THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
TONI PRECKWINKLE
PRESIDENT

EARLEAN COLLINS	1st Dist.	PETER N. SILVESTRI	9th Dist.
ROBERT STEELE	2nd Dist.	BRIDGET GAINER	10th Dist.
JERRY BUTLER	3rd Dist.	JOHN P. DALEY	11th Dist.
STANLEY MOORE	4th Dist.	JOHN A. FRITCHEY	12th Dist.
DEBORAH SIMS	5th Dist.	LARRY SUFFREDIN	13th Dist.
JOAN PATRICIA MURPHY	6th Dist.	GREGG GOSLIN	14th Dist.
JESUS G. GARCIA	7th Dist.	TIMOTHY O. SCHNEIDER	15th Dist.
EDWIN REYES	8th Dist.	JEFFREY R. TOBOLSKI	16th Dist.
		ELIZABETH ANN DOODY GORMAN	17th Dist.

ZONING BOARD OFAPPEALS
OF THE COUNTY OF COOK
ANDREW PRZYBYLO
SECRETARY

69 West Washington
Suite 2840
Chicago, Illinois 60602
TEL (312) 603-0540
FAX (312) 603-9941

ADDENDUM TO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COOK COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

December 15, 2014

Please note this document is an Addendum to the previous Findings of Fact on Chicago Title Land Trust Co. Trust Agreement 5/19/13 T#8002361908MA-14-02, SU-14-03, and V-14-08, dated September 17, 2014.

Re: Chicago Title Land Trust Co.
Trust Agreement 5/19/13 T#8002361908
MA-14-02, SU-14-03, and V-14-08
CC District #14

Applications:

1) Map Amendment to rezone approximately 44 acres of the Subject Property from P-2 Open Land District to an R-6 General Residence District for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) of 137 residential units;

2) Special Use for a PUD in the R-6 General Residence District (if granted under companion MA-14-02) for twenty one (21) detached single family homes, seventeen (17) duplex containing thirty four (34) units and eighty two (82) multi-unit (townhouses) for a total of 137 residential units, and

3) Variation in R-6 General Residence District (if granted under companion MA-14-02 & SU-14-03) to reduce rear yard setback for duplex and townhome lots from minimum required 40' to 25'; reduce corner side yard setback for townhome lots from minimum required 21.5' to 20'; increase the F.A.R for duplex lots from 0.5 to 0.66 and increase the F.A.R. for townhome lots from 0.6 to 0.73 in Section 18 of Northfield Township.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommendation of Approval.

BACKGROUND SUMMARY

The Subject Property consists of approximately 43.22 acres, located north of Techny Road and west of Western Avenue in Northbrook, in Northfield Township, Unincorporated Cook County, Illinois. The Subject Property address is 1677 W. Mission Hills, Northbrook, Illinois 60062. The PINs are 04-18-200-004-000, 004-18-200-020-0000 and 04-18-200-037-0000.

Pursuant to due notice, a public hearing was originally set for July 9, 2014 at the Village of Northbrook Board Room, 1225 Cedar Lane, Northbrook, Illinois 60062 1:00 pm but, due to overflow from the unanticipated extraordinarily large number of residents who wished to attend the hearing, the public hearing was continued to July 21, 2014 at 1:00 PM at the Glenbrook North High School's Sheely Center for Performing Arts Auditorium, 2300 Shermer Road, Northbrook, Illinois, 60602.

*** October 8. 2014, by direction of the Cook County Board of Commissioners, the companion zoning applications concerning the subject property located at 1667 Mission Hills Road in Unincorproated Cook County, Illinios was remanded back to the Zoning Board of Appeals so that Zoning Board of Appeals so that additional testimony may be collected.**

Pursuant to public notice, a public hearing was held at the Niles Human Services, 999 Niles Center Road, Niles, Illinois 60714, on Monday, November 10, 2014 at 1:00 PM.

In attendance for the applicant Attorneys James Banks, Nick Ftikas and Sara Barnes, Law Offices of Samuel V.P. Banks; Todd Fishbein, President of Applicant RSD Mission Hills, LLC., Terrence O'Brien, Terrence O'Brien & Co.; Appraiser, Ron Adams, Civil Engineering w/ Pearson Brown; Luay Aboona, KLOA Traffic Consultant; Erik Doersching, Feasibility Analysis.

Also present at the hearing were Thomas Boyle, Law Firm of Burke Warren Mackey, Serritella, Bernard Citron, Law Office Thompson Coburn, Daniel Creaney P.E. , Daniel Creaney Company, professional engineer, Michael McCann, McCann Appraisal and Consulting, Steve M. Lenet AICP/ASLA, Principal LCT Design, Karen Jump, Mission Hills Open Lands; *Representing Commissioner Greg Goslin's Office, 14th District.*

In addition, testimony was heard from the following residents of the neighborhood: Karen Jump, Mission Hills Open Lands; Mike Delamore, 3851 Mission Hills Road, Irv Kolesky, 1740 Mission Hills Road, Rose Kahn, 1621 Mission Hills Road, Valerie Weiss, 1800 Mission Hills Road, Francine Stein, 3900 Mission Hills, Sharon Hartman, 1721 Mission Hills, Norman Levine, 1771 Mission Hills, Larry Chavo, 1771 Mission Hills, Wallace Sweet, 3821 Mission Hills Road, Marsha Marco, 1831 Mission Hills, Michael Nees, 1656 Mission Hills, Ynez Draden, 3741 Mission Hills, Thomas Poupard, a staff member with the Village of Northbrook Development and Planning Services Department, Sheila

Chinsky, 3816 Mission Hills, Sherry Natenberg, 3741 Mission Hills, Katherine Bronner, 3751 Mission Hills and Ron Malvin, 1740 Mission Hills, Pat Dolan, 3911 Mission Hills.

Objector's Case in Chief – Direct Testimony

Attorney Bernard Citron of Thompson Coburn, LLP, served as lead counsel for the Objectors. Mr. Citron's first witness was Daniel Creaney. Mr. Creaney is a registered professional engineer. Mr. Creaney testified that he was retained by the Objector's counsel to review the site plan and engineering plans submitted by the Applicant. Mr. Creaney testified to the existing patterns of water flow on the subject site. He further testified that because onsite water currently flows toward the Mission Hills residential properties, flooding is already an issue of concern. That flooding can, at times, extend beyond the Mission Hills residential property and onto the neighboring properties, including near the public streets. Mr. Creaney testified he was concerned with the inadequacy of the existing culverts under Sanders Road to handle the water from the site. Mr. Creaney testified that the proposed development provided adequate storm water detention, but that the downstream water flow conditions as a whole would need to be thoroughly studied (page 45-46 of the Remand Transcript). Mr. Creaney indicated that he would feel more comfortable with the plan should it comply with the newly enacted Cook County Watershed Ordinance (page 51 of the Remand Transcript). After direct questioning by Attorney Citron, Chairman Freeman questioned whether Mr. Creaney had prepared a report or compiled data to support his positions. Mr. Creaney indicated he did not prepare a report and instead was testifying based on his personal experience and understanding of the existing site conditions. When Chairman Freeman pointed out that most, if not all, of the issues raised by Mr. Creaney had been addressed by the Applicant's engineer in either his report or his oral testimony at the prior hearing Mr. Creaney testified that he had only reviewed the preliminary plans for the Applicant's proposal and had not reviewed the engineering report submitted by the Applicant or the Applicant's engineer's testimony at the prior hearing.

After the direct examination, Mr. Creaney was questioned by the ZBA Commissioners.

The second witness for the Objectors was Michael McCann. Attorney Tom Boyle handled the direct examination of the Objector's second witness. Mr. McCann testified that he is a real estate appraiser and consultant, and was serving as the Objector's primary appraisal consultant. Mr. McCann testified that he was retained to assess whether the Applicant's project would cause a diminution in value to the surrounding properties, and in particular, the dwelling units located within the Mission Hills residential community. Mr. McCann testified that he reviewed the Cook County Zoning Ordinance and standards as they relate to property values. He explained that he researched the transaction history within the Mission Hills residential community to determine whether there was a view premium attributable to a golf course view. Mr. McCann testified that he has appraised other golf course properties in Illinois, including some with a residential component surrounding the golf course. Mr. McCann opined that homes with an expansive view of the golf course are valued above other similar properties in the same neighborhood. McCann summaries his four (4) general opinions as follows (page 79 of the Remand Transcript): One – the new residential development will impair the view amenity and the value of adjacent mission Hills condos and townhomes; Two – the value diminution is quantifiable and amounts to a 15% reduction that totals about $6.25 million; Three – the

Applicant's Appraisal Report provides no empirical support for the claim that there will be no value impact; and Four – the golf course, if run by a competent golf course management company, should be viable.

After providing the four (4) general opinion and conclusions statements, Mr. McCann explained his analysis and the PowerPoint Presentation he prepared for the Remand Hearing. The PowerPoint Presentation included photographs of the Mission Hills units, various golf course views from those units, and Mr. McCann's calculations and data. Mr. MaCann explained that he Mr. McCann then explained how he assigned a view ranking to each of the units he studied. The witness then explained that based on the purchase and sale prices of the units within each view category, a 15-16% difference in value was identified among the units (pg. 91 of the Remand Transcript). Mr. McCann opined that the unit's view was the factor attributable to the difference in value.

Mr. McCann next opined regarding the purchase price and viability of the golf course. His opinion, again, was that a competent golf course management company could make the golf course operate at a profit, especially considering the $1 million purchase price paid by the current property owner.

Mr. McCann next offered a critique of Mr. O'Brien's Appraisal Report for the Applicant. McCann indicated that the subject property is not vacant and is instead improved with a golf course banquet facility & clubhouse , bunkers water features, greens and tree areas constructed, landscaping planted and going through the maturation process (pg. 97 of the Remand Transcript). McCann further opined that Mr. O'Brien's testimony that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on neighboring property values was incorrect (pg. 95 of the Remand Transcript).

Mr. McCann then testified that the proposed rezoning of a portion of the golf course property would amount to a transfer of equity from the condo owners to the golf course investor.

Mr. McCann concluded that the proposed residential development and corresponding zoning applications would negatively impact the surrounding properties, and that the same changes could negatively impact the operations of the nine-hole golf course that is to remain (pg. 110 of the Remand Transcript). .

After the direct examination, Mr. McCann was questioned by the ZBA Commissioners.

The third witness for the Objector was Steve Lenet. Mr. Citron handled the direct examination of Mr. Lenet. Mr. Citron debated with Chairman Freeman regarding Mr. Lenet's ability to testify to the underlying zoning and jurisdictional issue concerning the expired Planned Unit Development and restrictive covenant. Chairman Freeman considered the argument, but the board ultimately held that the legal question had been resolved and that no further testimony on that issue would be appropriate during the Remand Hearing (page 133 of the Remand Transcript).

Mr. Lenet, when called to testify, presented himself as a consultant with 27 years of experience in the land use planning and zoning field. Mr. Lenet offered that he prepared the Cook County Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Lenet maintained that he was retained by the Cook County Board of Commissioners

in 1997 to update the 1976 Cook County Comprehensive Land Use and Policy Plan. Per Mr. Lenet, the comprehensive plan and policies are still the official policies of the Cook County with respect to the land use for unincorporated Cook County. Mr. Lenet testified that he had reviewed the plans and testimony of the Applicant's case in chief in preparation for the Remand Hearing. Mr. Lenet then explained the reasoning and objective for establishing open space opportunity areas within Cook County. This open space opportunity areas went on to include golf course properties. Per Mr. Lenet, as of 1999, the official Cook County policy was to maintain to the greatest degree possible of open space. He stated that Mission Hills carries the designation of open space according to the official map designation (page 143 of the Remand Transcript). Mr. Lenet next explained that official maps are used by municipalities to show future rights of way and future public areas. Per the witness, the official maps give the affected governmental agency one (1) year to acquire property in instances where a proposed use differs from an opportunity use.

Mr. Lenet next offered that the underlying zoning is considered when applying the standards for a PUD. Mr. Lenet opined that he knows the zoning ordinance and zoning maps better than anyone. His opinion is that the property is under one PUD – Chairman Freeman reiterated that the PUD issue was not up for discussion. Debate with the witness and Attorney Citron continued. Mr. Lenet contested that the use designation per the Cook County Comprehensive Plan was townhomes.

Mr. Lenet next reminded the ZBA that it is bound to enforce the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan of Cook County. Chairman Freeman responded that the Ordinance allows land owners to seek relief from the Comprehensive Plan in light of changed circumstances, desires and needs.

Mr. Lenet next opined that the underlying zoning of the subject property is P-2 (page 163 of the Remand Transcript). P-2 zoning was explained to be privately owned open space. Mr. Lenet explained that P-2 zoned land may be considered for some development. Mr. Lenet explained the concept and process for designating certain proposed zoning districts for land throughout Cook County. Lenet indicated that the scale of the map did not allow him to delineate between the residential component of Mission Hills and the golf course property for the site as a whole. As such, a decision was made to designate R-5 zoning on the Comprehensive Plan Map for the combined site, although, per Mr. Lenet, R-5 zoning was not meant to apply to the golf course portion of the property. Per Mr. Lenet, the Map shows R6, P2, PUD (page 176 of the Remand Transcript).

Mr. Lenet opined that the Applicant's project did not comply with the planning objectives, policies, and maps of the County. Further, the applications do not meet the open space opportunity designation or policy to preserve the land for open space per the Comprehensive Plan policies. Mr. Lenet then opined that the Mission Hills development would not have been granted except for the golf course (open space). Mr. Lenet next opined that bifurcating the golf course from the Mission Hills property causes the residential development to be non-conforming (page 184 of the Remand Transcript).

Mr. Lenet next opined that the proposed development was not laid out to preserve environmentally sensitive areas, natural resources, habitat and topographical features to the fullest extent possible.

As a follow-up, Mr. Lenet opined that there were a number of trees being taken down per the development plan. However, Mr. Lenet conceded that Mr. Kurensky's plan appeared to preserve some open space and provided a net gain of trees on site. Mr. Lenet's critique was that the proposed density of the development ultimately caused the reduction in overall open space.

Mr. Lenet next opined that the R6 could be appropriate given the surrounding uses, but that it appeared the Applicant was piggybacking the Mission Hills development. Mr. Lenet opined that Mission Hills is 40-50 years old and not indicative of the trend of development. In the witness' opinion, the newer developments carry more weight than the older developments. Mr. Lenet also testified that the subject property was not vacant, and instead was improved with a golf course, which is specifically permitted in P-2 zoning. The Applicant's proposal could not meet the standard as it applies to the time of vacancy because it is not currently vacant. Moreover, the golf course could be financial viable (page 195 of the Remand Transcript).

Mr. Lenet next opined that use and enjoyment of one's property includes sitting on a veranda or balcony and watching golfers, and the loss of that type of use is considered as part of the zoning standards for approval. The impact to the public is a consideration made and weighed by Mr. Lenet.

When prompted by the ZBA commissioners, Mr. Lenet opined that PUD do not lapse, however, covenants and annexation agreements might lapse. Per Mr. Lenet, the Cook County State's Attorney was wrong in concluding that the Mission Hills PUD lapsed. Mr. Lenet reiterated that he did the zoning ordinance. In terms of additional density, per Mr. Lenet, the additional units contemplated in 1972 would have been located on the development site and not on the golf course (page 209 of the Remand Transcript).

Cross Examination of Objector's Witnesses

Mr. Banks, attorney for the Applicant, first cross examined Steve Lenet. Mr. Lenet conceded that there is not express prohibition against rezoning a property from P-2 zoning to R6 zoning.

Attorney Banks next cross-examined Daniel Creaney. Mr. Creaney confirmed that the Applicant's engineering firm followed normal operating procedure for submitting plans for review to Mr. Creaney. Further, Mr. Creaney's response memorandum dated October 17, 2014 (Applicant's Remand Exhibit 2) was issued as part of the same regular procedure. Mr. Creaney next clarified his position that the storm water detention provided on the Applicant's site was adequate for the proposed development. As to the open concerns, Mr. Creaney maintained his position that he would be more comfortable with the proposal if it complied with Cook County's new Storm Water Ordinance. Per an exchange between Attorney Banks, Attorney Citron, and Chairman Freeman, it was explained that the concerns raised by Mr. Creaney are addressed as permitting issues after zoning entitlements are obtained.

Attorney Banks next cross-examined Michael McCann. Mr. McCann confirmed that he identified the units and assessed a view category to each unit. Mr. Banks' point was that this process was subjective; the witness classified it as methodical. Mr. McCann explained that a loss of view, in this

instance, was really a change in view – that change being more drastic for certain units located within the Mission Hills residential community. Mr. McCann's opinion was that the predominate view from Mission Hills would be of the newly proposed residences. Mr. Bank's stated there will be an open fence, picket or wrought iron fence, something that one can see through. Mr. McCann agreed that the setbacks between the existing buildings and proposed residences would vary between 86 ft. and 212 ft., building to building, and that the intervening space would contain grass, trees, bushes, and other landscaping (pages 227-231 Remanded Transcript).

Mr. McCann next explained that he preferred not to use the word "always" with respect to the loss of value attributable to a golf course view. Per Mr. McCann, his eight year study smoothed out any peaks and valleys, and that the results support his position that units with a golf course view have a premium value when compared to the units without a golf course view. When questioned about other variables affecting price, such as unit size, location within a particular building, upgrades, and floor plan, Mr. McCann responded that he found a pretty good mix of units and that other such variables were "picked up in the wash." The units were found to be pretty homogenous. Per Mr. McCann, when you balance the data, it shows an even mix of renovated and un-renovated units. No other pattern appeared (page 236 Remanded Transcript).

When questioned about his credentials, Mr. McCann conceded that he is not MAI designated. Mr. Banks confirmed that, per the requirements of the Cook County Zoning Ordinance, an MAI appraiser was required to prepare reports for the Applicant's case in chief.

Redirect of Steve Lenet by Attorney Citron

Mr. Lenet offered that Mission Hills P2 is the only P2 in all of Cook County that is part of the PUD.

Applicant's Rebuttal Witnesses

Attorney Banks called Ron Adams to offer rebuttal testimony as to the engineering plans and water retention and detention systems that would be implemented per the Applicant's development plan. Mr. Adams testified that it was standard operating procedure for an engineering firm to submit preliminary engineering plans for review prior to zoning approvals and entitlements being obtained. Further, based on his experience, Mr. Adams believed he would be able to address each of the comments identified in Mr. Creaney's October 17, 2014 letter. Mr. Adams next testified that the Applicant's development would comply with the new Cook County Watershed Ordinance, and that the Applicant was not seeking exemption from the new Ordinance. Mr. Adams also opined that Mr. Creaney's conclusions about onsite water flow may be incorrect. Per the USGS map, there is a major drainage divide that impacts water flow to the north branch. Per Mr. Adams, the goal was to adequately bypass the drainage, not necessarily detain it, which he believed would be achieved. (pages 247 - 248 Remanded Transcript). In conclusion, the release rates of the proposed development would be controlled by current standards, whereas the existing detention ponds on the Mission Hills site and the golf course property have proven to be inadequate. Per Mr. Adams, the Applicant's plan provides for adequate water retention, which Mr. Adam's believes Mr. Creaney acknowledged during his testimony (pages 253 Remanded Transcript).

Attorney Banks next called Erik Doersching to offer rebuttal testimony to Mr. McCann's research, report, and conclusions. Mr. Doersching is not a certified or designated appraiser. Mr. Doersching is a real estate consultant and market research analyst. He offered testimony regarding an independent study he conducted evaluating the 213 unit transaction that occurred between January, 2010 and September, 2014. Attorney Citron objected to Mr. Doersching offering any opinions as to value. Attorney Citron stipulated that there are other factors affecting property value (page 260 of the Remand Transcript). Mr. Doershing did not prepare a report for the Remand Hearing, but instead analyzed data as a rebuttal witness and analyzed market information internal to Mission Hills. Mr. Doersching ultimately testified that he found a limited number of identical units that sold within a short amount of time from the other unit. Mr. Doersching found that the units with golf course views were not always sold at higher prices than the non-golf course view units (page 270 Remanded Transcript). Upon cross-examination by Attorney Boyle, Mr. Doersching testified that he did not look into the buyer and seller in each transaction, and did not confirm whether the sales where short-sales.

Attorney Banks next called Terrence O'Brien as a rebuttal witness. Mr. O'Brien testified that, for comparison's sake and as a way of assessing the potential impact on value, he reviewed the market activity in the area surrounding a different Red Seal Development. That development is named Sander's Prairie, and it is located less than a mile from the subject site. That development was done on vacant land surrounded by a residential community. Mr. O'Brien's conclusion was that the Red Seal Development did not have an adverse impact on neighboring property values. In fact, in that example, the Red Seal development appeared to increase surrounding property values in the immediate area of that property (page 285 Remanded Transcript). Mr. O'Brien also attempted to clarify the Record as to his classification of the subject property as vacant land (as opposed to property improved with a golf course). Using Sanders Prairie as an example, Mr. O'Brien re-confirmed his original conclusion that the subject development would not have an adverse impact on surrounding property values. Mr. O'Brien also pointed out that Mr. McCann's own evidence suggested that the market trends were increasing at Mission Hills, even since the Red Seal proposal was made aware to the public. Lastly, Mr. O'Brien testified to the transactional history specific to the golf course property. His opinion was that the same professional golf management company that purchased the golf course property for $5 million in 2007, later sold the property to the current owner in 2013 at a $4 million loss. Mr. O'Brien inferred that even a professional golf management company had difficulty making this particular golf course profitable (page 290 Remanded Transcript).

Public Testimony

Mike Delamore, 3851 Mission Hills Road, testified that he would prefer the 18-hole golf course to remain instead of the proposed Red Seal development.

Irv Kolesky, 1740 Mission Hills Road, testified in support of Red Seal.

Rose Kahn, 1621 Mission Hills Road, a realtor, testified that the golf course view was preferred by her clients.

Valerie Weiss, 1800 Mission Hills Road, testified in behalf of Mission Hills resident John Levin in support of the applications. Mr. Weiss also spoke for herself in support of the development. She indicated that many residents felt bullied by the group of unit owners objecting to Red Seal.

Francine Stein, 3900 Mission Hills, a member of the Board of Directors (M7 Association), testified in support of the proposal.

Sharon Hartman, 1721 Mission Hills, spoke in favor of the applications on behalf of Mission Hills resident William Layton. Mrs. Hartman also spoke in favor of the application on behalf of Mission Hills resident Dr. Hadler. Lastly, Mrs. Hartman spoke in favor of the project on her own behalf, as well as her husband.

Norman Levine, 1771 Mission Hills, testified in support of the project. Mr. Levine clarified that he was not represented by Mission Hills Open Lands, and that they did not represent the opinion of numerous other residents at Mission Hills.

Larry Chavo, 1771 Mission Hills, testified in support of the Red Seal project for Mission Hills resident Mr. List. Mr. Chavo did not choose to testify on his own behalf.

Wallace Sweet, 3821 Mission Hills Road, testified that he worked for Corley Development and was not in support for bifurcating the Mission Hills residential property from the golf course property. He believed the property to be under one PUD.

Marsha Marco, 1831 Mission Hills, testified that the residents who just spoke in support of Red Seal are all in the "inner circle" of the Mission Hills property, and therefore not affected by the proposed development. Ms. Marco prefers to preserve the golf course and open space. She also believes the property was purchased with the intent to "flip it."

Michael Nees, 1656 Mission Hills, president of the T2 Association, testified against the proposed Red Seal development and claimed the majority of residents are against the project.

Ynez Draden, 3741 Mission Hills, testified against the proposal and was concerned that the loss of a golf course view would decrease her unit's value, and other unit values within Mission Hills.

Barbara Warshawsky, 1831 Mission Hills, testified against the project. Her main concern was that of owning a non-conforming unit.

A Member of the Audience, who resides at 3741 Mission Hills, testified against the project.

Thomas Poupard, a staff member with the Village of Northbrook Development and Planning Services Department, submitted a copy of Northbrook's Comprehensive Plan, and informed the ZBA and public at large that the Village of Northbrook Trustees were planning to vote on whether to formally file an objection as a municipality within 1.5 miles of the subject property.

Sheila Chinsky, 3816 Mission Hills, testified against the project and said the golf course club house was in disrepair.

Sherry Natenberg, 3741 Mission Hills, testified that the local community is horribly split on this issue of whether to support or object to the Red Seal development.

Katherine Bronner, 3751 Mission Hills, vice president of T2 Association, testified against the project, citing the environmental impact and the potential for flooding.

Ron Malvin, 1740 Mission Hills, believes the Red Seal development would disrupt the tranquility and serenity of the Mission Hills community, and add traffic, noise, and congestion. Mr. Malvin submitted 102 signatures of persons against the development.

Pat Dolan, 3911 Mission Hills, inquired about the State's Attorney's opinion regarding the jurisdictional issue of the underlying expired PUD and zoning.

Karen Jump, who is represented by Attorney Citron, provided statements from Mission Hills residents Barry Frydberg and Bev Brimford, respectively. Both statements were in objection to the proposed Red Seal development.

Position of Others

Citation Lake Lake–Lot Owners Association a/k/a Citation Lake Conservation Fund, 3483 Whirlway Drive, Northbrook, Illinois sent a petition of 57 signatures in objection to the proposed applications to the Zoning Board of Appeals on November 6, 2014.

On December 8, 2014, ZBA received written protests by 7 condominium associations immediately adjoining the Subject Property.

On December 10, 2014 ZBA received written protests by 34 unit owners with Mission Hills and 13 homeowners in the surrounding area.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:

The Cook County Comprehensive Plan designates the Subject Property P 2 Open Land Zoning.

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
OF THE
COUNTY OF COOK

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the foregoing Findings, the Zoning Board of Appeals **unanimously recommends approval** to the Cook County Board of Commissioners and that the Map Amendment as requested, MA-14-02, SU-14-03, and V-14-08:

1) Map Amendment to rezone approximately 44 acres of the Subject Property from P-2 Open Land District to an R-6 General Residence District for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) of 137 residential units; and

2) Special Use for a PUD in the R-6 General Residence District (if granted under companion MA-14-02) for twenty one (21) detached single family homes, seventeen (17) duplex containing thirty four (34) units and eighty two (82) multi-unit (townhouses) for a total of 137 residential units.

3) Variation in R-6 General Residence District (if granted under companion MA-14-02 & SU-14-03) to reduce rear yard setback for duplex and townhome lots from minimum required 40' to 25'; reduce corner side yard setback for townhome lots from minimum required 21.5' to 20'; increase the F.A.R for duplex lots from 0.5 to 0.66 and increase the F.A.R. for townhome lots from 0.6 to 0.73 in Section 18 of Northfield Township **granted**. If granted, all pertinent records, maps and the Comprehensive Plan shall be changed in accordance with this recommendation.

Respectfully submitted,
Zoning Board of Appeals

Kevin L. Freeman, Chairman

KLF/see