

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES – January 23, 2018**

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, Veenbaas,
Absent:

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

Mayor Prejna read the following statement:

MEMBERS OF THE AUDIENCE ARE REMINDED THAT THESE PROCEEDINGS ARE BEING VIDEO TAPED FOR CURRENT AND FUTURE BROADCAST OVER THE CITY’S CABLE TELEVISION CHANNEL.

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES:

Mayor Prejna: The first item on the agenda this evening is a motion to approve the minutes from the January 9, 2018 Council meeting. Is there such a motion? Alderman Banger made the motion and it was seconded. Are there any additions, deletions, or corrections to the minutes? Alderman Cannon.

Alderman Cannon: Thank you Mr. Mayor. Unfortunately I didn’t open up the packet right now, but in the minutes it said when we talked about the cell towers the motion failed. In fact in the meeting that passed, it didn’t fail. When we turned down the change of the height.

Mayor Prejna: We voted on two.....

Alderman Cannon: In the minutes we voted on changing the height from 75 to 45.

Mayor Prejna: And there were four votes against.

Alderman Cannon: So that’s, okay, I’m sorry. Thank you.

Mayor Prejna: No problem. Are there any other? The question is shall the minutes be approved? All those in favor please signify by saying aye; those opposed? The ayes have it and the minutes are approved.

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 2

MOTION TO DEVIATE:

Mayor Prejna: There is a motion to deviate from the agenda this evening. Is there a motion to deviate? Alderman Banger made the motion and it was seconded. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is shall the council deviate from the agenda? All those in favor say aye; those opposed say nay. The ayes have it and we will deviate from the agenda.

1) Public Hearing – CDBG Call for Projects

The Cook County Bureau of Administration requires the City of Rolling Meadows to hold a Public Hearing regarding the use of Cook County Community Development Block Grant Funds. This Hearing is to solicit input from the Community regarding future funding and program needs.

Let the record show this Public Hearing opened at 7:33 p.m. on Tuesday, January 23, 2018.

The Cook County Community Development Block Grant Program funds a variety of needs some of which include Single Family Rehabilitation, Fair Housing Activities, Housing Counseling, Affordable Housing Opportunities, Infrastructure Improvements, Commercial Rehabilitation, Capital Improvements and Public Service Activities.

The City of Rolling Meadows encourages any interested parties or organizations to present any current or future request or ideas regarding the use of Cook County Community Development Block Grant Program funds.

The City of Rolling Meadows City Council will be requested to approve any Community Development Block Grant project applications at a regularly scheduled meeting in late March or in early April, 2018, to meet the schedule as established by the Cook County Bureau of Administration.

The City is required to follow the established procedures of the Cook County Community Development Block Grant Program regarding project submittal and established limitations on funding. The City of Rolling Meadows will also consider any necessary revisions to its Five Year Plan on file with Cook County Department of Planning and Development, at a future City Council meeting.

Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak regarding the Cook County Community Development Block Grant Program?

Let the record show this hearing closed at 7:35 p.m. January 23, 2018.

MAYOR'S REPORT:

Mayor Prejna: I did have the opportunity to attend the ribbon cutting and rededication at Northwest Community Hospital for their Wellness Center and it's quite a facility and we do have a number of residents from Rolling Meadows that do use that facility.

Are there Ward Reports this evening?

WARD REPORTS: None

MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR 20 MINUTES:

Mayor Prejna: The first person on the sign in sheet is Mr. Fritz Duda. Welcome Fritz, you're part of the family. Just want you to know that.

Mr. Fritz Duda: Thank you. Fritz Duda, 564 Maple Street. I'm a principal with Clark Street Real Estate and we're the owner of the Dominick's property, kitty corner from here right now. We're here mainly to talk about the future and not the past, but a real quick review. Kirchoff Road is 2.2 miles long and has 12,800 cars per day. Point of comparison for some of the other traffic counts, Algonquin Road and Golf each carry roughly 31,000 cars per day for a total of 62,000 cars per day so a big distinction in the traffic and it really plays into everything we're trying to accomplish here. When CSRE, Clark Street, acquired the property in 2011, 2012, as you recall it was zoned R-3. It was approved under a PUD, which had expired at that time, for 300 units including apartment, townhomes, and some age restricted units, along with ancillary retail. That project was never built, obviously. We spent four years marketing the property, both on an anchored and junior anchored plan. At the end of that period we decided to pivot and sell the property. We took it out to market. We retained Greg Parcelli and his team from Collier's who are hands down the best in the business at selling large land sites to the development community. The response was the market was good, but it was limited to three categories, senior living, apartments, and townhomes. I've been told publicly and privately that apartments for rent product would not be acceptable to the City of Rolling Meadows and we honored that. We of course bought the South Bay Plan Senior Living. We know the end of that story. In 2017 we took it back out to market again with Greg Parcelli, again with good results, in exactly the same three categories. Obviously we were left with townhomes and we had multiple options. We picked the best group we thought fit with the community at that time and here we are. That's the past, now it's up to the future. There was some discombobulation, primarily because we didn't actually submit materials regarding the commercial property. As you know I've sent you a memo just yesterday with some conceptual site plans to show what is possible on the property. It's a very fair question out of P&Z. What you see is with the lots we've presented we can accommodate up to 9,000 feet of restaurants, parked at a 10 to 1, and up to 15,000 feet of retail parked at a 5 to 1. 10 to 1 and 5 to 1 are industry norms. They're zoning standards in many communities across the United States. The width of my commercial property in the front is about 400 feet. As a commercial developer we look for lots that are roughly 200 feet. That gives me two lots. The depth of the property really is dictated by the site planning. In urban downtown development, green development, developers are tucking parking in the rear. They're not having seas of asphalt. We laid out two rows of parking, a drive aisle, building depths, sidewalk, and we end up at 150, these guys have been very generous, and we're now at 163, 164 feet in depth so really the depth of the lots is dictated by the plan itself. Retailers want access and visibility. Those are the two things that you'll always have. They want to sit broadside to the street. They don't want to sit long and deep. We've laid out plans and I won't review my memo, hopefully you had an opportunity to read it, but we laid out plans that really work pretty well, both pedestrian friendly, more traditional, as well as certain boxes if the user were to say hey I have to have a square. How does the geometry work? All of these plans work on the site that we're keeping. We're committed to work with the City and Martha Corner to market these properties as soon as they're approved for sale, for lease, or build to suit. We'll hire the best in the business. There's two or three logical candidates out there to take those out to market. We're ready to get to work. We're asking for your approval tonight on the MBR plan. We are a sidelight of that in the plat of subdivision, but I hope we've given you enough information to clarify a lot of the questions from P&Z now. Thank you.

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 4

Mayor Prejna: Thank you. Next gentleman up is Greg Parcelli. Thank you for coming forward tonight.

Mr. Parcelli: Mr. Mayor, thank you and the City Council's time tonight. I've been asked to just briefly present to you our services and capabilities as a broker real estate company as it relates specifically to the property on the strip. In addition to that I will also recap very briefly what we've done over the last few years relative to the marketing of the property. I am an Executive Vice President with Collier's International. We are as the name implies an international corporate real estate company. We have 460 some offices around the world and 110 offices here in the United States, but more specifically our office in Chicago, and we have two main offices in Chicago downtown and out near the airport, are responsible for much of the Midwest marketing for Collier's International. Our firm was originally founded as Bennet and Conweathers Associates 71 years ago. We became investors in Collier's International to create an international platform some 20 years ago. We're the oldest corporate real estate company in Chicago and as a result of that we have an experience and expertise in the Chicago market that we feel is second to none. Our core service groups are really industrial, office, land, retail, multi-family, and hotel products. Through Collier's we have access to the most comprehensive and best in class lists of, database, of users and developers for these core business types. And the reason I want to present that to you is because you need to understand the depth of the efforts that we've gone through over the last couple of years and the capabilities that we brought to bear. We have spent a great deal of time, we currently have a number of major projects out in this immediate area. We are marketing the 200 acre Motorola property in Schaumburg. We recently did a deal in Long Grove and have properties in Rolling Meadows and we're marketing the Indian Lakes Resort in Bloomingdale so we're very active out in this northwest, suburban corridor and as a result of that activity that brings to bear prospects and users that we can show this property to and others like it. Our original focus when we took on the assignment was to take Meadows Marketplace and go out to the market looking for retail users, mixed use developers, and residential and the residential component that really covered townhomes, multi-family, which is primarily apartments, and then senior living and memory care. Having gone to the market with these product types on several different occasion, the interest that has been developed as a result of this has really been in the residential side of it. As you know about a year and a half ago we did have the property under contract for senior housing, but that was not acceptable to the community at that time so that deal we passed on, but following that the interest that we got really is on the townhome product side. We have not seen any kind of mixed use or town center kind of interest from the developer community. And in fact, really over the last couple of years the retail marketplace and the apartment market place has slowed down considerably.

Mayor Prejna: Mr. Parcelli, you have one minute please.

Mr. Parcelli: Has slowed down considerably, so as a result that brings us here today with MBR as the client that we selected along with Fritz to work on the property from a townhouse development project. And I'm available for any questions.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you.

Mr. Parcelli: Thank you.

Mayor Prejna: The next gentleman on the sign in sheet is Scott Shelton.

Scott Shelton: Good evening Mayor, City Council. My name is Scott Shelton, 850 E. Dale Road, Naperville. I'm with Ryan Homes. As the ultimate builder on the project I just want to take a few minutes to highlight some of the project. My colleague Andrew will talk a little bit more about some of the technical aspects, but we continue to believe, or a strong belief in Meadows Square will serve a

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 5

Market need for lifestyle oriented new construction in a great location. The price points are expected in range from the high \$200,000 to the mid \$300,000 serving largely young professionals as well as buyers desiring a more low maintenance lifestyle. Our townhome products that we offer that Ryan Homes will be selling will be for sale only. They will be 3 bedroom units, ranging in 1600 to approximately 2,000 square feet. A mix of rear and front loaded providing a nice variety of streetscape and floor plan variety as well. The front elevations are varied so you can avoid monotony, but yet have a consistent look through coordinated color schemes and brick color schemes as well. Our analysis that we provided to you using Naperville's school tables projected unlimited impact on the school system, approximately 22 children throughout the 113 proposed units. We believe it adds a significant number of residents to the downtown area without a large burden on the school system. These additional residents we believe can patronize the local businesses and ultimately provide additional base of residents to further the future viability that Fritz talked about. We also project it could add up to almost approximately a million dollars for the tax revenue for the various taxing bodies. As shown it's projected to be 113 units, down from 120 from some original discussions we had here some time ago and is in line with comparable density from several projects around the suburban area in Arlington Heights, Palatine, here and also in Schaumburg. I'll ask my colleague Andrew to talk further. I believe he's next on the list.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you. Andrew Mouw.

Andrew Mouw: Good evening. Andrew Mouw with Ryan Homes. I wanted to point out just a few key changes based off the most recent plan that we did based off the discussions from the Planning & Zoning Committee. The comments we heard were larger commercial site, parking in the northwest section of the community for guest parking, the few of the dead end streets which we would consider to be driveways, but they've been, so that was a concern and then the unit count. Couple changes we made, a few tweaks, we've increased the commercial by 13 feet in depth as Fritz has already talked about to make that property even more viable. We've increased, we've added five additional guest parking spots and moved a significant number of them up to the northwest, or a number of them up to that northwest quadrant to serve those residents. We've removed two of the dead-end streets to, and in doing so we lost two units but we made that commercial property larger. And finally, that eastern driveway, curved that road around and made it more of a driveway as you typically see with this type of townhome product. These are all private drives so the maintenance will be uniform throughout. So, I think these changes that we made address many of the concerns that the Planning & Zoning Commission bought up. We're here to answer any questions and we also have our engineer. He's going to pass on making comments but if you have any technical questions during the agenda item he's here to answer those too.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you for coming forward. Dwayne Gillian.

Dwayne Gillian: I'm passing

Mayor Prejna: Okay, thank you. That moves us on to Patty Callahan. Thank you Ms. Callahan for coming forward tonight.

Patty Callahan: Thank you, good evening Mayor and Council. Since I was eight years old my family moved to Rolling Meadows. Kirchoff and Meadow Drive have been the downtown, the City center where everybody in town went for various services. Yes I know, times have changed. Shopping habits have changed, but the residents still come to town looking to connect and gather. Comet is a prime example. Some evenings cars are parked at the Lutheran Church and people are gathered long after they have finished their custard creations. You ask anyone in Rolling Meadows. What do they want to see on the Dominick's space? Restaurants and some retail. The current plan by Ryan Homes is

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 6

offering two parcels approximately 7.5 acres each. What does that provide in the way of building restaurants and retail such as a family pizza place? One that serves breakfast through dinner. How about a restaurant with a bar in it? A place to go after council meetings for libations. The plan also lacks retail space that could bring the City in more property tax dollars and provide sales revenue. Retail habits may have changed since the early years of Rolling Meadows, but as long as people make money people will spend money. Now when it comes to traffic counts, please look at the success of Sam's and Tuscano on Campbell and Wilke and the Westgate Shopping Center as an example. They've got plenty of business and there's not a lot of traffic there, but they do plenty well. Now I have answers if you're thinking that if a restaurant wants to come here, why haven't they? The only available space for a restaurant is about 2,000 square feet and that's in the Jewel Shopping Center. The rent there is approximately \$5,000 a month because I have called. And that is much higher than what was quoted in the rent prices by Goodman and Williams in the informational meeting in the summer of 2016. In 2011 during the Dominick's acquisition process Fritz Duda spoke to the Daily Herald about Clark Street's plan for the Dominick's space. He said it should be all retail, but we may need to do both residential and retail. But every time I looked on that website, that property was always marketed as retail. Before the property is rezoned and a plan for housing is accepted let me ask this of the voting council. Have you yourself picked up the phone or typed an email asking a potential business to join the downtown? Have you yourself went outside of Rolling Meadows for entertainment and dining? We've all talked about leakage before. How much of your money have you spent outside in Arlington Heights, Palatine, or Schaumburg that we could be spending in our own community and bringing in tax dollars? What is the overall impact going to be on our schools, our Police Department, and our Fire Department if more housing is bought in? And the other question I'm going to ask you is I ask carefully of the council members to think, not because you're tired of this property and you just want something there, but because of the history of once was and the vision of what can be. Please save the downtown. Thank you.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you Ms. Callahan. Next person up to speak would be Dale.

Dale Engelking: Hi, thanks, good evening.

Mayor Prejna: Thanks for coming forward tonight.

Mr. Engelking: I've got probably just as, Patty said most of it, but this is Rolling Meadows. We have to think what's good for the town. We were here a couple years ago when the council voted the way the residents wanted. Now we come in with another Ryan Homes. They're going to build their townhomes. They're going to sell them and they're going to leave. What's left are the people that live here and at the Planning & Zoning Commission most of the comments were negative from the Board, so they come there, they change a few things, they give us an extra 13 feet. I was here one other time and why do we have two or three acres residential then 7 or 8 acres commercial? We need tax dollars. The City just spent close to a million and a half dollars on a new fire truck and a new ambulance. We recently spent 1.2 or 1.3 million dollars on property for a new fire station. All this is needed for the town, but where's the money coming from? You're going to get real estate taxes, but no real estate taxes. As far as the traffic's concerned, that's an old traffic study. I believe a new traffic study should be done. We've had a business survey done recently this past summer and by an independent party and she came up with not too good news. We have to be more business friendly. We have to go out there, Mr. D'Astice had mentioned something about incentives for restaurants. I haven't heard any more talk about it. Maybe we need some incentives here tonight. You're giving out another 7b. We're giving TIF's to multi-billion dollar companies. Let's get together and maybe create another TIF district down there. Maybe get some commercial back. We're spending money in other towns like Patty said. We're taking our money, spending it in other towns. They get the tax revenue, we don't. If all you guys are going to depend on is

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 7

Real estate taxes you know what's going to happen to each and every one of our real estate taxes. They're going to keep going up and up and up. We have to find other ways that we can spend our money in our town to benefit our town. I strongly request and ask that the council vote no tonight. Thank you.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you for coming forward tonight. Mark Mehlhop

Marc Mehlhop: Hello, I see in the proposed drawing and I don't think the commercial lots are big enough for to put anything that we need in town. Most of the town is lower income people around here and the price of the buildings that they're trying to put there are way out of the price range for people to afford and like I said you're going to put a pond in there with open water and we're looking for places to park. You can't park in a pond. A boat can park in a pond, but a car can't. So, I hope to see you guys vote no for this tonight. That's all I have. Thank you.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you for coming forward. That brings Mr. Steve Holish forward please.

Steve Holish: Good evening. I'm going to get off base a little bit. Everybody else has been talking about Ryan Homes first. I'm going to talk about the reintroduction of the tower discussion tonight. I don't think that's necessary. You all voted four opposed at the last meeting. To change any of the information on the amendment to 45 feet means nothing. Those two items that were originally discussed, one was for the right-of-way utility easement, which is 45 feet, and everything else was going to be 75 feet. That's the way it should stand. I did a quick research on last time on towers around my house. This time I did towers around that actual property and out of the 107 towers that are existing today, 16 are under 74 feet. That means everybody else would have had to come in and do a variance to go anywhere from 45 to 74, or 75 I'm sorry, and that's not going to happen. Providers are going to look at 75 is a minimum. That's what their normal coverage is based on. I just noticed two new antenna streams. One over by the Fire Station. They're at 85 feet. So clearly anything below 75 feet is going to keep residents, not keep residents, keep businesses away from anything in Rolling Meadows and if you're trying to get more business in Rolling Meadows, this isn't the way to do it. You should keep it at 75 feet, keep the vote as it was, and let it go that way. The other topic I guess is a touchy one, Ryan Homes, and I think what I go on is I sat at the COW meeting and listened to discussions that went on and all you people are going to sit and say well what should we say. Should we let Ryan Homes do this or not? For Ryan Homes to invest a lot of money in this, you all voted to say yeah, let's go ahead. Let's get them in and do this. So they went ahead. Our staff has spent a lot of time on this. Unfortunately when it got to the Planning Commission, the Planning Commission didn't have enough time to review it, go through and really look at it. They all based it on one commercial under let say usage so they wanted more. That's been addressed by Ryan Homes. So I think I urge all of you to go back to what you were thinking about when you initially came in and said let's put in something in there. Ryan Homes seems like a good fit. We're going to get taxes. We're going to get some commercial and it would be a good fit for everybody. And the last thing I would say is everybody wants to bring other retail in here, but I don't hear anybody coming up and saying how much taxes more retail would go to that site? You're going to have another Dominick's? I don't know. So, I guess the taxes that will come from the houses will be a lot easier to get than the taxes would be from retail that would be struggling. Thank you.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you for coming forward. The next person up is Robin Gruenfeld. Thank you for coming forward tonight.

Ms. Gruenfeld: Thank you for having me. It's on the cell towers of course. What we need is to change our zoning. I'm not worried about the height, but if we can change our zoning to make it precise and exact so there's no gray areas, there's no loopholes, and anybody who has any questions the zoning laws will be that specific. Mr. Macholl even mentioned they're not written as well as they should be. To

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 8

lower the towers to 45 why not just lower the towers to 45 in residential/park and then in your C-1, 2, and 3, and your T-1 and T-2, and M-1 and 2, put your 75 foot towers in there. I think it's a good compromise and it's almost like a win/win situation here. Nobody wins totally, nobody loses totally. That's what compromise is and that's what we need. We're willing to work with all of you and to figure out these zoning laws and we need to get them in place quickly before another cell tower would like to come along and put it up. There's one other thing that I'd like to mention that in some cities they're lowering them, or not even letting towers go into R-1 in parks and they're also saying okay you can put it in commercial and all the other zoning that you have, but it's got to be a certain distance away from residential property lines. So, like I say, we're willing to sit on a committee, do anything we can to get these zoning laws put in place and really clarify and be specific about it. So just give us a call. Thank you.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you for coming forward tonight. Next gentleman on the sign in sheet is Mr. Brad Judd.

Alderman Judd: Good evening Mr. Mayor and Council. It's been a while since I've been around talking so I apologize if I'm a little rough tonight, but I've invested a lot of time in the last twelve years on this property starting off with the Bristol Moran back in 2005 until now and one of the things that I've always be an opponent of is apartments. I know some people have talked about them. Some people think they are a viable solution but they're not. They're going to be a lot more dense if we were to put something like that in here. We're going to end up with a lot more traffic. We're going to end up with a less impact on schools with the project that we have now vs. putting in apartments. I think if I recall Bristol was somewhere around 300 apartments, 240 apartments. There's also going to be a higher tax base if we take Ryan Homes vs. apartments and there's less impact on City services from Ryan vs. the other apartments and more disposable income and that's really where people spend money. A lot of people will bring up Arlington Heights, Palatine, Buffalo Grove, and how those places all have, not necessarily Buffalo Grove, but Mt. Prospect have train stations and that's why the downtowns have survived, but those train stations were here for a number of years. Where we really start taking off is when disposable income came and they took it and they had the people living there and they used that money in the town vs. apartments. I think this is a good project for the City. I think it's going to increase the property tax revenues to the City. It's going to have minimal impact on City services if we look at the road is supposed to be taken care of by the HOA so we're not going to have a plow in there. You're going to have Police and Fire, but that's going to be across the board anywhere you go. The schools are taken care of because as you see in the packet, I think Ryan says it's roughly 20 or 30,000 dollars per student that we're going to be putting into the schools. We're going to increase the property values in the surrounding area. If you get apartments to come in there that's not going to help the property values of the surrounding community, but if you get townhouses that's going to help it. You're also going to get more money from real estate transfer taxes if we sell these properties, of course across time. You look at a lot of apartment complexes, they sit by the same owner for a number of years. South Bay was going to do the same thing and hold onto that property for a number of years. You don't get the transfer taxes. Increase in disposal income is also going to help across the board. We've got numerous vacancies in the Jewel. We have a lot right across the street. We have things that people can come in and do if they want to do it from a business perspective and if we get this disposable income up people are going to spend that money accordingly. You also have the young people, young professionals, which is what they are kind of gaging this for, as they did for Lexington and as these people come in, if they're just a single couple, no children, as they start to have children and realize what a great community this is, they're going to go out and purchase the properties that are around here. They're going to say I want a yard. I want a driveway for my family. They're going to take care of that. One of the things that was bought up at the Planning Commission is the study that extrapolated from a

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 9

Professor over at Harper about the commercial from a state level and a county level. One of the things is the author didn't bring that to a municipal level. There's a reason for that because commercial when it's looked at is more from the Gallagher type standpoint. It's more from Weichai that we bought in as well and its bringing jobs. Retail doesn't necessarily bring jobs. It brings a little bit of tax revenue, but it doesn't necessarily bring jobs. You can't always extrapolate from the macroeconomics down to the microeconomics. They don't always come through the same, so when we take and say okay we're going to put retail in here, that doesn't necessarily say that all these things are, all these benefits from the other issues of having residential in there is going to be the same. I think what we need to think about is the Plan Commission. It seems to me like they were a little bit out of line. If you look at the minutes, most of the votes were I want more retail. I want a bigger retail space.

Mayor Prejna: You have one minute.

Mr. Judd: Okay, so I think I'll leave that for later. I think one of the things we need to be cognizant of is the odds of Clark Street suing us if we don't go through with this are pretty good. I've talked to an attorney. They've got everything going their way in the LaSalle line that they can go ahead and they bring something in for the community, meets what's around us, and then therefore they're going to have a pretty good stance when it comes to that. The last thing, Mr. Mayor, I think you've been noticeably absent from this whole entire process as to whether or not you are supporting the project or not supporting the project and I would really think that it would be nice to people in this room, as well as all of the residents, for you to come out and say before the vote tonight whether or not you're supporting this project or not and not use this as political game and ship for the upcoming Mayoral Election. Thank you very much for your time.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you Mr. Judd. The last person speaking is Craig Carlson.

Craig Carlson: Hi I'm Craig Carlson and I'm the owner of the 3001 Kirchoff property, Comet Frozen Custard. I am coming here tonight to ask the City Council to vote no on the zoning changes at this time and I think we're all in agreement that Super Target is not going to go in there and that Wolfgang Puck is not going to put his next restaurant over there and that goes without saying. However I also think that if you look at what Rolling Meadows is and what the parties involved keep telling Rolling Meadows that you are and that is one of the business Jewels, that is one of Taco Bell's top locations, Walmart tried to come in here and put a grocery store right on Kirchoff. We're not going to be the next Deer Park and the property being shopped that way is probably not the best. If you look at some of the key businesses like in downtown Arlington Heights, a lot of them are independently owned like myself and they're very successful and I, Ryan Homes is a great company and I've said that before and I actually think a lot of Fritz. I think he's smart as a tack and I wish, I want them to be a part of this, but I don't think this is to pack that many townhomes in that site is the best for the City of Rolling Meadows. This is not what the City needs. It's truly not what the citizens have asked for over the past couple of years and it's not what this individual business owner wants. The redevelopment of a major site takes a lot of vision. It takes time and it takes patience and it takes work on your part as a City Council. And the City Council and the people who have been on here before you for the last decade or so have been very reactionary and you've kind of sat here and waited for something to come your way. And whatever comes you kind of like you kick it around is the driveway long enough? Is the building too tall? And that's kind of how it's been and the towns around you, Arlington Heights, Palatine, Schaumburg, Elk Grove, Mt. Prospect, and even Wheeling they are now all growing and thriving specifically their downtowns. And the question is why? Rolling Meadows has great schools, it has a great Park District, it has tree lined streets, and it has low crime rates. And it even has positive train line access to Metra and not to go into too much detail but I spent a lot of time with Metra and I ran, they gave me a whole bunch of data and

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 10

82% of the people that ride the train around here commute to the train. They said if you're in a 3 to 5 mile radius of the train station you get the benefit of the train station so that crutch that I've heard used here before that we don't have a train station needs to be thrown out. The City of Rolling Meadows and the community deserve better and you really have to work for a decent downtown area, not just react. And I would say should Ryan Homes be part of a plan, yes. Should there be some retail, yes. You could also end up with a couple more banks on Kirchoff with the way the plan's lined out. So I would say this is a strategic decision with permanent implications. A no vote last night, a no vote for tonight, is somewhat temporary. I didn't know anything about a lawsuit. I hope that doesn't happen, but let's get it right for this key piece of property. There's other needs for this town beside retail. I don't think it can all be retail, but let's try to build something great for the City and great for the citizens, not just now but in the future. If you give this away to this plan it might be the beginning, it might have a domino effect on the rest of us. I hope you think about it and I hope you'll be a little bit more progressive looking at what you want to do with that entire site. Thank you.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you for coming forward.

Mayor Prejna closed the floor.

➤ **PENDING**

A. Ordinance No. 18-05 / Amend Code to Allow City Manager to Sign Documents (2nd Reading)

Mayor Prejna read the background on the ordinance.

Mayor Prejna: Is there a motion to approve the ordinance? Alderman Banger made the motion and it has been seconded. Is there any discussion on the ordinance? Mr. Gallo

Alderman Gallo: I have a quick question for City Manager Krumstok. It's my understanding that you already have the privilege to sign certain amounts up to \$10,000 and so what would make this different specifically?

Mr. Krumstok: Part of it is the number of contracts that are coming up for Community Events and there's a gray area that City Attorney Jim Macholl and I talked about that this just clears it up and takes care of that overall.

Alderman Gallo: Okay, thank you.

Mayor Prejna: Are there any more questions for discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the roll?

AYES: Cannon, Budmats, Majikes, Gallo, Banger, D'Astice, Veenbaas

NAYS: 0

ABSENT: 0

The ordinance was adopted.

B. Ordinance No. 18-06 / Approve Text Amendment to Zoning Code to Allow Small Private Lending Libraries in Front Yard (2nd Reading)

Mayor Prejna read the background on the ordinance.

Mayor Prejna: Is there a motion to approve the ordinance? Alderman Cannon made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Banger. Is there any discussion on the ordinance? Seeing none, the Clerk will please call the roll.

AYES: Cannon, Prejna, Majikes, Gallo, Banger, D'Astice, Veenbaas

NAYS: 0

ABSENT: 0

The ordinance was adopted.

C. Ordinance No. 08-07 / Amend Code with Respect to its Policy Against Discrimination & Harassment, Including Sexual Harassment for Elected Officials and Commission Members (2nd Reading)

Mayor Prejna read the background on the ordinance.

Mayor Prejna: Is there a motion to approve the ordinance? Alderman D'Astice made the motion and it has been seconded. Is there any discussion on the ordinance? Seeing none, the Clerk will please call the roll.

AYES: Cannon, Budmats, Majikes, Gallo, Banger, D'Astice, Veenbaas

NAYS: 0

ABSENT: 0

The ordinance was adopted.

➤ **MOTION TO RECONSIDER:**

D. Ordinance No. 18-08 / Amend the Comprehensive Zoning Code – Antenna (1st Reading) (Failed at the January 9, 2018 Council Meeting) (2nd Reading)

Mayor Prejna: This ordinance was before us before. It was to amend the Zoning Code for an antenna. It was voted down at that meeting. At this time it has been requested that we would ask for a Motion to Reconsider. Is there such a motion? Alderman Budmats made the motion and it has been seconded by Mr. Gallo. Is there any discussion on the ordinance? Mr. D'Astice

Alderman D'Astice: I was not in attendance at that meeting. Can you give me exactly what we're reconsidering?

Mayor Prejna: It was the same motion, it was the same ordinance that was there that evening, but since there were three members of the council absent, this will simply, a Motion to Reconsider, will bring it back on the agenda and you will have the opportunity to discuss it and vote on it just as if it were appearing for the first time.

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 12

Mr. Krumstok: Alderman D'Astice, the biggest part is from 75 to the 45.

Mayor Prejna: Is that your question, the 75 to 45 or why it's on for reconsideration?

Alderman D'Astice: Both

Mayor Prejna: Okay it's on for reconsideration because there were three members of the council absent and it was the ordinance to move it from 75 feet to 45 feet, so this is simply to bring the ordinance forward.

Alderman D'Astice: Okay

Mayor Prejna: Mr. Cannon

Alderman Cannon: Mr. Mayor, maybe some of my confusion, maybe you can help me with this. So when we voted on it last time we were told in the beginning of that meeting that we had a quorum.

Mayor Prejna: Yes

Alderman Cannon: And we voted 4 to nothing to turn this down.

Mayor Prejna: Correct

Alderman Cannon: So explain to me why it comes back then.

Mayor Prejna: This is a parliamentary procedure if an ordinance is voted down only the people who voted that evening against it can make a motion and a second to bring it back so the entire council will have an opportunity to vote on it, so Mr. Budmats has made that motion and Mr. Gallo has seconded it. We will need a quorum for it to move forward to be back at status as 1st Reading.

Alderman Cannon: So you're saying that one of the four of us requested to bring this back.

Mayor Prejna: Yes

Alderman Cannon: Are you allowed to say who did?

Mayor Prejna: The person who made the motion.

Alderman Cannon: Well none of that information is in here so it's a bit confusing. That's why I'm confused.

Mayor Prejna: Well, I guess it was clear by the fact that Mr. Budmats made the motion and Mr. Gallo seconded it.

Alderman Cannon: Okay, now I know more than I did earlier.

Mayor Prejna: Okay. Is there any other discussion? Mr. D'Astice

Alderman D'Astice: So are we voting tonight to say yes we'd like to reconsider it or is this a vote, is the first vote of an ordinance and a second vote will come up after?

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 13

Mayor Prejna: This is a first vote to reconsider it, so the best way to give you the example is this, pretend like this is the 1st Reading of this antenna ordinance and you were absent for that meeting so you now have the opportunity to vote on it. It does take four votes to reconsider, so if we do not get four votes then the whole council will not have had the opportunity to speak on it. Mr. Cannon

Alderman Cannon: So Mr. Mayor, again, I'm sorry for being so confused, but this is really different from what we've done in the past, so when we had brought this up before when three of the members were absent, no one seemed to voice any objections that night and obviously they're entitled to do that, so I guess if people object to this I would just like to hear what they have to say because I don't know what's going on.

Mayor Prejna: That can be done, but first we need to bring it forward so it's like a regular amendment, so think of this....

Alderman Cannon: I thought that's what we were talking about right now.

Mayor Prejna: It was voted down by 4 to 0 and I know that we've only done this a couple of times on the council, but to bring it back so the full council, all seven people that are here tonight, can vote on it and discuss it. We need a motion, which we got from Mr. Budmats and a second from Mr. Gallo and we need the four alderman to vote yes I want to bring this back just as if it was ordinance in for the 1st Reading. Mr. D'Astice

Alderman D'Astice: Okay, but that's not what you just said to me. I said are we voting on this as if it was the first time and you said yes and now you just said....

Mayor Prejna: No, what I said....

Alderman D'Astice: Because right now we're having discussion on this.

Mayor Prejna: We're having more discussion, and we should only have two rounds of the question. Mr. Macholl, you want to step in.

Mr. Macholl: Well, I don't know what more I can add, but I'll try. So the matter is on the agenda for a Motion to Reconsider. What's up before the council right now is a motion to bring this ordinance back for a 1st Reading.

Alderman D'Astice: Okay

Mr. Macholl: So you vote on the Motion to Reconsider. If that passes then you vote on the ordinance for passage on the 1st Reading.

Alderman D'Astice: Okay, I understand now.

Mr. Macholl: Okay

Mayor Prejna: Thank you. Are there any further questions? Seeing none, the question shall we reconsider this ordinance. Will the Clerk please call the roll?

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 14

AYES: Budmats, Majikes, Gallo

NAYS: Cannon, Banger, D'Astice, Veenbaas

ABSENT: 0

The ordinance fails on the Motion to Reconsider

➤ **CONSENT ORDINANCES:**

Mayor Prejna: This brings us to ordinances in for 1st Reading. It consists of E and F. Does any alderman wish to pull one of the ordinances? Mr. Gallo

Alderman Gallo: E

Mayor Prejna: We no longer have a consent agenda for ordinances.

E. Ordinance / Approve a 3-Lot Subdivision, Rezoning of the Southern 9.5 Acres from C-2 General Commercial Services to R-4 Intermediate Residential, Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and Preliminary Planned Development for 2819-2915 Kirchoff Road (1st Reading)

Mayor Prejna read the background on the ordinance.

Mayor Prejna: Is there a motion to move this ordinance forward for 2nd Reading? Alderman Cannon made the motion and Alderman Banger has seconded it. Mr. Gallo you have first opportunity.

Alderman Gallo: Well first I'd like to see if we could, I would like to make a motion that much like we did with the cell phone towers and the Zoning Board, that we not take any action as a 1st Reading and know that this will come back to us and allow the Zoning Board to take this information in first prior to our maybe delivering an opinion one way or another and let them see this organically and then bring it back to our table, our dais for a decision and direction. So my motion would be to hold off on any decision making until the Board reviews it.

Mr. Krumstok: I know the City Attorney has a comment on it.

Mr. Macholl: It's up for preliminary approval so it's going to have to go back to the Planning & Zoning Commission and then come back here, so if you took this in its current state and send it back to the Planning & Zoning Commission, it's still going to have to come back here so.

Alderman Gallo: I understand that. We just took that same approach when it came to a contentious item like the cell phone towers that had a lot of conversation around it and it makes sense not to give our input because we look to the Building & Zoning expertise to provide us suggestive matter.

Mr. Macholl: With all due respect, the issue relative to the antenna that we just went through was more of a parliamentary process where this really isn't.

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 15

Alderman Gallo: Not this last conversation here at this meeting, but the previous council meeting where we decided to hold off and allow the Zoning Board to make their recommendations before we made any statements.

Mayor Prejna: I want to make the council aware of that you have two opportunities to speak when we're coming forward for this, so you have a motion to that you would like this moved back to the Zoning Committee

Alderman Gallo: Correct

Mayor Prejna: Thank you. Is there a second? Seeing none it fails for a lack of a second. Is there further discussion? Mr. Budmats.

Alderman Budmats: I have a question. The ordinance that you read talks about two .73 acre pieces, but now the plan that we were shown has two .8 acre pieces, so which are we really voting on?

Mayor Prejna: That was just sent out today or yesterday?

Mr. Krumstok: As the City Attorney would say, what you're actually approving is the preliminary approval which is the .73 on the two lots that was actually looked at so the final document that would go back, that first has to go back to the Planning & Zoning Commission before it comes back to you, but actually talk about everything that is in front of you with that revised. What Ryan Homes and Clark Street actually did was provide you the comments that came from the Planning & Zoning and also showing you from the preliminary to the final what their thoughts are before it actually gets there, so they're advance of some of those other pieces, but in front of you is exactly what went to the Planning & Zoning Commission which is the 115 and the .73 and the .73.

Alderman Budmats: The question is that when we see this next time, are we going to see .8 and .8 and then 113 townhomes. Is that going to be our 2nd Reading on that or is that going to be our 1st Reading on that ordinance.

Mr. Krumstok: That would be actually on the final document that you will see when it gets back through the Planning & Zoning, so the next time you see this it will still have what's in front of you for that 2nd Reading.

Mayor Prejna: Mr., just for clarification for those that are here, this is a 1st Reading on this. It will come back to us for a 2nd Reading. It will go the Planning Commission. After it goes to the Planning Commission it will come back to us for another 1st Reading and then a 2nd Reading on the recommendations of the Planning Committee, so there will be a total of 5 times that this will be reviewed and the opportunity for input either from the council or the Planning Commission. Does that help?

Alderman Budmats: A little bit, but one more question. If I voted yes this time, yes next time, it has no bearing on anything because we're still going to get a second bite of this apple when it comes back with the plan.

Mr. Krumstok: That is correct

Mayor Prejna: That is correct, yes. I just wanted to make sure that folks understood that tonight this is just one part of the process. Yes, Mr. Veenbaas

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 16

Alderman Veenbaas: Can we amend this to put in the accurate information as Alderman Budmats just mentioned? I want to make a motion to do that. Can we do that?

Mayor Prejna: Mr. Macholl

Mr. Macholl: The Zoning Code provides that, and the route that the developer took was to pursue a preliminary approval which is a scaled down version of what they would ultimately provide for. That went through the Planning & Zoning Commission. That needs to come here and we do it all the time, but once that plan gets revised and the details relative to final Plat of Approval, which is much more specific from what was currently here, and currently before the Planning & Zoning Commission, that's why it has to go back to the Planning & Zoning Commission and has to come back here.

Alderman Veenbaas: Okay

Mr. Macholl: Well, that's the process.

Alderman Veenbaas: All right, thank you.

Mr. Macholl: Sure

Mayor Prejna: Any further, Mr. D'Astice

Alderman D'Astice: So can we adjust this now so that we are voting on this which is going to be closer to what Planning & Zoning is going to get or can we not make amendments on that?

Mayor Prejna: I believe what Mr. Macholl has said is that this is just a preliminary vote and there will be adjustment, no matter what the council does tonight, the Planning Commission will make adjustments to it, so it could be .8, it could be .85, it could be a number of changes. They could say we don't want the 112, we only want 100 units and then it will come back to us, so I think what Mr. Macholl is saying is we can make all the little nuances that we might like tonight, but when it comes back to the Planning Commission they will adjust everything that we may have done and it will be the final time when it comes back two more times. Does that answer your question Mr. D'Astice?

Alderman D'Astice: No, because the question was can we make any changes on this. So the answer is yes we can make an amendment to this or no we can't.

Mayor Prejna: Yes you could, but the Zoning Commission will probably have the last say

Alderman D'Astice: Tim made a motion.

Mr. Krumstok: So I know Jim wants to talk, but I have another comment too. I'll let you talk.

Mayor Prejna: Go ahead Jim

Mr. Macholl: Had they gone through and submitted for a final approval, I understand the back and forth, I truly do, but had they submitted for final approval you would have this ordinance up for a 1st Reading and a 2nd Reading and it would be done. It would not go back to the Planning & Zoning Commission. Had they made these relatively minor adjustments, I'm going to call them minor, I don't think they're really that substantive that I would normally send it back to the Planning Commission, Planning & Zoning Commission, but that's the path that it's on and it's not a process that the council is

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 17

unfamiliar with. We've had preliminary subdivision approval and then it comes back for final approval. We do that frequently, so this isn't an abnormal process, but it's the process that was put in place.

Mr. Krumstok: Overall what we're trying to say is you have a process in front of you that disposes the preliminary documents that are the .73, the .73, and the 115. No matter what happens after the preliminary, the final has to come back to the Planning & Zoning and to the City Council. That's the one that would have all these other items. What you have, again, dispose of the preliminary, which is how you're going to vote on this next two votes, but then the other piece that comes back that will all be cleaned up. What Clark Street and Ryan did was provide you their thoughts, their comments, and additional items before it actually gets back to that final item.

Mayor Prejna: Go ahead Mr. Macholl

Mr. Macholl: I just want to clarify this so there's no misunderstanding when it comes back. Relative to the Zoning, that's not coming back. If you approve the Zoning on the 1st Reading and you approve it on the 2nd Reading, the R-4 Zoning District is going to be established. To the extent the Planned Unit changes, the area of that zoning is going to change, but just so we're all on the same page, that zoning is not going to change. It's not coming back for the zoning approval.

Mayor Prejna: Does that help clarify?

Alderman D'Astice: Yes

Mayor Prejna: Yes, Mr. Cannon

Alderman Cannon: Are we allowed to discuss stuff now?

Mayor Prejna: In other words we're, after you've spoken two times, so that's....

Alderman Cannon: I didn't speak two times.

Mayor Prejna: I understand. Go ahead Mr. Cannon

Alderman Cannon: So, since we really haven't gotten into the meat of what this is all about, in my opinion, I think tonight we have three gentlemen here from the company that presented a viable opportunity for us to move forward. We have many people sitting in the room that have opinions, both good and bad, relative to this project. I think that we owe these three gentlemen and we owe the rest of the people that are sitting here, the people on TV, and people who don't even care. I think we owe them an explanation of how we feel about this project. Each one of us up here, including you Mr. Mayor. I think when we ran the last election people used this as a political weapon and I think this is not a political document, but I think it was used that way before. I think we owe it to the people to have people either throw pitchforks at me or compliment me for voting the way I do and I'm willing to take that and I think everybody else should take the same approach. Obviously I can't force anybody to do that, but I think that it's important for people to understand where you stand on this issue and not just hide by a yes or no vote. So I'll have some other thoughts if no one else....

Mayor Prejna: If you'd like to start.

Alderman Cannon: Sure, is this one or two for me?

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 18

Mayor Prejna: This is number one Mr. Cannon

Alderman Cannon: I've spent, contrary to what some people might say when they walk up here, I have a lot of respect for the other six people that sit up here with me and I think we've spent an awful lot of time on this. I think no one is going to take this vote lightly no matter how they vote for it. So for people to say that we're not taking this seriously, we don't know what we're doing, you're entitled to your opinion, but I think each one of the people up here spent a lot of time and a lot of effort to try to come to a good conclusion. The one thing that I can say no matter what side of the fence you're on, nirvana will not be achieved here. Some people are going to love this. Some people hate it, but you know the property has sat there now since 2004 in different stages. We had a gentleman in this group came in and purchased the property 5 or 6 years ago. To this moment I haven't heard anybody else put any money up to do things that people want. His group is the only one that has come forward to give money, put their money where their mouth is and try to develop a plan. Contrary to what many people will say about Clark Street, to my knowledge they're a development company. They didn't buy the property to sit on it or to give us a hard time or not fill people's needs. I think anybody that thinks that they weren't trying to develop the property doesn't understand what they do for business and doesn't appreciate what they do for the business. They have projects all over the metropolitan area. That is their business. Collier's International is an internationally known company. They couldn't get it done. I myself would love to see all commercial in there. That would be wonderful. I don't think that could possibly happen in today's world. To give you an example last Saturday I was out and I was driving down Northwest Highway in Mt. Prospect. There used to be a big electronics store and a Jake's Pizza that faced the railroad tracks. They were both taken down about 3 years ago. There's a beautiful strip center that goes along there. It's a very attractive looking building and it's been up for over a year now. You can't quote me on this but I think there's only one storefront filled. The other 8 or 10 of them are just sitting there empty. In our city of Rolling Meadows we only need to look over next to the Walmart and see what happened with the Sam's Club. The number one retailer in the world closed that facility a long time because it didn't meet their profit projections. That same company now has closed 63 stores and if you look at the articles about Wheeling, and Naperville specifically, those stores did an incredible amount of sales, but yet they didn't meet profit projections so they closed or are going to close shortly. As much as any of us would like retail in there, it just doesn't seem like it's realistic that it's going to happen. We have plenty of spaces open in Jewel/Osco that have been sitting there for a number of years and hopefully they'll get filled, but so far there's been no one lining up to move in there either. So the bottom line is that I'm for this. I think this is the best solution we have going forward at this time. I know that's not what some people want to hear. Again, the thing I would say is Ryan Homes has come up here and I don't know what the expense is so far, but I'm guessing it's probably a couple hundred thousand dollars with engineering and everything else. No one needs to feel sorry for them, but again they've bet on their pocketbook to move this forward. So at this point they have my support to move forward with this. Thank you.

Mayor Prejna: Mr., or who would like to be first? Mr. Budmats?

Alderman Budmats: Sure, I'll go. So as it personally stands with the .73 acres, each piece, I wouldn't vote for it. But with the renewed plan that came with .8 I'm considering it. I believe in Bennett & Conweather. I knew Lou Conweather. I believe they are a good company, or Collier's now. I think that they know what they're doing. I've seen Ryan Homes' work. I think that they do a nice job. I think overall the project is a good project. I just would like to see the commercial pushed a little further back and get as much commercial space so that we don't limit our options on the Kirchoff Road frontage later just for what would amount to a few townhomes. So whatever we can do to do that I think we're moving in the right direction. I'm glad that there was already some shift and so I'd like to see a little additional shift if it's available, as it presently stands I wouldn't vote for it the way it's being presented

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 19

today. However, all we're voting on is a zoning change with the numbers to follow. I'm willing to vote yes on the zoning change, but not on the numbers as presented.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you. Ms. Majikes, do you pass, or....

Alderman Majikes: No, I'm as Alderman Cannon said none of us up here takes this lightly. Others have been on the council longer than I in dealing with this property and stuff and residents need to remember that the City doesn't own this property. Clark Street Development owns this property. There's only limited things that we can do or ask and say, so it is not up to us to build on this property and I don't think the City's in a position that we're looking to buy the property. So, I like what Clark Street and Ryan Homes have discussed and bought forward. I'm happy with the commercial site on it. I've had numerous residents approach me or call me and say they're in support of this. That is, yes we'd all love the commercial and the vibrant business downtown area, but they're very happy with what is being proposed and this commercial site is being added to it. There's potential, who knows, the City owns the lot kiddy corner from here. Who knows what's going to happen with that. Fire Station 15 when that goes we'll have that lot, so there's going to be other possibilities going on for more development of commercial in the City. So I'm in support of this.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you Ms. Majikes. Does anyone else want to speak? Mr. Banger

Alderman Banger: Thank you. It shouldn't come as any surprise that I'm in support of this. I again think it's the market at work here. Obviously I thought that was the case for South Bay but we sent them packing. I also wanted to mention you know when we pontificate about being pro-business. I think the way we talk and commentary regarding this kind of voids that pro-business aspect. We're pro-business and that might be a piffy statement, but when you start saying we're pro-business, not just this business, or that business. This is a great example of somebody writing a check and that's been my expression all along. These guys were willing to write a check for this property and yes, no sympathy. That's a gamble. I have a low tolerance for risk. These guys have more of a tolerance for risk and they've been out there for several years waiting to develop this and they finally bought something forward that hopefully will move forward and I'm going to vote for it in order to move it forward. Thank you.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you. Mr. Veenbaas

Alderman Veenbaas: Just a minute. I, as like the other aldermen, have thought about this very carefully and I'd like to make a few comments. I talked to a lot of people in my Ward 7 and I would say with the exception of one person who actually wanted to bring a bowling alley back to Rolling Meadows, so I actually made a call when I was Mayor of Rolling Meadows to Lucky Strike to see if they would bring kind of like an entertainment complex here and they weren't interested because of the traffic flow and I kind of understand that if you know what kind of areas they typically locate in, but at least I followed up on it. And when I was Mayor I also included reaching out to local restaurants including some that used to be downtown and asked them to come back and they said it wasn't enough traffic. They weren't coming back. I also got a hold of some other sports activity complexes to see if they were interested and once again they did not have any interest. I personally went to Northwest Municipal Conventions to bring Rolling Meadows ideas when I was the Mayor to see what other communities were doing. To see what they were doing and what we weren't doing. And they did a lot more marketing than us. Did a lot more work than us, but at the end of the day they certainly had a lot more to offer in the areas that they were trying to develop than what we had presently. So I was the one that helped initiate getting Martha Corner here to become our Business Advocate and there were two parts to that. Number one was to retain the businesses that are here that we found out that there was some criticism about how we were

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 20

treating them and we worked on an action plan to improve that, as well as work on new businesses to come. I know she's done a lot of work with Mr. Krumstok, but at the end of the day we haven't gotten too far with respect to this Kirchoff property. So I just want to say that in addition to the survey we did, and we learned a whole heck of a lot, I personally met with Mr. Duda a number of times, both as alderman and as Mayor. I helped shape the fact that we wanted to put commercial businesses in front of this area and I tried to get and negotiate as much acreage as we could and actually I can see whoever's been talking to Mr. Duda and his group, you've actually had more commercial than what I originally saw and that was in I believe in November of about a year ago. In fact I'm the one who also recommended that we don't bring this to the council until we added new alderman. It was an election year. We had to get a new Mayor, new aldermen, and I asked Mr. Duda to put everything on hold until we got a new bunch of aldermen here. So here we are. I'm in support of this. Mr. Duda you've done your best to bring us more commercial property in front and I'll be supporting this. That's all.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you. Any more comments? Mr. D'Astice

Alderman D'Astice: Sure, I'll be the fifth. No we don't take this lightly. Yes I've seen Bristol Moran come up with 300 units, high density, high tall buildings, and more commercial and people said no we don't want that. I saw Uncle Joe's come up and they went belly up. I saw South Bay come up and it was a swell of people saying no we don't want that and I voted against that. And tonight we've had four, well three residents and business owner say they don't want it and we had two residents say they do want it. And I've studied this a lot and much like Ms. Majikes, Mrs. Majikes, and the other members of the council, sure I'd love to see more commercial but I think Mr. Duda and the folks from Ryan have heard the same thing we have heard and they've tried to do their best. They're giving us two restaurants or sites for two restaurants, or sites for up to twelve shops. I think we should be looking forward and not looking backward any longer. We've got sites here. Ms. Majikes said we've got a site kiddy corner. We've got a fire house site coming up and we've lost a site of the area at Golf and Algonquin. That's the money maker for the City right now. That's where we should be focusing our attention. There's a big old warehouse there that we should find the money to buy that out and now we control that and put something in there. Stop waiting around. We waited for this for a long time and we've gotten a good project, but I think we need to be forward looking. We need to look at Plum Grove Road. We need to look at Golf. We need to look at Algonquin. We need to look at the open spaces along Algonquin. We need to be forward looking and stop dwelling on the past. The past is over. I will support this.

Mayor Prejna: I spoke with our City Attorney, Mr. Gallo you qualify for one speak.

Alderman Gallo: So technically I spoke multiple times, but about one subject, so I have one more opportunity to speak. Alderman D'Astice, this is the second time I've heard you make the statement. once was being a resident and citizen out in the seat hearing you say we need to as a City dedicate an employee, an individual to take time to focus on developing and building the community and be forward thinking. And that was the first time that inspired me to get up here because the lack of proactivity that I saw occurring on our council. And I hear you repeating this and it's a groundhog day because nothing has changed since that last time. Here we are with you making a proclamation that we need to dedicate ourselves to finding somebody to find the lot, to make that magic piece fit, right? And I...

Alderman D'Astice: No I didn't say that.

Alderman Gallo: But I feel, rhetorically, so...

Mayor Prejna: Just so you understand, Mr. D'Astice will have the opportunity to respond.

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 21

Alderman Gallo: Yes, I hope so. So rhetorically with that statement, I feel a little bit disheartened that we as a City from the first time over a year ago with the South Bay issue, haven't spent more time working with Fritz and his company to develop this beyond townhouses. And it's nice to have traffic studies and hear things about density and I work with Smart City Initiatives and with the autonomous industry and at a time when you guys talk about having saturated streets. We're working to have less vehicles on the road that get people where they need to be smarter. We're working in an area where the world is quickly changing, specifically regarding technology. It impacts our environment. It impacts our industry, the technical jobs available, and the type of safety, security, and our living space. And forward thinking people, businesses recognize their communities need to be on top of this. But if you can't recognize it, and others can't recognize it, and we won't be a city of choice. And we're not making the right choice if we recurve this for residential use right now without exploring new technologies and initiatives that we can apply here commercially. We're not doing it properly. I would vote no as it stands.

Mayor Prejna: Mr. D'Astice, you have the opportunity to respond.

Alderman D'Astice: I do not wish to respond.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you. Is there any other discussion? Will the Clerk please call the roll?

Alderman D'Astice: Are you going to say anything?

Mayor Prejna: Pardon me?

Alderman D'Astice: Are you going to say anything?

Mayor Prejna: I don't need to say anything.

Alderman D'Astice: I'm just asking.

Mayor Prejna: I will say that I'm disappointed that this has become a political football for a couple of members of the council tonight and that does sadden me, but you know what? I will make the comment, the same comment that I have made before when I was sitting in that seat is that I would like to see this property go back at 50% of it being townhomes or upscale townhomes and 50% of commercial development. I have told that to Mr. Duda on a number of occasions and I've been, I think Fritz you will agree, from the very beginning I've been very honest and open with you and told you how I felt. I have also had discussion with Ryan Homes and I believe I mentioned to you on more than one occasion that I believe that there should be more commercial development in there and I thought that the density was too high. So, that has not changed since I sat in that chair next to you Mr. Cannon and it won't change now. Will the Clerk please call the roll?

Alderman Cannon: Can you refresh, I'm not sure exactly, can you word what we're voting on here?

Mayor Prejna: We're on Ordinance E and we're going to proceed to vote on Ordinance E.

Ms. Cotugno: To move it forward.

Mayor Prejna: To move it forward for 2nd Reading.

Ms. Cotugno: So Cannon yes?

Alderman Cannon: Yes

AYES: Cannon, Majikes, Banger, D'Astice, Veenbaas

NAYS: Budmats, Gallo

ABSENT: 0

The ordinance is moved forward for 2nd Reading.

F. Ordinance / Amend Code for Ambulance Billing (1st Reading)

Mayor Prejna read the background on the ordinance.

Mayor Prejna: Is there a motion to move the ordinance forward for 2nd Reading? Alderman Banger has made the motion and Alderman Gallo has seconded it. Is there any discussion? Mr. Cannon

Alderman Cannon: I guess I'd like to ask our lawyers, is it possible that we could require that like half of this revenue would go to Road Funds only? I know we had that included in there as one of the three, but in light of the fact that we're so short on road funding I was wondering can we dedicate by this ordinance that we could put a certain percent in there.

Mr. Macholl: I don't know why you couldn't do that.

Alderman Cannon: Okay, I guess I'd like to amend it, Mr. Mayor, and offer that 50% of these funds that are collected go to the Road Fund. The other funds can be split over the other 50%.

Mayor Prejna: The motion is 50% Road Fund and 50% to the General Fund?

Alderman Cannon: I think Mr. Krumstok had another item in there also didn't you?

Mr. Krumstok: Well what we had was again pensions, road improvements, and the hedge, so the General Fund overall.

Alderman Cannon: So the General Fund and the pension would get the other 50%?

Mayor Prejna: Okay, do we have a second to that? Mr. Gallo has made that. Is there any discussion on the amendment? Will the Clerk please call the roll on the amendment?

AYES: Cannon, Budmats, Majikes, Gallo, Banger, D'Astice, Veenbaas

NAYS: 0

ABSENT: 0

Mayor Prejna: With 7 in favor and none opposed the amendment passes. Now, we will vote on the, staff recommends updating the fee to \$1500 per ambulance transport. That 50% of the fund balance reserves would go for balance reserves and pensions and 50% would go for road improvements. Is there a motion to move forward with the amended ordinance? Mr. D'Astice made it and Mr. Cannon has seconded. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, will the Clerk please call the roll?

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

The Clerk will move the ordinances forward for 2nd Reading.

➤ **NEW BUSINESS:**

G. MOTION TO APPROVE PAYMENT OF BILLS ON WARRANT 1-23-18.

Mayor Prejna: Is there a motion to approve the January 23, 2018 Warrant as presented by the Finance Department? Alderman Majikes made the motion and it has been seconded. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the Clerk will please call the roll.

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

The warrant was approved.

➤ **CONSENT RESOLUTIONS:**

- H. Resolution No. 18-R-05 / Approve a Class 7b Real Estate Tax Assessment for Substantial Rehabilitation of Commercial Development in the City of Rolling Meadows – 2550 Golf Road (Postponed at the January 9th Council Meeting)**
- I. Resolution No. 18-R-07 / Approve Purchase of Three (3) Police Vehicles**
- J. Resolution No. 18-R-08 / Approve Purchase of Refuse Vehicle**
- K. Resolution No. 18-R-09 / Approve Purchase of Trackless Vehicle**

Mayor Prejna: That brings the council to the resolutions for this evening. There are four of them that could be grouped together in a Consent Agenda if the council so wishes. They are Items H through K. Would any alderman like any of those items stricken from the Consent Agenda? Mr. Cannon

Alderman Cannon: K

Mayor Prejna: Any others? The Chair declares it order for one motion to consider all three in one motion and vote without debate. Is there such a motion? Alderman Majikes made the motion and it has been seconded by Alderman Veenbaas. The question is shall all three resolutions be adopted?

Mayor Prejna read the background on the resolutions.

Mayor Prejna: Will the Clerk please call the roll?

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

The resolutions are adopted.

K. Resolution No. 18-R-09 / Approve Purchase of Trackless Vehicle

Mayor Prejna read the background on the resolution.

Mayor Prejna: Is there a motion to adopt the resolution? Alderman Majikes made the motion and it has been seconded. Mr. Cannon you pulled it so you have first crack at it.

Alderman Cannon: Thank you Mr. Mayor. I guess a couple of things. Obviously I'm on the Vehicle Replacement Committee and we did have a discussion about this vehicle, but I'm, I have some concerns. The first concern I have is now all of a sudden we're buying a remanufactured thing. We did not talk about that in the Vehicle Replacement Committee, so I guess I'd like a little bit of an explanation of what it means to be remanufactured and I guess another question I would have to go along with that could you explain to the council in general what a ribbon blower is please. How much we use it.

Mayor Prejna: Mr. Horne

Mr. Horne: Yes, thank you Mayor. A ribbon blower is basically like a snow blower that would go on the front attachment. It's usually for heavier snow, or heavier snows, larger snowfall events and the item regarding the remanufactured unit, it's my understanding they're not very often available. There's usually less than a half dozen available per year throughout the nation. They're usually only for companies that went out of business. Then the units that were relatively new are repossessions. The company doesn't typically remanufacture units that are older and beat up. So there's usually less than a half dozen. We were going to bring that item to the Vehicle Replacement Committee in February to discuss it, but there are only four left nationwide and we did not want to lose the opportunity to present it to the City Council.

Mr. Cannon: Could you tell me about how much, how often do we use the ribbon blower vs. the V-Plow just in general? I know you don't know specifically. Is it half and half?

Mr. Horne: I honestly, to be quite honest I could not tell you that. I have not been here enough to know.

Alderman Cannon: Because I've never seen the blower myself, but that doesn't mean we're not using it. I just never seen it.

Mr. Horne: I know the guys in recent discussions when we were down doing an inventory of what's at the Old Public Works Facility, said they do use it often. As far as the specifics of that I cannot tell you at this time, but I'd be happy to get that information for you.

Alderman Cannon: I hear what you're saying. Thanks. I guess the last comment that I would make, I was really troubled by this when we were talking about it in Vehicle Replacement only because it's not so much that I'm against the vehicle, but we're spending \$100,000 for a vehicle we use a handful of times every year. I know it's a backup vehicle, but it just seems, in light of where we're at budget wise and all the things we have in front of us, I'm going to vote against this tonight because I'm not willing to spend that much money. I think this is a good value relative to what we were talking about so it's just a lot of money to me to be used a few times a year. That's just an opinion of mine. Thanks for listening.

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 25

Mayor Prejna: Thank you. Any other comments? Mr. Budmats from the Vehicle Replacement Committee. Did you wish to speak?

Alderman Budmats: Yeah, we as a committee talked about this. We voted on it. I know Mike that you objected to it at the time, or you weren't as crazy about it, but they really pushed for this. They said the last one they had they had for 25 years or something and so it's not like if we can spend \$100,000 and keep a piece of equipment for 25 years that's \$4,000 a year so I really, even though it gets used infrequently, I see its value and if we can save enough money by buying a remanufactured unit and get that additional savings I would say we should jump on it while we can.

Mayor Prejna: Thank you Mr. Budmats. Mr. D'Astice.

Alderman D'Astice: Thank you. My question is going to be how much are we saving by buying a remanufactured unit?

Mr. Horne: About \$40,000. The manufactured unit is \$81,000. The brand new unit off the NJPA is about \$120,000. So about \$40,000.

Alderman D'Astice: So by buying a reman, we also get the blower and the V-Plow.

Mr. Horne: Correct sir, yes

Alderman D'Astice: Because otherwise we couldn't get those things.

Mr. Horne: Absolutely true

Mayor Prejna: Thank you. Any further questions from anyone? Will the Clerk please call the roll then?

AYES: Budmats, Majikes, Gallo, Banger, D'Astice, Veenbaas

NAYS: Cannon

ABSENT: 0

The resolution was adopted.

OTHER BUSINESS & REPORTS:

Mayor's Appointments: None

Mayor's Proclamations: None

City Clerk's Report: None

City Staff Reports:

1) Community Items of Interest

- 1) The City, SWANCC, and Elgin Recycling are conducting a holiday light, extension cord, and wire recycling program again. Collection boxes are located outside of City Hall. Items that are accepted include the following items: mini-lights (or Italian lights), c7 lights, C9 lights, rope lights, LED lights, extension cords, house wire, computer wire, etc....All colors and lengths will be accepted. The City cannot accept garland, live greens, wreaths, or other non-recyclables. The program runs through February 16, 2018.

- 2) Future topics at February Committee meetings:

Economic Development (*Tuesday, February 6th at 6:00 pm in the Council Chambers*): tentative items for discussion consist of: 1) new business feedback and contact distribution; 2) 2017 Economic Development Review & New Business Summary; 3) City Lot Across from City Hall (Kirchoff & Owl Drive); 4) business advocate highlight; 5) continued restaurant incentive discussion; 6) items of interest; 7) Chamber of Commerce Update; and 8) other items of interest in the City.

Planning and Zoning Commission: (*Tuesday, February 6th at 7:30 pm in the Council Chambers*): This meeting will deal with Commission training.

2) New Businesses – December 2017

| Company Name | Address | RM or PAL | Contact Name | Phone # | Type of Business | Home Occupation |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|---|----------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Law Offices of Soojae Lee/OP Property Management | 3501 Algonquin Road #532 | R.M. | Soojae Lee attorneysj@gmail.com | 224-3574-6899 | Legal and Property Management | No |
| Royaume Design | 2406 Algonquin Road #1 | R.M. | Felix Figueroa admin@royaumedesign.com | 847-802-8966 | Office for General Contractor | Yes |
| Lone Rover Construction Inc. | 1051 Rohlwing Road #D | R.M. | John Diebolt cleo@lonerover.com | 678-624-1441 | General Contractor | No |
| Hithink Financial Service Inc. | 5005 Newport Drive #500 | R.M. | Peng Liu loo@hithink.com | 847-221-0123 | Mobile App Development | No |
| Atlas Stone Distribution | 3121 Tollview Drive | R.M. | Ziggy Torres ziggy@asdusa.com | 847-690-9345 | Wholesale Natural Stone & Quartz | No |
| FH Paschein, SN Nielsen & Associates LLC. | 3320 Tollview Drive | R.M. | James Blair aellsworth@fhpaschein.com | 773-444-3474 | General Contractor | No |

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 27

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------|---|--------------|------------------------------------|----|
| Neptune Management Corp. | 2380 Hicks Road | R.M. | Leona Hertzendorf Leona.hertzendorf@sci-us.com | 954-556-9424 | Retail Office for Funeral Services | No |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------|---|--------------|------------------------------------|----|

3) Staff Traffic Advisory Report – January 2018

Mr. Horne: The monthly meeting of the Traffic review committee was held on Wednesday January 17, 2018.

The following information is provided to the Mayor and City Council to summarize this meeting:

1. Staff is initiating communications with Cook County Highway Department again in regard to the Euclid Avenue pedestrian crossing at Vermont Street.
2. Parking and truck access issues were discussed along several locations on Berdnick Street.
3. Parking issues along East Frontage Road, south of Central Road appear to have been resolved. It was pointed out that there are some less than desirable locations to park along street curves; however, without them, a number of residents would have no nearby access to on street parking.
4. Two issues with parking and pedestrian conflicts at Fire Station 15 were reported by Fire Department staff; these were referred to Public Works Department for corrective actions.
5. 5521 Meadowbrook Court –An on-street overnight truck parking problem was reported; Police Department is to investigate.
6. Old Plum Grove Road at Brockway Street – Pedestrian/ school children crossing access to and from Plum Grove Jr High School. Police Department staff observation report was discussed; there are very few students observed to be crossing Old Plum Grove Road at Brockway Street, in fact more students were observed to be crossing at the entry to the Grove Park parking lot. Police Resource Officer will be asked to communicate via the school to recommend that students be directed to cross Old Plum Grove Road at the traffic signal at Meacham Road.

The next meeting of the Traffic Review Committee is scheduled for Wednesday February 7, 2018 at 2:30pm.

MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:

Mayor Prejna: Are there Matters Not on the Agenda this evening? Mr. Cannon

Alderman Cannon: Thank you Mr. Mayor. I just want to remind you Mr. Mayor that I'm not going to be here for the next meeting so I don't know if you want to postpone the 2nd Reading or?

Mayor Prejna: We've already had that discussion. If you're not going to be here we'll move it back to the next meeting.

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 28

Mr. Krumstok: Technically it has to show up on the agenda and then it can be tabled by the City Council at that point in time, but it has to follow the procedure. It has to be on the agenda.

Alderman Cannon: Thank you for your consideration.

Mayor Prejna: Anybody else? Alderman Budmats

Alderman Budmats: Several times tonight I've heard about how we have old information about a vehicle traffic study on Kirchoff and how many cars are actually going back and forth. It seems to be in everybody's best interest to have an accurate idea of what the new totals are. We have a bunch of people living in new townhomes so we really don't know what our traffic is there it seems like. It would be in everybody's benefit, including ours, to if we're pushing somebody saying hey we want to put a restaurant here we can at least give them possibly a higher number than 12,500, so I don't know if this is the best time of year to do that or how long it takes to do that, or how much money it costs, but if those are all reasonable things, and if it's something that we can easily accomplish, I'd like to make a motion that we do so.

Mr. Krumstok: We'll get additional information on that.

Mayor Prejna: Can that be a staff report?

Mr. Krumstok: Yeah, we can get a staff report or we can talk to our engineers and get you numbers.

Mayor Prejna: How long, can we get this done by the next time, the 2nd Reading?

Mr. Krumstok: I'm going to first have to talk to Burke Engineering tomorrow and see what their timing is, so I don't want to commit to something, but we will get you something quick.

Mayor Prejna: Okay, if you could after you speak with Burke send out a memo to all members of the council and let them know the status.

Mr. Krumstok: That's the idea.

Mayor Prejna: Okay, thank you. Any other Matters Not on the Agenda?

CLOSED SESSION:

1) Personnel – 5 ILCS 120/2 (c) (1) of the Illinois Open Meetings Act

Mayor Prejna: There is a motion to go into Closed Session for the above. It does require a formal motion and vote. Is there such a motion? Alderman D'Astice made the motion and it has been seconded. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is shall the Council go into Closed Session? The Clerk will please call the roll.

AYES: Cannon, Budmats, Majikes, Gallo, Banger, D'Astice, Veenbaas

NAYS: 0

ABSENT: 0

City Council Meeting

January 23, 2018

Page 29

Mayor Prejna: With 7 in favor and none opposed the council will now enter into Closed Session. The audience and press are advised that we do not anticipate taking any action upon returning to open session.

ENTERED CLOSED SESSION AT: 9:11pm

RETURNED TO OPEN SESSION AT: 9:42

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, by unanimous consent the meeting adjourned.

City Council meeting of January 23, 2018 adjourned at 9:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Ginny Cotugno, Deputy City Clerk

January 23, 2018 Council Minutes Approved by Council on February 13, 2018.

Ginny Cotugno, Deputy City Clerk