

City of Rolling Meadows
Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes
7:00PM
Wednesday, August 3, 2022

Call to Order

Chairman Duvall called the August 3, 2022 meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to order at 7:01PM.

Roll Call

Presiding: Chairman Duvall

Present: Buckingham, Burchert, Gercken, S. Morrison, Sheehan, Sipple

Absent: Chubirka, L. Morrison

Also Present: Elizabeth Kwandras, Interim Superintendent Community Development; Martha Corner, Business Advocate; Cindy Browder, Secretary

Chairman Duvall declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Duvall asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the July 5, 2022 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Mr. Buckingham moved to approve the minutes as written and Mr. Gercken seconded. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote. Minutes approved as written

Pending Business: NONE

New Business – New Public Hearings:

1. Public Hearing for a special use pursuant to Section 122-331 of Chapter 122 “Zoning” of the City of Rolling Meadows Code of Ordinances, to authorize a special use for a Pet Day Care and relief necessary to accommodate the use, 2639 Kirchoff Road, Mark Leers, Meadows Dog House, petitioner.

Chairman Duvall asked if the file was in order and proper notice was given. Staff indicated that it was.

Chairman Duvall asked for a motion to open the public hearing and enter the Staff report included in the packet into record. A motion was made by Mr. Gercken and seconded by Mr. Sipple. Motion to open public hearing approved by unanimous voice vote.

Mark Leers, 421 Brookmont Lane, Barrington was sworn in by Chairman Duvall.

Mr. Leers stated that he previously owned a dog daycare in Arlington Heights since 2010. He vacated that facility in 2021 and with thorough research decided he would like to relocate his business to Rolling Meadows. The business would include dog daycare, grooming, retail and dog training. Hours of operation would be 6:30AM-6:30PM Monday-Friday and 8:00AM-3:00PM on Saturday. He has worked with the landlord and City of Rolling Meadows on feasibility of this type of business at this location.

Questions and Comments from the Board

Chairman Duvall opened the meeting to Commissioner's questions and comments.

Mr. Sipple questioned Mr. Leers about leaving Arlington Heights due to safety concerns and challenges and how it would be different in Rolling Meadows. Mr. Leers responded that parking, and a blind spot when leaving the building, were issues in Arlington Heights which caused both vehicular accidents and a dog was hit. This wouldn't be the case in Rolling Meadows.

Mr. Gercken asked if Mr. Leers was willing to work with the conditions stated. Mr. Leers assured that he is committed to being a good neighbor and follow processes similar to other dog daycare centers to keep waste, smells, and noises away from the surrounding businesses and residents. Mr. Gercken asked what the procedure is if a dog is in their care and the owner isn't able to pick up by closing time. Mr. Leers responded that they will stay up to 30 minutes past time, after that the dog will go home with a company employee. Mr. Gercken asked if there would be any security measures for employees such as swiping in/out or locked doors. Mr. Leers responded that there will be security cameras pointing toward the parking lot but no other security measures.

Ms. Sheehan had questions regarding parking issues at the Arlington Heights location and how Mr. Leers plans to control ingress and egress at this location. Ms. Sheehan inquired about the traffic study and who will provide it. Ms. Kwandras clarified that it is more a parking agreement than a traffic study which is used more often with shopping centers as they are given more leeway as part of the Zoning code. It would be performed by the petitioner Mr. Leers and the shopping center to determine required calculated parking that each tenant needs and what overlap hours are. As long as there is not an excessive amount of overparking, a parking agreement can be reached and signed by the City Manager as per the Zoning code.

Ms. Sheehan asked about the space that will be designated to retail and grooming as it is not shown on the floor plan as well as how the debris from grooming would be dealt with. Mr. Leers stated that retail will be a small area consisting of a moveable kiosk in the front lobby. Grooming would be limited to bath, nails, ears, and teeth and no haircuts so the debris would be minimal. They will have a HEPA scrubber that will pick up anything that is in the air so that it doesn't get into the HVAC system and spread throughout the building. They will take steps necessary to keep debris out of air and sewer system.

Ms. Sheehan asked regarding the inside potty zones that will be installed with artificial grass and plumbed into existing drain tiles and how that works. Mr. Leers explained there are drains in floor with drain tile on top of that and artificial grass on top of that. The artificial grass and pad are sanitized and cleaned nightly so there is no smell.

Ms. Sheehan asked if pest control would be set up for around garbage containment. Mr. Leers said there would not be pest control set up. Exterior trash control is in a locked area that is animal resistant. Interior trash will not contain food items that would attract pests.

Ms. Sheehan questioned the total number of dogs that would be on site per day. Mr. Leers stated that the business model is 40 dogs at once divided between 3 groups based on dog size. Each dog handler would handle a maximum of 15-20 dogs at one time.

Ms. Sheehan questioned whether applying acoustics to the walls would subdue the noise from 40-50 dogs. Mr. Leers explained that prior to signing the lease they did a sudo sound study using music at top sound levels. LuLu's, the neighbor to the East, couldn't hear anything. Zee Vapor, the neighbor to the West could hear noise from the front of the building which isn't as well insulated due to the windows. Mr. Leers plans to build out the wall by 4" and add additional soundproofing and acoustic panels on the ceiling.

Mr. Buckingham asked regarding 40 dog limit and if this is at one time or for the entire day. Mr. Leers explained that 25% of the dogs were half day customers (6 hours) with the balance being full day customers (10-12 hours). Three Staff members would be on the schedule at one time. The goal would be a maximum of 15-20 dogs per handler at any time with the total number of dogs not to exceed 40 total.

Mr. Buckingham asked what type of training they do. Mr. Leers stated that all employees are trained by senior dog handlers and go through a six-week training module. Mr. Buckingham then clarified that his question was in regard to training the dogs. Mr. Leers stated they do one on one dog training with dogs and owners to correct certain behaviors. Mr. Buckingham asked where the training would take place. Mr. Leers stated that training would take place in one of the two rooms they have separate from other dogs.

Mr. Sipple asked if Mr. Leers has any concerns about meeting the conditions set forth in the construction plan and if the building would be suitable with a few upgrades. Mr. Leers has no concerns and confirmed that he is comfortable with the changes and upgrades needed.

Mr. Gercken asked for a comment regarding an exhibit sent in by a concerned party regarding Mr. Leers business in Arlington Heights being left a mess and the fact that she was uneasy that this Rolling Meadows property would suffer the same fate. Mr. Leers questioned the validity of the complaint as it was submitted by the owner of Tailchasers Pet Care that is now occupying that same facility and would also be considered a competitor of his business. Mr. Leers went on to say that they have 11 years of Department of Agriculture inspections and Village inspections and have never had any complaints.

Chairman Duvall asked about the HEPA filter described and how it works to control odor. Mr. Leers explained that the exhaust air is gathered through the store and goes through a charcoal filter on the way out. This is changed 7-8 times per day.

Ms. Kwandras - Staff Report

As indicated on the map, the unit is roughly in the middle of the shopping center located in front of Meadow Square so noise and odor control, as well as control of dogs themselves are things Staff is concerned about and that the petitioner has been working with the building official on. HVAC, fire alarm and sprinklers will be required. The space will need modifications because of the change of use from dance studio to pet daycare if this petition is approved.

Regarding parking, retail spaces require 4 per 1,000 square feet and pet daycare normally require 3.3 per 1,000 square feet. To be sure estimates would be sufficient, Staff did calculations at 4 per 1,000 square feet. Staff expects that the majority of traffic and parking impact for this business will be at the beginning and end of the day whereas the parking demand for others businesses in this shopping center will be in the middle of the day. There are multiple interior building modifications that the petitioner is proposing as part of the conditions of recommendation that he will be held to. Regarding exterior modifications, there are some that we would seek in most circumstances such as enclosures for the dumpster and a secondary ingress egress that we would have them connect to, but since no exterior modifications are being proposed with this special use we are not recommending that those be pursued at this time. They will remain on the horizon for us. The Commission was provided with the petitioner's response to how they think they meet the five standards of the Zoning code for special use as well as the proposed findings of fact included in the staff report. Ms. Kwandras asked for any questions.

Mr. Gercken asked Mr. Leers regarding signs for the business. Mr. Leers responded that signage would be in the existing box used for previous occupant.

Questions for Staff:

Mr. Buckingham asked if Staff is comfortable with ventilation and drainage. Building official Dan Streit has been in contact with Mr. Leers and the petitioner will be required to provide all things described in his petition including any HVAC modifications or upgrades that are above and beyond code requirements.

Chairman Duvall added, since there isn't a submittal for ventilation is there specific wording to address odor control. Ms. Kwandras stated that Mr. Streit would get a copy of approval conditions to be aware of as plan reviews commence.

Chairman Duvall reiterated that his concern is due to the fact that it is a relatively unique use of the space and its proximity to homes. Ms. Kwandras mentioned Biscuits & Bows, another dog daycare business operating in Rolling Meadows since 2003. There have been no complaints or issues from other tenants or residents nearby.

Ms. Sheehan asked if there is a safety plan in place in the event evacuation was necessary especially considering there is no fenced in area outside. Ms. Kwandras will speak to the Fire Department on this matter.

Ms. Sheehan asked about one of the two bathrooms being converted into a grooming area and what Staffs' position is on that. Ms. Kwandras wasn't aware of this but confirmed that it is covered by the Zoning and Plumbing codes. She encouraged Mr. Leers to reach out to Building Official Dan Streit to determine the required number of bathrooms for this use before moving forward with any major changes.

Chairman Duvall asked the gallery for questions or comments. No response.

Motion to close public hearing:

Chairman Duvall asked for a motion to close the public hearing, motion received by Mr. Buckingham, seconded by Mr. Gercken. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Chairman Duvall asked for a motion to be read to approve, deny, or modify the petition. Motion received by Ms. S. Morrison.

Based on the submitted petition and testimony presented, I make a motion that the Rolling Meadows Planning and Zoning Commission adopt the findings for a special use for the 2,400 square foot space located at 2639 Kirchoff Road, as listed in the Staff report prepared for the August 3, 2022 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, and recommend to City Council approval of a special use to allow a pet day care, and other relief necessary for Meadows Dog House, subject to the following conditions: 1. Except for times when pets are being dropped off or picked up, animals and all business functions shall remain inside the building at all times. 2. This approval shall be null and void if permits for the interior modifications described in the Staff report prepared for the August 3, 2022 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting are not applied for within two (2) months of City Council approval, and work completed within one year. 3. This approval is for zoning only. No part of this approval shall be interpreted to waive requirements of the building code, or the need for building permits or a business license. 4. The interior will be modified as the petitioner has indicated in the submittal, including, but not limited to, HVAC modifications, plumbing in the floor to handle liquid waste, and noise controlling paneling. 5. The petitioner shall execute a parking agreement for the shopping center prior to occupancy, which shall require the petitioner to complete a parking study to identify the estimated high-traffic times for this business, and incorporate proposed dog training schedules. 6. The unit dumpster shall be serviced not less than one time per seven-day week, unless notified by the City that more frequent servicing is required pursuant to the receipt of odor related complaints. 7. The property shall be maintained in accordance with the adopted property maintenance codes of the City Code of Ordinances. Failure to maintain the interior of the property can result in revocation of the special use approval. 8. This special use approval shall become null and void on the transfer or sale of the business license and/or the property, or when the use is not active for six (6) consecutive months.

Seconded by Mr. Gercken.

Chairman Duvall requested roll call:

Buckingham – Yes

Burchert – Yes

Gercken - Yes

S. Morrison – Yes

Sheehan – No. This will potentially impact seven other tenants in this space and she does not believe the petitioner has demonstrated the standards necessary to meet the special use.

Sipple – Yes

Duvall – No. Cannot support without seeing a submittal or more definitive action on the exhaust ventilation system as the impact to the shopping center residents and housing residents is potentially high.

5 Yes

2 No

The motion is carried and a recommendation for approval will be forwarded to City Council for 1st reading on August 23, 2022.

2. Public Hearing and Consideration of a special use pursuant to Section 122-331 of the City of Rolling Meadows Code of Ordinances to allow a special use for outdoor storage and other relief necessary to accommodate outdoor storage at 1675 Hicks Road.

Chairman Duvall asked if the file was in order and proper notice was given. Staff indicated it was.

Chairman Duvall asked for a motion to open the public hearing and enter the Staff report included in the packet into record. A motion was made by Mr. Buckingham and seconded by Mr. S. Morrison. Motion to open public hearing approved by unanimous voice vote.

John Luisi was sworn in by Chairman Duvall

Mr. Luisi stated that he read the Planning and Zoning Commission summary and wished to elaborate on certain points contained within. Regarding the list of materials for exterior storage, there are additional items they want to store outside but did not notify Staff of. The first is pool covers and the other is spare treads for Bobcats. The other item to mention is regarding the 18 vehicles to be parked in the rear parking lot. In the winter when things slow down the number of vehicles could go from 18 up to 22-24. They agree to obtaining a dumpster enclosure but are concerned that it costs \$412 for a change out and to be required to schedule a weekly pick up when their dumpster is only half full. On page 5 of the summary, it lists the penalty of loss of license if items are stored outside that have not been approved to be stored there. Their intention is to store what is allowed but feel it is harsh that their license could be taken away.

Questions and Comments from the Board

Chairman Duvall opened the meeting to Commissioner's questions and comments.

Mr. Buckingham requested clarification on the storage racks; asked if they are enclosed and would be up against the building. Also, would equipment be sitting open in the racks without locks. Mr. Luisi clarified that storage racks are not for equipment but rather for supplies like electrical conduit. Mr. Buckingham asked if there was concern over theft. Mr. Luisi said there is a concern but it is not practical to fence in the entire rear lot and is not possible on the right side. Ms. Kwandras stated the reason for not requesting the entire lot to be fenced is that it shares ingress egress with 1545 Hicks Road and a fence would cut off a certain amount of access for both buildings and make it impossible for the parking spaces there to be used. Mr. Buckingham asked about the type of vandalism they have experienced in the past. Mr. Luisi stated that trucks have been broken into, windows smashed and tools taken. This was one occurrence that effected six vehicles.

Mr. Buckingham asked if there was space to store all of the 22-24 vehicles. Mr. Luisi said they have calculated that there is a maximum of 26 spaces in the back.

Mr. Gercken clarified regarding page 5 of the summary where penalties are listed that special use would be revoked not their license. Ms. Kwandras confirmed that this is correct.

Mr. Gercken asked if the modifications they are requesting; to store additional items outside and have more than 18 vehicles, would affect moving forward. Ms. Kwandras deferred to Staff report.

Ms. Kwandras – Staff report

As noted, this is 1675 Hicks Road mainly surrounded by manufacturing businesses as this one is zoned to the south and east and C3 to the north. Residential neighbors to the west. Currently those two properties are vacant. Previously had a petition to subdivide that into eight separate properties. The subdivision was approved on preliminary plat but never came back for final plat so that has expired and redevelopment would have to come back through the Commission unless it is straight two houses. Prior to the application for the special use the petitioner obtained a fence permit. The fence was installed and the permit is finalized. A resident brought a concern to us on property maintenance standards not being met. One of the conditions of approval would be that the petitioner would be required to maintain the property to property maintenance standards whether or not it can be seen by the neighboring residents with fence installed.

Some of the items that are being presented this evening such as the additional vehicle parking and items for storage, have not been discussed with Staff so it is difficult to provide feedback. The concern that Staff has regarding parking is that the site plan shows approximately 18 spaces in the back which is why that was allowed. Outdoor storage is generally permitted only from the backline of the building. Anything from the west of the building would have theoretically been okay. Any additional vehicle storage would start creeping up into the side and front parking. Staff has not had an opportunity to consider the impact of that but generally speaking it is against the standards of outdoor storage. Any materials would need to be stored south of the northern building lines so they are completely hidden by the building from the street. It is our understanding that the petitioner is fine with this. The other thing that we want to assure is that the overhead loading dock, once this is all laid out, is not impeded. The other condition that Staff is requesting is that the height of the outdoor storage be limited to 8 feet. Staff believes that this is a reasonable height that can be screened well by the existing 6-foot fence from the neighboring residences. Parking on site is barely sufficient based on the square footage available and on the type of usage this is. Calculating parking needs conservatively is 33 spaces and 32 are on site. It is important to note that part of this business is warehousing which requires about half the parking of an office space. Parking is also provided at the front of the building as per the Zoning code. There are two handicap parking spaces located behind the building. In order to comply with ADA requirements, one of those spaces will be required to be relocated to front of building. Should the petitioner not comply with property maintenance standards in keeping the outdoor storage neat and presentable the special use may be revoked after normal code process. This would not affect their business license in any way. Findings of fact are provided.

Chairman Duvall asked for questions from the Commission.

Ms. Sheehan commented on the petitioner's findings of fact where it indicates on item 1 that "during the last 5 years we have been working on 1675 there have been no instances of ingress egress. We own 13 feet of that area and are not calling or asking for any changes in that area. We would like to see a copy of this ingress egress agreement". She too would like to see the agreement if it exists. Ms. Kwandras went on to explain when two buildings are under the same ownership there may be an agreement to allow shared ingress egress. An example is 4190-4200 Euclid Avenue which underwent subdivision and share ingress egress and sometimes parking so there is likely an agreement. Ms. Sheehan questioned if this has any bearing on the special use or what the petitioner is asking for. Ms. Kwandras doesn't believe the agreement is relevant to the request at hand.

Chairman Duvall in an attempt to ascertain how much space is actually needed to store 22-24 vehicles with 18 parking spaces asked Mr. Luisi what type of vehicles there are. Mr. Luisi said there are Bobcats and other vehicles. At this point Staff has not had the opportunity to determine the impact on the area as this was the first they were hearing of this.

Ms. Sheehan asked Mr. Luisi if they own this building and plan to remain in Rolling Meadows. Mr. Luisi explained that with their consistent growth they purchased this building in the hopes that it will be their last move. He went on to say that as a result of the Covid 19 Pandemic and supply chain issues, they needed the flexibility to order supplies in advance and have a place to store them. Their demand went from 20 residential pools per year to 70-80 per year. They have 12 office employees and another 50-60 in the field.

Mr. Buckingham asked where they keep the vehicles now. Mr. Luisi stated in busy season the equipment is on site from start of job for two weeks before moving on to next project. Foreman take their vehicles home. Mr. Buckingham asked why they need to store them overnight. Mr. Luisi responded that this would be needed when it is between jobs or in their off season.

Mr. Buckingham asked about the additional supplies such as pool covers and Bobcat treads and if they would be stored in the racks. Mr. Luisi stated they would be stored on the ground under the windows in rear of building. Ms. Kwandras explained that as long as it is stored neatly there isn't an issue with storing outside on the ground. Again, Staff has not had the opportunity to consider the impact of these items as they are hearing about it for the first time tonight.

Mr. Buckingham asked how big these storage items are. Mr. Luisi said pool covers are in a 20-foot-long box. Due to supply chain you now have to order in advance and take the materials when they are available. The pool covers could need to be stored 4-6 at a time. Mr. Luisi said that the treads are rubber and fold up. If necessary they could store these inside but would prefer not to as they are so restricted in space. The tread boxes are 3 feet long by 18 inches wide and stand 1 foot high.

Mr. Buckingham asked Ms. Kwandras what the main concern is regarding the storage of 18 vehicles in back. In this case you can't fence in the whole lot because of the previously stated ingress egress and parking challenges so the 18-vehicle limitation was based on two things: number of available spaces behind the building and the petitioner's submittal that they would have a maximum of 18 vehicles stored on site.

Mr. Gercken asked how to proceed if the Commission wants to modify the conditions of the special use to increase the number of vehicles stored on site. Ms. Kwandras recommended continuing this subject.

Chairman Duvall asked for a motion to continue this to the September 6, 2022 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting. Mr. Gercken recommended continuing this so Staff can work with petitioner to determine if the number of vehicles can be increased. Mr. Sipple seconded the motion.

Chairman Duvall requested roll call:

Buckingham – No
Burchert – No
Gercken - Yes
S. Morrison – No

Sheehan – Yes
Sipple – Yes
Duvall – Yes

4 Yes
3 No

The motion is carried and a recommendation for continuation as part of the agenda for September 6, 2022.

Chairman Duvall turned over to Staff for discussion items

1. Workshop discussion on voting procedures and PZC recommendations:

Ms. Kwandras stated that feedback has been received from some Commissioners that it is somewhat confusing as to how we present the motions and conditions to the Commission. The purpose of the Staff report is to provide as much information as possible to help you make an informed decision. There is some confusion about making a motion in the positive and a positive recommendation to the City Council. The City attorneys have advised us that when we make a motion with regards to a petition that the motion needs to be made in the positive for example, I make a motion to approve this petition for Meadows Dog House and then anyone who does not wish to make a positive recommendation can vote no. If the majority of the Commission votes no, that forwards a negative recommendation to the City Council. If the majority of the Commission votes yes, that forwards a positive recommendation to the City Council. This is a quasi-judicial Commission in that it is a public hearing where we hear testimony, consider all the facts, evidence, and testimony with regard to these petitions and then forward that recommendation to the City Council along with your findings of fact so that it can be included in the ordinance or resolution approving the petition if said petition is approved by the City Council. Mr. Gercken commented that in previous years when a Commissioner voted no they needed to mention why. Ms. Kwandras said that it is preferred to provide a reason. The Commission always has the option to continue a petition at another meeting as we did tonight with 1675 Hicks in order to request additional information from Staff or the petitioner. When the Commission chooses to do so it is recommended that the public hearing is not closed. By keeping it open it gives the petitioner, and any other concerned parties who come for that petition, the ability to speak at the next meeting. If the Commission is considering making a recommendation in the negative you might consider continuing the petition and asking Staff to rework the findings of fact based on the conversations. It is good to note that findings of fact are not set in stone and are what Staff believes to be the case. Zoning code calls for the Commission to make its own findings of fact. If you don't agree with what you hear continue the petition and give us direction on how you'd like to see them modified and we can bring them back at the next meeting.

Ms. Sheehan commented that code does not state that recommendations be made in the positive yet legal is making that recommendation. Why do they believe this? It is her personal belief that if the Commission is going to deny something that there is no reason not to make a negative recommendation and every body vote yes. It sends a different message that they are cognitive of what they are doing and that they are doing it on purpose and if there is a legal reason she wants to understand what it is. Ms. Kwandras will reach out to the City attorney to get that information. Mr. Gercken recalled from previous years that the legal reason is that it limits the city to lawsuits. If we make a negative recommendation the potential of lawsuits increases. If a

positive recommendation is made and by saying yes, we agree and the individuals say no, that limits the City's liability. If we say no we are speaking as the City that we don't like this that there is a potential for lawsuits.

Ms. Sheehan commented that for at least the last year the Commission has passed on and voted with petitions that have been incomplete and thus done a disservice to the Rolling Meadows residents and she asked that Ms. Kwandras check with the City attorney to see how this may impact the Commission. She went on to thank Staff for now making the petitions complete with the findings of fact and standards from our petitioners. Ms. Kwandras acknowledged that Staff should have been requesting this information. It was an oversight and wasn't something that was required in the previous code. Moving forward we will be asking for this from every petition that comes forward. We are going to revamp all of our submittal documents and everything will reflect that. It is my understanding that Assistant Director Charlton spoke with City Manager Sabo who also spoke with Mayor Gallo on this issue and the current prevailing opinion is that going forward the board will be provided with the information but it should not affect any prior petitions. Ms. Sheehan would like an update on this as it becomes available. Ms. Kwandras commented that Staff won't always get all the information they are looking for but the petitioner will still insist on coming. The Commission then has the right to continue it or to make a negative recommendation based on the materials that are supplied by the petitioner

Chairman Duvall commented that two years ago during the height of the pandemic Commissioner training was performed in a virtual format on line and one of the questions that came up was if you aren't going to support a petition and you are going to vote no, please explain why you are voting no because it gives the person saying no a little teeth and the opportunity to defend their position. Ms. Kwandras stated that comments from the Commission are forwarded to City Council to provide them with feedback as part of the staff report.

Ms. Kwandras mentioned standards and petitioner responses to them, what you see before you tonight are what we think you can expect from us moving forward unless there is an attorney involved. A lot of times what we see is that these petitioners are self-representing. They are attempting to open a small business but don't necessarily know the terms or what we are looking for. Staff will guide them to the best of our ability but it is something that the commission should be aware of that sometimes they won't be as complete as we might like no matter how much guidance is given. Ms. Sheehan commented that this opens the door for the Commission to ask additional questions. We know that Staff can put together a really nice packet and that your findings of fact, although sometimes skewed to the positive, gives us an insight into the petitioners understanding of the process and what we can ask them and open the door to essentially contradict your findings of fact. Ms. Kwandras stated that the findings of fact that Staff puts together are recommendations based on their review of the submittals and the Commission is within their right to make their own findings of fact. One of the most powerful tools that you have at your disposal, that we don't see used that much, is a continuation. The continuation can give Staff time to go back to the petitioner on some of the items that the Commission has talked about. We didn't have the opportunity to discuss some of these new items they were providing yet still they were asking you to make a recommendation. The continuation is a powerful tool in your arsenal to request that information and also to request Staff modifications to the Staff report and findings of fact that we recommend.

2. Election of new chairman Reports:

Chairman Duvall confirmed that this is his last meeting due to personal family matters and that a new Chairman needs to be elected. Mr. Sipple made a motion to nominate Mr. Buckingham as Chairman. Mr. Gercken seconded.

Chairman Duvall requested roll call:

Buckingham – Yes
Burchert – Yes
Gercken - Yes
S. Morrison – Yes
Sheehan – Yes
Sipple – Yes
Duvall – Yes

7 Yes
0 No

With 7 yes votes the motion is carried and Mr. Buckingham is the next Chairman of the Rolling Meadows Planning and Zoning Commission starting September 6, 2022.

Ms. Sheehan proclaimed that Doug has done a phenomenal job and thanked him for all of his hard work! Applause from the audience!!

Chairman Duvall said it has been a privilege and a pleasure serving with this group. Thanks to the Commissioners for their support, thanks to Elizabeth (Kwandras) and JoEllen (Charlton) for invaluable guidance and support. This commission especially has shown insight and creative thinking to progress the needs of all the petitioners to the benefit of the City and I'm sure they will continue to do so. To Elizabeth and Jo Ellen, especially Elizabeth, let the record show that Community Development couldn't be in better hands.

Ms. Kwandras – report items:

1. There are seven petitions on the agenda for September.
 - a. Continuation of 1675 Hicks Rd.
 - b. Taekwondo studio requesting a special use to go into the Rolling Meadows Shopping Center.
 - c. District 214 is coming back. They purchased a house in Rolling Meadows for architectural and construction students to work on. Temporary special use.
 - d. Two text amendments; one is to regulate tobacco, CBD, and vape shops as special uses in the C1, C2 districts.
 - e. Text amendment to modify the Zoning Code under variances to allow petitions to seek variations from the Building Code and other codes with the city code of ordinances cause at this time there isn't an avenue for that.

- f. Medical facility asking for a special use pursuant to the text amendment just approved to go into Arlington Office Park at 1941 Rohlwing Road.
- g. Daycare facility requesting special use to go into Arlington Office Park at 1951 Rohlwing Road.

Ms. Kwandras addressed question put forth by S. Morrison earlier regarding the Holidome. The request on the table was for workforce housing low income housing and in the Algonquin Road corridor where they wanted to locate it was not an appropriate use. Mr. Patel was going to go back with additional information on who he is going to be working with next. So that is still a work in progress.

Adjournment

Chairman Duvall requested motion to adjourn. Ms. S. Morrison made motion, seconded by Mr. Gercken. Carried by unanimous vote. The regular meeting of the August 3, 2022 Planning and Zoning Commission was adjourned at 8:46 PM.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, September 6, 2022.

Cindy Browder
Administrative/Clerk
Community Development Division