

**City of Rolling Meadows
Planning and Zoning Commission
City Council Chambers
7:30 PM
February 5, 2019**

APPROVED

Motion to Open the Meeting

Chairman Bisesi asked for a motion to open the February Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Mr. Whitney moved to open the meeting and Mr. Lynch seconded. Motion carried. Roll call:

Presiding: Chairman Bisesi

Present: Fink, O'Brien, Patterson, Whitney, Lynch, Rybarczyk, Stefaniuk

Absent: Rataiczuk

Also Present: Fred Vogt, Public Works Director; Elizabeth Payne, Administrative Services Coordinator; Barry Krumstok, City Manager; Judy Brose, Deputy City Clerk (Recording Secretary); Martha Corner, Business Advocate

Call to Order

Chairman Bisesi called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Bisesi asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the December 11, 2018 and January 9, 2019 Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Whitney moved to approve the minutes as written and Mr. Stefaniuk seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Fink: Yes

Mr. Lynch: Yes

Mr. O'Brien: Yes

Mr. Patterson: Yes

Mr. Rybarczyk: Yes

Mr. Stefaniuk: Yes

Mr. Whitney: Yes

Chairman Bisesi: Yes

Motion carried. Minutes approved as written.

Upcoming Public Hearings: NONE

Pending Business: NONE

New Business:

- 1. Amendment to Planned Development for additional Tesla Supercharging Stations at 1301 Meijer Drive, C-2 General Commercial Services District, Aaron Adelman, SMJ International, LLC, Petitioner**

Chairman Bisesi asked if the file was in order.

Mr. Vogt stated that the file was in order and was made part of the record.

Jordan Rhyne, Tesla Inc., 3500 Deercreek, Palo Alto, California was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi.

Mr. Rhyne – Just a slight correction, I'm Jordan Rhyne with Tesla, Aaron Adelman is our Petitioner, he handles the engineering and submittal. I'm the developer responsible for this project. Thank you guys for the time this evening. Some of you may already be familiar with our existing project over at Meijer's here in Rolling Meadows. We built a 10 stall supercharger which is an electric vehicle fast charger designed to recharge Tesla's in about 30 to 40 minutes. The reason we're here is kind of exciting, demand has surpassed what we initially thought it might be to the point where we actually, especially on weekends or busy travel times, are seeing congestion at that site which means that all 10 stalls are full and cars are pulling in and actually have to wait in line. That is not ideal, we've gone back to Meijer and they've approved us to add an additional 10 superchargers to the existing parking lot in a similar location. We're actually little further east over in the corner of the lot about as far as you can get from the store. In terms of equipment and design it basically mimics what's already actually on site. We think that these extra 10 stalls will actually continue to serve people in the community who drive electric vehicles and it will also serve people traveling in and out of Chicago as they need to recharge their cars. We're looking forward to hopefully breaking ground sometime this spring if everything lines up. I'll be happy to take any questions or comments

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting to commissioners' questions and comments.

Mr. Stefaniuk - The only question I had was why that site that was more East picked versus the possible future expansion?

Mr. Rhyne – They are some existing utilities in that area and as you may know Meijer will often sell some of the perimeter out lots for future development so not sure what the zoning implications are for that but they basically asked us to choose a new location. That was our first choice, Meijer said maybe there's plans there and if we go in that other corner. We try to work with them closely, they obviously know their properties better than we do. The new location they approved is probably the lowest possible impact for parking.

Mr. Rybarczyk –No questions.

Mr. Patterson – No questions.

Mr. Vogt - Yes.

Mr. Whitney – No questions just a comment. I agree, every time I'm in there it's busy, it's full.

Mr. O'Brien - That was going to be one of my questions. A couple of constituents asked me if it was really that crowded. I'm over there maybe once a month or so and I haven't seen it packed and I'm glad that it is. I was wondering if you had any numbers, there wasn't any numbers in here.

Mr. Whitney – I have never seen with less than five cars when I've been there.

Mr. O'Brien - The only other question I have is in the write up it says additional request for future stalls in the West but on the drawing here to the West it says Meijer doesn't allow that. It seems like it's in conflict. What you looking for, 20 additional stalls, 10 stalls to the east and 10 more in the future to the west? But Meijer says no?

Ms. Rhyme – great question. What we're looking for tonight is just approval for the additional 10 stalls and construction drawings will be coming for those in the far east corner. I think what Elizabeth and Fred was trying to figure out that if we do decide that there will be additional future expansion is that there is a way to do that administratively. That's what that's about we haven't finalized for even when or where the stalls will be.

Mr. O'Brien - Okay, you're looking for approval for additional 10 stalls.

Mr. Lynch - Looking at the space that you've designated for the new stalls and the equipment location. Does that box represent the de facto 10 stalls? The reason I ask that question is there still space to the West of that, why not ask for that entire space to be approved subject to individual permitting later? If there's space there to do 15 but you only want to do 10 now, why not ask us for the entire space and then when your business grows rather than having to come back to us and ask us again, then you've already have the space approved and then it's just a matter of getting permits.

Mr. Rhyme - I think that's what we were trying to do but probably the confusion is that we just don't have the next batch of stalls approved by Meijer. We work with them pretty closely and they also balance all the business they do in terms of how many stalls they give us, we just don't have that approval from them yet. We're developing sites throughout Chicagoland so once we hit the 20 or 20+ stalls we often look to a nearby adjacent property to provide a diversity of experience. If people are coming from different directions, it's nice to spread out our presence a little. It may still be within the City but may not be on the Meijer property. To clarify which stalls will be using, are there copies of construction drawings? That should clarify exactly where our equipment's going in which parking stalls. There should be more specific drawings in your packet.

Mr. Lynch – As I look at A-1 it appears to be showing using the dotted line, those appear to be the 10 spaces that you're looking for now but to the west of that that is six parking spaces. I'm just curious, why not just ask for that whole space now? If you and Meijer can't work it out and you don't use it then you don't have to come back from California to come see us again and we don't have to put time aside for another hearing to do what we might do tonight.

Mr. Rhyne – That’s a great point. I guess to answer, we basically have it considered that yet. We haven’t considered to only come back and add an additional six stalls, typically we don’t because of construction costs. The demand that we are seeing with our cars we don’t add less than 10 stalls at a time. We could in the future use those spaces plus somewhere else on the property, with we just don’t have that finalized yet. I don’t want to ask for approval on specific locations until we know Meijer would approve it and we know that this is exactly where it would be even for the next 10 down the road.

Mr. Vogt – that’s basically what Staff is suggesting/recommending, condition #8 in your packet, approval is granted for an initial 10 additional stalls; 10 additional stalls may be considered administratively provided they conform with the site plan provided to Staff. What you are looking at in your packet is generally what Staff is saying, anywhere along Meijer Drive in that general area whether it’s immediately west of what they’re currently proposing or further to the west at some point. Rather than have the petitioner come back to this body and get ordinances that we can approve that administratively. If they came in five years from now and wanted to build something closer to the store or in another location the next kind of a game changer and they would have to come back based on our current structure. Hopefully that explains what Staff’s recommendation is.

Mr. Lynch – One other question, I’m asking truly out of ignorance, is there a revenue benefit to the City with the stalls?

Mr. Rhyne - To some extent, yes, the reason Meijer likes having us on their property because our customers tend to become their customers. They may already be Meijer customers but what we found that once there’s a fast charger on site people are way more likely to visit that property at a higher rate. So people are being driven to the Meijer store and also if you’re familiar with that property there are some restaurants around the out lot. Some Rolling Meadows residents may already patronize those but were also, because of that location, we know a lot of the traffic comes from surrounding suburbs or from even out of town. Some people are coming into Rolling Meadows and spending money when they may not otherwise.

Mr. Lynch - So if I understand, it’s a secondary revenue generation. The City is not receiving revenue for every car that uses the station.

Mr. Rhyne – Correct.

Mr. Fink – My question is you are familiar with the eight comments from Staff?

Mr. Rhyne - Yes, I am.

Mr. Fink – You have no objections to any of them?

Mr. Rhyne - I was able to review them just before the meeting so at first glanced no issues, we’ll go over the more in-depth with the engineering team and make sure they are feasible. But at first glance everything seems to be reasonable.

Mr. Fink – Okay, the big one for me is the bollards #4, we kind of made that happen on the first set especially around the transformer area because most of the transformers in town are 480 V, you don't

want to car coming around the corner too fast and slide and hitting anything. So for me it's the bollards, that's a big one for me.

Mr. Rhyne – One thing you will notice that will be a different and this is actually a requirement from Meijer and we happily agree, we're going to build an enclosure around the electrical equipment so that won't be the transformer specifically but around our inverters there will actually have full protective gear so would you still like to see bollards in front of that as well?

Mr. Fink - I would like to see bollards as bollards are mirrored like the ones you have next to it. Obviously engineering would get would Staff and figure all that out as far as placement.

Mr. Rhyne – We'll make sure those are in the next set of drawings.

Ms. Payne - I just like to bring up on sheet A – 2 there is bollards proposed around the utility transformer in the lower right-hand portion and all the immediate electrical equipment is simply surrounded by a fence, bollards are proposed on the drawing.

Mr. Fink - the bollards I was speaking of was around their equipment as well to mirror the set next to it.

Chairman Bisesi - I have no questions.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting for comments from the public. With there being no public comment, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Whitney – I'll make a Motion to allow the Amendment to the Meijer Planned Development to allow the installation of additional Tesla Charging Stations with all associated equipment in general conformance to the overall site plan (Sheet A-1) and site plan (Sheet A-2) as prepared by LAB of Wixom, Michigan and dated 1/17/2019, 1301 Meijer Drive, C-2 General Commercial Services District, Jordan Rhyne, Tesla, Petitioner.

With the following conditions:

1. This are is to be monitored with surveillance cameras.
2. There must be three feet of clear area between the sidewalk and any cabinet.
3. Final engineering and landscaping for this part of the subject property is subject to the approval of the City Engineer and Public Works Department. Landscaping is to be consistent with the approved 2017 plan.
4. Protective bollards are to be installed to protect the equipment cabinet.
5. Prior to the issuance of permits, utility locates will be required at the site.
6. The elevation of the proposed transformer must be at a height that will not block driver visibility from the Meijer parking lot.
7. Any parkway trees that would need to be removed must be replaced.

8. Approval is granted for an initial ten additional stalls; ten additional stalls may be considered administratively provided they conform with site plan provided to staff.

Mr. Patterson seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Fink: Yes

Mr. Lynch: Yes

Mr. O'Brien: Yes

Mr. Patterson: Yes

Mr. Rybarczyk: Yes

Mr. Stefaniuk: Yes

Mr. Whitney: Yes

Chairman Bisesi: Yes

Yeas – (8) – Fink, Lynch, O'Brien, Patterson, Rybarczyk, Stefaniuk, Whitney, Bisesi

Nays – (0) - NONE

Absent – (1) – Rataiczky

Abstain – (0) – NONE

Motion approved.

Chairman Bisesi – You have a 8-0 vote with 1 absent, the item would go before the City Council with a positive recommendation.

Mr. Vogt – Scheduled expected to be Tuesday, February 26, 2019, pending 1st reading approval, March 12, 2019 for 2nd reading.

2. **Presentation of the draft Comprehensive Plan presented by Teska Associates, City of Rolling Meadows, Petitioner**

Michael Blue, Teska Associates, 625 Grove St., Evanston, Illinois was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi.

Mr. Blue presented an overview of the draft Comprehensive Plan with a Power Point presentation. The draft plan can be viewed online at www.plan4rollingmeadows.org.

The purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is to provide long-term guidance and vision to the City of Rolling Meadows for physical, social, and economic development. It is not a regulatory document. It provides a blueprint to utilize for future goals and development. The Planning and Zoning Commission, the Mayor, and the City Council can use the plan to assist with budget and land use decisions, and can also use the plan to communicate what the city hopes to see in the future to those in the private sector. Updating the Comprehensive Plan provides conversations with our residents and businesses about City issues, and developing methods to address future questions and issues. This process facilitates bringing everyone together and striving to make the City a better place.

The Comprehensive Plan was developed with nine chapters: Introduction, Community Engagement, Vision and Goals, Sense of Place, People, A Great Place to Be, Getting Around, Environment and Infrastructure, and Implementation. Each chapter provides information about how the plan update was formed, identifying opportunities and ideas for helping to determine the direction the City may take in the future. Appendices is with more specific data, including results of the community survey, are also included.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting to commissioners' questions and comments.

Mr. Vogt - we wanted to point out in our report, we put a schedule out in terms of what may happen from tonight in the way we see it there's two options available. Option #1 would be have the Planning and Zoning Commission members have their discussions, comments and the like, hear from the Public and if comfortable with the Plan where it is now certainly you can decide to vote in favor of the plan or against the plan. We would then go to the Committee-of-the-Whole meeting on February 19, 2019 and subject to input from the city Council at that point possibly first ordinance reading for approval of the plan March 12, 2019 with the formal adoption on March 26, 2019.

Option #2 would be if not comfortable with moving forward informally recommending approval of the Plan tonight would be to allow for comments to continue, in fact we would do that anyway over the next couple weeks, I believe we heard from three of the nine members of this body with email comments in advance of this meeting, you can provide your thoughts tonight or get them to Staff prior to the Committee-of-the-Whole meeting. If you postpone this process, we'll you look at the March 5, 2019 meeting unless there was some strong desire to have a meeting before March 5 and we can get a quorum and have to advertise for a special meeting, it might be rather challenging but certainly we can consider that. That would simply push the process back. Staff feels the February 19, 2019 Committee-of-the-Whole meeting is good to have Council input at that point and not wait any further. We could run the two simultaneously. If this body chose to do that, when you have your special meeting or you postpone it to your regular scheduled meeting on March 5, 2019 you'll have the

opportunity to hear public comments and comments from the City Council members as well before deliberating further on this.

I wanted to point those two options out which we think would be the proper path. From Staff's point of view we're not wanting to just let the process go on forever, just trying to set some schedules and set some target dates. We certainly understand those dates can be changed, there is no deadline that we have to approve it by a certain date but we want to keep the process moving forward. I think we've done a reasonably good job over the past six months working with the consultant, the focus groups, the workshops and the like. That's where we are right now before you take the meeting any further.

One other thing, keep in mind that the Comprehensive Plan Update is intended to be an overview, a plan, a tool, a guide. As Michael blue said we're welcoming all comments even things that get down in the weeds and the details but we do have to use some discretion in regards to not getting too into the weeds, too into the details and too into the implementation for future groups to use. The Comprehensive Plan is a guide for future use land considerations. That Staff's input for now.

Mr. Bisesi - I'd like to actually have a quick discussion regarding those options before we get into the real formal part whether we're going to approve this or not. Get kind of a feel for what the Commission would like to do. I definitely want this plan, at least in my personal opinion, something that is fully vetted in the community has had a chance since it just went up on the City's website.

Ms. Payne - If I'm not mistaken it went live Thursday of last week.

Mr. Bisesi - I doubt if anyone has really had a chance to review it. If there's some way we can publicize, we want to make sure the community is well aware that this is what's in it. It's not ordinances, it's not saying this is what we have to do, it's just a tool to preserve and create the things we want for the City. With that said, I was wondering if there was any other Commissioners that have any thoughts regarding the timetable.

Mr. Whitney - I don't think I would be comfortable approving it tonight. I like what I saw. I've learned some things. I was expecting more detail and I sent my comments in, and then I went to look at a couple of other plans and realize my expectations were probably a little bit off. I was expecting a little bit more than what the scope was. I actually put this out on a Facebook page and got a few people looking at it but I just don't think the community had enough time to respond. For something like this I would have expected to see quite a few more people out in the audience and we're not seen that. I think we need to give the community a little more time to respond. We need to give our comments a chance to discuss as well. I would be comfortable with presenting it to the Committee-of-the- Whole meeting but I think as a group we still need to keep moving it forward and make sure by the time we get to the middle of March we have a final plan and the City Council can approve it at that point.

Mr. O'Brien - I kind of felt the same way as Mr. Whitney but I was the opposite. Being the first time doing the Comprehensive Plan I guess I had different expectations but when I went and looked at others I thought it was right in line. I'm personally moving ahead, the feedback I gave was more of a consistency perspective of what I saw on the document but I'm personally comfortable knowing that, yes larger attendance, people attend more of the City Council meetings so by the low turn out tonight

I don't think that's a apprehension to it. It's just that there are more attendance at those meetings versus the Planning and Zoning. I don't want to delay something just to delay something.

Mr. Patterson - I would like to hold it over to the next regular scheduled meeting.

Mr. Lynch - I know in my comments some got into the weeds, wordsmithing certain sentences, I get that, it's what I spent 40 years doing. There are other points that I thought were more general and needed to be addressed. I would like to see more public participation, I understand both of what Elizabeth has told me and from what I heard here this evening. My colleagues have also submitted comments. Elizabeth said that she's taking all the written comments that we've generated and combine them and I'd like to see what those are. I like to know what others are thinking before we get into a more general conversation where we find that we're repeating things etc. etc. Gives us the chance I think to build some common interests we can build on if something needs to be built on. I would be uncomfortable voting on it tonight but I also understand that there is a desire to have this done before we have a new City Council. I don't have a problem with the timeline either, for example does it make sense for us and is there time, is there an opportunity to create a working session where in effect we operate it like a COW meeting. Going in the back and facing each other, the public and talk to us instead of a formal meeting.

Chairman Bisesi - That's kind of like what I was envisioning. I was thinking we'd have some sort of a special meeting. There's the public notice constraints on that but I think if it's something that that we as a Commission would be in favor of, I think we should make the decision tonight so that we can get the proper public notice and not delay any of our other things. I think we were looking at the calendar and thinking that the first date that we can possibly do that would be like the 2/26 or something.

Mr. Vogt – With Tuesday's being taken for a Council meetings and Committee-of-the-Whole that would be rather awkward unless met at 5:30 PM or 6:00 PM or in a different room at the same time as a Council meeting or you can look at a Wednesday. We would need to know very soon.

Ms. Payne - If this is going to be a special meeting we are not constrained to Tuesday's or Wednesdays, we can have it Saturday morning, a Friday evening whatever it was that the Commission so desires. If this is the direction that the Commission would desire, I would request that potential dates be sent to me by the end of the week so that I can compile when we would have a quorum at a minimum of people who could attend and then start getting together the required documentation and public notice and all the stuff that you guys have to sign as well.

Mr. Lynch - The idea of a Saturday morning meeting would do a lot to encourage and facilitate residents to attend.

Ms. Payne – Staff will look at their calendars and if it's acceptable to the Commission I will pick out a couple of dates and times and reach out to the Commission.

Mr. Vogt – Staff will be here regardless.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting for comments from the public.

Lara Sanoica, 4126 Jody Ct., Rolling Meadows, IL was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi.

Ms. Sanoica – What I noticed in the draft plan is there was a nice mention of the multiculturalism that exists in the City. The stats that were 27% of the community was born in another country in about 37% speak a language at home that was not English. As a concern to involve the entire community what efforts have been done to make sure that these plans are accessible to those residents?

Chairman Bisesi - I think that's an excellent question.

Mr. Blue - It's all in, it's all on the website. We have not done specific translations or looked to translate it. We haven't had anybody that came to either the open house or any of these meetings that was looking for translation services. If they had or if we had a request we would have done that. We didn't have a call for it. It's not unusual for people where English is a second language to not come to the meetings but we've posted everything that's we've done through the meetings on the web which makes it sort of translatable of itself through the magic of Google translate. Beyond that we really have not had a request so we haven't done any of that.

Ms. Sanoica – So one of my suggestions would be for either someone on the Commission or enlisting someone who is involved with the various communities that we have within Rolling Meadows in order to reach out. Our consultant was talking about having a really strong connective network for our economic development initiatives and part of that might be reaching out to business owners that weren't necessarily born here in the United States because I think they still have a perspective that might be really useful for us or help us think in a way that we really haven't thought of before. That's my suggestion. I wonder if we have any connections on the business side such as the Chamber of Commerce for any business owners that are not involved?

Mr. Vogt - We can certainly communicate with the Chamber of Commerce and reach out if it hasn't already been out there. It is on our website but we can certainly make some efforts to find out if there's anyone that's interested in obtaining information in multi-language, they need to reach out to us and we would certainly facilitate as we can.

Mr. Krumstok - When the committees were being formed, we did reach out to businesses in different locations and different groups. It just wasn't businesses it was also some of the property owners and landowners who are diverse. The information sessions is where you would get the feedback.

Mr. Vogt – No reason why we can't do that one more time.

Ms. Sanoica – Or perhaps ask what might be more convenient. Elizabeth mentioned earlier that maybe a weekend would be more helpful for these individuals to be able to make these types of meetings as well.

Mr. Lynch - If I could ask a question, Mike to your point about Google translate, is there a way in which when you click on the link to the report that we can also incorporate a Google translate link?

Mr. O'Brien - I'm speaking from the Park District because I sit on that board too, that's what we did with our community survey. With the consultant there was a Google translate option embedded in the link from the Park District site, we wanted to make it optional for the residents with multi-languages.

Chairman Bisesi - Is that something may might want to suggest to the City to put it on the City's website? I'm sure there's more than just the Comprehensive Plan that some people might want to look at?

Mr. Vogt - Technologically I can't speak to that, but we will certainly look at reasonable efforts to do that and we can also use our police resources in terms of getting the word out via some of the staff that are multi lingual.

Mr. Lynch - Realistically it may be that we just don't have the time or resources to do what you're suggesting. Not that they're not good ideas, clearly the City wants to be inclusive and we want to be inclusive which is one of the reasons why we're not voting on this tonight. We just may not be able to do it unless there's a piece of technology that we can incorporate into the link.

Mr. Blue - I don't know how the technology works. Google translate might do something, will look into it. I think it's a great idea I'm just clueless as to what the technology can do.

Ms. Sanoica - With all due respect, I am a certified translator in English and Spanish so the technologies that do exist I think Google translate is viable for English and Spanish. I'm uncertain as to what that English and Polish accuracy rates would be but I think that it's really important for Rolling Meadows if they are going this route and demonstrate that they are making initiatives to be more diverse with our communities then we should proceed from a professional standpoint. If that's the case then having just a Google translate button might not send the right message. If we have someone in outreach, Fred mentioned someone from the police department, who could be that person that someone could communicate with might be more effective than just a button.

Chairman Bisesi - I was also wondering how hard it would be have a version translated?

Mr. Blue - We've done that in other communities, I would tell you it's no small feat.

Mr. O'Brien - It gets real pricey because we looked into that at the Park District. It almost became cost prohibitive.

Ms. Sanoica - For a 130 page document you're looking at about \$6 – 7,000 for a professional translation.

Chairman Bisesi - I would rather spend that on other ways of communicating with the diverse group that we have in our City.

Mr. Patterson - it's a possible idea, is there some way that we could just put a note if you have a language barrier please contact us. As far as I've heard nobody has come forward yet requesting an additional language.

Ms. Sanoica - With all due respect Commissioner, I don't think there's anyone here that comes to the meetings...

Mr. Patterson - That's my point, they don't show up and they don't participate.

Ms. Sanoica - I misspoke, what I mean to say is instead of investing resources in creating these documents that no one will read, as you mentioned earlier, having someone as an outreach contact person who's already involved in the community might be way more effective.

Mr. Patterson - I'm not saying that it's not a good idea to incorporate other languages but how many other languages are spoken in Rolling Meadows?

Ms. Sanoica - At least 37% of the population, a significant amount.

Mr. Patterson - If 37% all speak Spanish...

Ms. Sanoica - If that's their preferred language at home that it's not a problem.

Mr. Rybarczyk - If that's 37% of the population that were not communicating with, that's not true.

Mr. Patterson - How many languages are involved? Not the quantity of people.

Mr. Blue - I think the idea of the outreach and making it not just Google translate and not just any one thing, I think it speaks not just to the ability to be able to understand the Plan. It's also general outreach, it's also making people know that they're part of the community.

Mr. Whitney - I run a Commission called Crime Stoppers and we have a definite language barrier, we have a lot of people from the East Park Apartment Complex that don't speak very little English. So what we have is a translator from the Police Department that sits in there at the meetings. It's a little confusing because I talk and then she translates but we get our point across, we can include them that way and it works pretty well.

Ms. Sanoica - I guess I would like to emphasize that it might be important to have somebody else in the community that's not associated with Crime Stoppers or the Police Department because that doesn't necessarily have the best optics. When you're dealing with one community it's only associated with crime.

Mr. Lynch - I think he only use that as an example.

Ms. Sanoica - I understand. I just wanted to bring that point up as well. Those were all the comments I had.

Chairman Bisesi - Thank you very much. Is there anyone else would like to speak?

Annette Szafran, 2309 Central Rd., Rolling Meadows, IL was sworn in by Chairman Bisesi.

Ms. Szafran - I really appreciate the comments that this young lady had and I think there are some great opportunities and great value into what she said. I also think that a lot of the English speaking families, when you say a Comprehensive Plan they really don't understand, it's not really been publicized enough in our local papers of what exactly this is. It says it's a Plan for the future for land-use, that's not enough for people to get involved and unfortunately I think the weather really prevented a lot of people tonight from coming out. We were gutsy, we came out. So I think you have to make it more clear in what the Plan is for, what it's covering, maybe include some of the ideas that we can all share for the future growth of our little City and let the people know this. Voting on it whether it goes forward or not tonight or even two weeks from tonight is not enough time for people to hear what this Plan is doing. By the way, I think the plan is really well written from what we heard tonight from the speaker. Something kept running through my mind as I heard this, a lot of good points, a lot of interesting things that I didn't think of before. One of the things that came to me was you talked about communication, connecting with our business community and I think for a long time we have not made big efforts for our major corporations. I worked in my career for a major corporation for a short time in Schaumburg and if I said the name you would all know who it is, worldwide company. They connected with Schaumburg in a lot of ways, we had United Funds, we had little things that Schaumburg brought in and we all got involved. We never had that here, ever. We never had any kind of challenges or connections with Northrop, Weber, Gallagher, we don't have that connection. The little stores and the little places. To make our town grow better we have to seek all communication with all the businesses. I think that's really been one of the things that has been preventing more industries from coming into Rolling Meadows. A lot of times we just feel like they're there and that's it, we don't connect with them the way that many other communities do. Arlington Heights, Palatine, Schaumburg, we're surrounded by these big communities and they incorporate some fun things that the businesses that are there. We don't look to that as an avenue, we don't look to that as a way to communicate to strengthen that tie that's lacking. I think that's a major thing that the Plan should consider, better communication. I don't know how it's done, that's not my expertise but part of that Plan should look into that. That's really what I wanted to say.

Chairman Bisesi - There are opportunities that we have had in the past. I do know there's been some work that the City's done and things that the corporations, back when I worked at 3Com I know they helped with the computer system for the City. I know there's things that Northrop donates when I used to run 4 July parade and we got a lot of donations in exchange for visibility of their stuff.

Ms. Szafran - That had to be a very long time ago.

Mr. Vogt - We can name some right now but I do want to get into it.

Chairman Bisesi - There is some of it but there needs to be more and I agree 100% of what you're saying.

Mr. Patterson - Maybe it needs to be more publicized because I know there's a lot of interfacing between us and Northrop, it's just not advertised.

Mr. Vogt - There are several companies that do interactions with the City and organizations, I don't want to get into listing them because of probably forget somebody, it's not publicized often enough.

Chairman Bisesi – We need to as Mike said, we need to celebrate some of those things, make people aware. I'm going to guess the majority of the people don't know that that's going on. The only way I knew was because I worked at the company.

Ms. Szafran – I think that's the message we need to have.

Chairman Bisesi - I think that something we talked about at ad hoc team, some of the brainstorming that we did, we really need to keep in touch and we really need to foster those relationships.

Mr. Blue - That was really an area of emphasis from these folks as we talked about the Plan. We talked about all those recommendations and it really was an area of emphasis. Not just the ones that are here but the ones we want to bring here. The City has been doing more of that in recent years and that's why we were comfortable putting a lot of that in terms of the recommendations in the Plan because the City's building capacity to do just what you're talking about.

Chairman Bisesi - And what can we do to set us apart? So that that business that's looking for new location is saying there's this building on Golf Road that I can do some rehab like what Gallagher did and bring 500-1000 jobs into the community. But there has to be something in it for them, not necessarily TIFF's but a reason why they want to come here.

Ms. Szafran - The other comment I had, you mentioned about calling this City Center instead of downtown, I think most people relate downtown to downtown Chicago.

Chairman Bisesi – Thank you very much for your comments.

With there being no further public comment, the public hearing was closed.

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:

Chairman Bisesi opened the meeting to additional questions and comments from the commissioners.

Mr. O'Brien - we've had a half-dozen people that came out here in the weather there is nothing saying in two weeks we're going to have a foot of snow. This is just me, the last couple items that we've kick the can down the road for something else and we've been asked to be here by previous Mayors and previous Staff. By kicking it down the road some that might not be respecting everybody in the room here that came tonight. I'm comfortable, I've reviewed the material and I might be the only aye or nay vote depending on how it gets worded. I feel we've been put here to make some suggestions and not kick the can down the road any further.

Mr. Lynch - I can appreciate that but based on my vote counting here it would be defeated.

Mr. Patterson - Additionally, when it was first suggested, I'd say a good third of the heads that were here bobbed up and down by the suggestion of postponing it. Not just on our side but in the audience.

Chairman Bisesi - I'm kind of thinking that it might be a good idea, if there are comments or if there is anything that the Commissioners would like to add within reason, we should probably have a discussion regarding those comments.

Mr. Vogt - I certainly encourage the Commission and even from the public standpoint once the Plan is online, if there's comments get them to Staff because I would envision that we need to assemble comments, opinionate or input back on comments both with consultant and from the Staff perspective and give you time to digest them before we have a meeting. Looking ahead on the calendar, if we could get your input one way or the other in the next two weeks or before the Committee-of-the-Whole meeting on 2/19 that would certainly help. We will take it upon ourselves to put comments into that staff report we prepare that for the Committee-of-the-Whole as well as our consultant is scheduled to be here 2/19 for presentation to the Committee-of-the-Whole.

Mr. Blue – We got our first comment on the website, by the way.

Mr. Lynch - Do you need a formal motion and vote by us tonight to direct you to find a workshop date? Or do we need to formally put off this petition that's before us?

Mr. Payne - I think it would depend on the Commission's direction with regards to where they want to go. If it is The Commission's direction that they want to vote on the plan tonight which is sounding like it's not the case but if that is the Commission's desire the language has already been provided to you. If you wish to postpone to the March 5 meeting I can provide some language for that, if you wish to postpone to a special meeting I can wordsmith something for that as well because there is no certain date for that, that something to be scheduled. I need a motion regardless to handle this matter for this evening. What kind of motion depends on what the Commission wants to do next.

Mr. Lynch - My sense is that it's in two parts, one is, if I hear you correctly, a motion to postpone formally this line item until March 5. The second would be to formally request the Staff to identify and set a date by which the Commission will come together in a public meeting without any intent to vote but to discuss this Plan.

Ms. Payne - The Commission would formally request a workshop to be scheduled at a date later in February. If the special meeting that we're discussing is meant to be only a workshop format and no action will be taken, I do not need a motion about that. I just need a motion to postpone this matter to the March 5 meeting. In the meantime, if the Commission would formally direct Staff to schedule a special workshop prior to the March 5 meeting we can get started on that.

Mr. Lynch moved to postpone the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, as created and presented by Teska Associates, City of Rolling Meadows, petitioner, to a future Planning and Zoning Commission meeting on March 5, 2019 at 7:00 PM in the City Council Chambers with a workshop to be determined prior to March 5, 2019.

Mr. Whitney seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Fink: Yes

Mr. Lynch: Yes

Mr. O'Brien: No

Mr. Patterson: Yes

Mr. Rybarczyk: Yes

Mr. Stefaniuk: Yes

Mr. Whitney: Yes

Chairman Bisesi: Yes

Yeas – (7) – Fink, Lynch, Patterson, Rybarczyk, Stefaniuk, Whitney, Bisesi

Nays – (1) – O'Brien

Absent – (1) – Rataiczkyk

Abstain – (0) – NONE

Chairman Bisesi - With a vote of 7-1 with 1 absent in favor of postponing this matter to March 5, 2019 with a workshop to be determined in February.

Miscellaneous Business: NONE

Matters Not on the Agenda: NONE

Reports:

Mr. Payne – Next month we will have three matters on the agenda, 1) this current matter, the recommendation of the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan draft as continued from today, 2) a PUD amendment for Continental Towers to install charging stations in their parking lot similar to what we saw tonight with Meijer and Tesla and 3) I know you all have been waiting for this, we finally have submittals for the Dominick's property from Taylor Morrison for the final subdivision into three lots, two commercial and one roughly 9 acre residential and final PUD for the residential development which will be approximately 106 townhomes as submitted with other minor changes per Staff request. That's the agenda for March 5.

Mr. Lynch – Can we start earlier that night?

Chairman Bisesi – I actually think that might not be such a bad idea.

Mr. Patterson – At least move it to 7:00 p.m.

Chairman Bisesi – I'll need a motion for that.

Mr. Whitney made a motion to we start the next regularly scheduled March 5, 2019 meeting at 7:00 PM instead of 7:30 PM.

Mr. Patterson seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Fink: Yes

Mr. Lynch: Yes

Mr. O'Brien: Yes

Mr. Patterson: Yes

Mr. Rybarczyk: Yes

Mr. Stefaniuk: Yes

Mr. Whitney: Yes

Chairman Bisesi: Yes

Yeas – (8) – Fink, Lynch, O'Brien, Patterson, Rybarczyk, Stefaniuk, Whitney, Bisesi

Nays – (0) – None

Absent – (1) – Rataiczkyk

Abstain – (0) – NONE

Chairman Bisesi - With a vote of 8-0 with 1 absent in favor of starting the next scheduled meeting at 7:00 PM.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Whitney and seconded by Mr. O'Brien. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote. The regular meeting of the February 5, 2019 Planning and Zoning Commission was adjourned at 9:47 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Judy Brose

Judy Brose

Deputy City Clerk

Distribution:

Mayor

City Manager

Planning and Zoning Commissioners

Community Development Department

Clerk's Office

Minutes approved at the March 5, 2019 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as written.