parking to the west side of the street to eliminate parking adjacent to the guard rail. A follow up public information meeting will be scheduled.

5. *Meadow Drive east parkway immediately south of Kirchoff Road: Proposal to allow for the removal of a 10 foot side concrete sidewalk/bike path and replace it with a 5 foot wide sidewalk, Taylor Morrison, Developer* – This item of business has been brought to the Traffic Review Committee as the result of discussion by the City Council at its March 26, 2019 meeting when considering the proposed Planned Development Ordinance. Instead of following a proposal (one

## City Council Meeting

April 9, 2019

Page 17

that was not approved) to refer this matter to the Environmental Committee, staff believes the matter to be more appropriately considered by the Traffic Review Committee.

Meadow Drive is a three-lane pavement in this location with two northbound lanes (through lane and left turn lane) and one southbound lane. The speed limit on Meadow Drive is 25 miles per hour in this location.

Points to consider, per Committee discussion, are as follows:

- What is the pattern of use (i.e. pedestrians and bicycles)? Police Department to provide this information.
- Is there available accident data involving pedestrians and bicycles there? Police Department to provide this information.
- Can a bike lane be established on Meadow Drive with existing lane geometrics? City Engineer to provide this information.
- Is there a need for the bike path to remain due to proximity of schools? A sidewalk will still exist there.
- If grant funds aren't being used, an 8 foot wide bike path could be placed at this location.
- There is no "logical terminii" for the existing bike path (to the south); therefore no compelling reason exists to keep it in place.
- At the current south terminus of the 10 foot side sidewalk/bike path, there is no transition to/from a bike path lane for cyclists utilizing Meadow Drive.
- If the existing 10 foot wide sidewalk/bike path were to be removed adjacent to the proposed townhome development, northbound cyclists will be able to access the bike path that will remain at the Taco Bell restaurant to get off the street pavement in advance of the Kirchoff Road intersection.
- Discussion took place, and there are no known prohibitions of bicycles on standard 5 foot wide sidewalks. (As an example, portions of New Wilke Road are signed to direct bicyclists to use the sidewalk.)
- Signage could be a consideration for posting of permitted sidewalk use by bicyclists in this location.

No action was taken by the Committee on this matter at this time. Staff pointed out that any further considerations are not time sensitive for City Council action on the proposed Planned Development Ordinance, as this matter is totally within the existing City right-of-way and can be coordinated with final engineering plan approval for Meadow Square at a later date.

6. *Algonquin Road resident report of concern regarding a motorized wheelchair observed crossing the roadway* – A specific location was not provided as to if the occurrence was at one or more specific intersections, and with or without crosswalks/traffic signals. Additional information will be sought by staff.

The next meeting of the Traffic Review Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, May 1, 2019 at 2:30 p.m. at City Hall.

**Melissa Gallagher, Finance Director went over the following:**

**4) Budget & CIP Planning Calendar**

In tonight's City Council Packet we are releasing the City's Budget Planning Calendar for the 2020 Proposed Budget. We are also releasing the 2020-2024 Capital Improvement Plan Calendar as well. The reason we're doing this is that we're beginning to work on the 2020 Proposed Budget, believe it or not. We are also working on the Capital Plan an earnest.

Our Ad Hoc Capital Improvement Committee has been meeting since February and will continue to meet until the budget process.

I wanted to highlight a few key items in the actual calendar which is in the packet itself. In June our City Auditors will present the City's 2018 Audit along with the Citizens' Financial Report. We will also have the Police and Fire Pension Fund actuarial discussion.

Another key date is September 10, 2019. We will release the 2020 Proposed Budget with the City Council Meeting Agenda Packet.

We will have hearings on the Budget and Tax Levy. We will also have a series of Committee-of-the-Whole meetings as usual and have our usual one on one Council meetings.

We wanted to release this to the City Council and to the Public

**Barry Krumstok, City Manager went over the following:**

**5) Committee-of-the-Whole 4/16/19**

The April 16, 2019 Committee-of-the-Whole Meeting has been cancelled.

**MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:**

**Alderman Cannon** – I have a couple of things. In upcoming COW meetings between now and June I would like to see that we have an open discussion about the two lots that the City owns, the one on Algonquin in the lot across the street along with the two fire stations that we will be getting rid of in the not-too-distant future. It takes long time to get those properties moved.

Secondly, I like to say to the residents in general, there's a sign that's been approved by the City Council that would be installed on Quentin Road between Silent Brook and Arlingdale, a lot of people now are objecting to that. For people who would like to find out more about the sign and either express a positive or a negative response to it there will be a Town Hall meeting here on Thursday, April 11, 2019 at 7PM in this room. Come to express your opinion. In conjunction with that I'm going to ask the City Manager to add an agenda item to our next COW meeting so we can have a discussion both pro or con about the sign.

Lastly, I will not be here at the next meeting. Thank you.

**City Council Meeting**

**April 9, 2019**

**Page 19**

**CLOSED SESSION/ADJOURNMENT:**

**Mayor Prejna** - Do I have a motion to adjourn? Alderman Banger made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Cannon. All in favor say aye; opposed.

**There being no further business, by unanimous consent the City Council meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted by: Judy Brose, Deputy City Clerk