BEFORE THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS COMMISSION
OF THE VILLAGE OF HODGKINS, ILLINOIS

Hearing was held in the Hodgkins Village
Hall, 8990 Lyons Street, Hodgkins, Illinois, commencing
at 7:00 o'clock p.m. on the 5th day of June, 2017
regarding a request for variance by a Stonetown
Parkview, LLC.

APPEARANCES:

MR. EDWIN BELKA, Chairman
MS. STEPHANIE GARDNER, Clerk
MR. MARK MAYER, Commissioner
MR. ANDREW SALERNO, Commissioner
MR. BILL URBAN, Commissioner
MR. JOHN O'CONNELL, Attorney for Board
MR. RICK CAMBONI, Commissioner

REPORTED BY LYN DOERING, CSR.
CHAIRMAN BELKA: The meeting will come to order.

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Edwin Belka, Chairman of the Zoning Board of Appeals. This evening we are dealing with a request for a variance originally submitted by a Parkview Stonetown Parkview, LLC. The variance was R2 to special use, a change to special use being 9300 square feet on 67th Street. This is a continuation of the meeting on the 22nd of May.

And I understand that the representatives are not here. Mr. O'Connell will explain.

Could I please have roll call?

CLERK GARDNER: Mr. Belka?

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Present.

CLERK GARDNER: Mr. Mayer?

COMMISSIONER MAYER: Here.

CLERK GARDNER: Mr. Salerno?

MR. SALERNO: Here.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Mr. Urban?

COMMISSIONER URBAN: Here.

CLERK GARDNER: Mr. Camboni?

COMMISSIONER CAMBONI: Here.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: I will now turn this over to Mr. O'Connell -- Oh, we need to have the pledge of
allegiance. Sorry I forgot that, people. My apologies.

(Pledge of Allegiance).

CHAIRMAN BELKA: This is a continuation of the meeting on the 22nd of May. This was postponed due to several issues; overall density, expansion of nonconforming use, multiple dwelling units, issues of adjacent property and existing property possibly with a lot of clutter. So at this point I understand there has been a bit of a change, and I will now turn this over to Mr. O'Connell, who will go ahead and explain the situation to you.

MR. O'CONNELL: What everybody in the audience as well as the Commissioners should have are two aerials of the area under consideration for a special use or variance. The reason we have this is that I was directed to call the owners of the property on Friday to discuss the concept of providing property on -- for lack of a better terminology -- property owned by Mrs. Ruth Doyle that the Village has contracted to purchase.

What the proposal that we had for Stonetown Capital, owners of Parkview, was that we would offer to trade approximately 11,300 square feet for the 9,300
square feet represented by the R-2 property that
presently houses the house, a garage and a proposed
mobile home unit that they wish to have as an
office/residence for the management.

If you would refer to this photograph which
has that property we will discuss this first.

Everybody okay? Everybody have it?

So I had spent about an hour on the phone
Friday with the owner, Mr. Roy Lapidus -- or the CEO --
and also Mr. Dax Nolen, who was at our hearing
two weeks ago.

They went back and forth. Dax had a lengthy
discussion about what's transpired over the past two or
three years. They indicated to me that they would
think about what the offer was and get back to me on
Monday, today.

What I received is what we will discuss right
now. So this is an either/or. We either select one of
the options. Not both. One. Either this option that
I am going to discuss or a second option which I will
discuss after this.

The first option would be Stonetown or -- for
lack of a better, I will say -- Parkview would keep the
R-2 subject property that has the old house, the garage
and a slab that used to have a mobile home unit on it.

What they are proposing is the following:
They would remove the old house. They would have it
torn down. It would be replaced by either landscaping
or a gazebo. It would not be a dwelling.

As to the garage, they would eliminate the
access from the garage doors to Lyons Street. They
would either remove the doors or they would keep the
doors locked and replace the doors with a frontage
on -- I believe it's -- Flamingo Drive to the east. So
the view from Lyons Street to the internal of this
garage would be precluded. That would be changed.

What they are suggesting on what we will
refer to as the northeast corner of the property, they
propose for the office/residence of the manager would
be a modular home, and they did give us some copies of
what the modular home might look like.

I have got it in my office. I will give it
to Sherri to distribute as we get going in the
discussion.

This would alleviate/eliminate the trade for
the Ruth Doyle property, but they would make changes to
the property. They indicated that they would clean up
the property. They indicated that the use of the
garage would be far less than it is right now, and they indicated that it would -- access to the office/modular home would be off of the -- I think it's called -- Robbin Street, so that there would be no frontage on Lyons Street.

So this was one proposal. It replaces the proposals that they had.

They will not try to renovate that old building. They will tear it down. They will not put a mobile home unit doublewide, but rather they would put this modular home, which looks like a home, but it's not a foundation home, and that would serve as the office, and they would make the changes to the garage, which I have mentioned, so that that nuisance would be mitigated.

If the Village says, "No, we don't want to do that," they proposed alternative -- I will call -- Alternative 2, which means -- if you look at the second sheet it means that the land would go to the Village for R-2 use, which could be a two flat, no more than two apartments, but we would then have title to that property.

In return what Parkview is offering is that they would extend Flamingo Drive into the Ruth Doyle
property, that we would trade 11,000 square feet for
the 9300 square feet.

One question that a couple of Trustees and I
discussed today along with our Building Inspector was
it's not clear what this property would be used for.

So I called this afternoon, and I did talk to
Stone Capital/Parkview. They plan on putting five
mobile homes on that site.

I asked, "What about storage?" They said
that they have closed on property in one of the suburbs
where they would do most of their storage and would
also -- they could put a storage facility up there, but
most of their storage would be in this suburb. I
forgot the name of it. So basically those are the two
proposals.

Now, how this relates to us tonight, in our
discussions they indicated that they wanted to use this
as a proposal for us to discuss. So tonight would
be -- there would be a thorough discussion amongst the
Commissioners of the ZBA, have input from the audience,
but tonight it's important that we have a thorough
discussion of the two options. So why don't we begin
that right now.

Perhaps, if we want to start out we have had
two of our Trustees and our Building Inspector discuss this throughout the day. It's open to the entire audience, but some of the Trustees, if you wanted to discuss this, the floor is open. And we would ask that everybody comes to the microphone.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: All right. Do any of the Trustees have any comments, opinions or things they would like to say?

Mr. Struve, could you stand up, state your name, and let us have it?

MR. STRUVE: Paul Struve, Resident of Hodgkins and Trustee.

John is correct in his explanation of what's been going on.

A little history, we felt that since we were purchasing the Doyle property anyway the park was going to use the frontal portion of the properties along Kimball Avenue, so the expansion that John is talking about, that they want to put I guess five -- I just heard that tonight -- mobile homes on would not be in close proximity to Kimball Avenue. It would be on the back end or the very east end of the southern lots, just for clarification.

But originally the thought process was,
because they have no storage space, that's the reason why everything is so crowded over on the first picture you were looking at, we felt that maybe we could swing a deal with them, and we offered them to -- we had an excess of land from what we are going to be purchasing the deal we had from the park.

We offered to take the land at the very east end of the south portion to allow them to use that property, that new property that we would trade for, from the Lyons Street property, and trade with them on that other property I just described, so they could use that for storage, a storage area to get all that junk away from their main entrance right now.

That we would originally -- The original thought process was just a trade, and then we realized there are some other pieces go that along with that that they have a garage there that they would no longer have use, and we had no need for it.

But that was the original thing, it was to be used for storage, and it was offered to them to be used for storage, and that it would remain R-2, and we would not fight them if they wanted to get a special use on that property on the south end of the Ruth Doyle property.
That's where it was left when I was aware of what was going on. There was nothing to be -- No mobile homes were to be put there. It was strictly for storage, and if they wanted to put a garage there they would be able to do that, but not for expanding the park. I wanted to make sure that everyone knew that circumstance.

So if anybody has any other questions about what I might be able to tell you, I am more than willing to try to fill you in.

COMMISSIONER URBAN: First of all, for the record I would like to declare that that same piece of property for the past six years I was trying to buy it, and still that is the only piece of property within the village that will support my house.

You currently have the whole hilltop vacated except for me, and it's always been our intention, multiple contacts with the Village, that we wanted to move our house to that area. I want that property. So therefore, my vote would automatically be no.

And I thought the Village all agreed on not expanding the trailer park in any way shape or form.

MR. STRUVE: It was never the intent, other than they have a problem, and I tried to correct the
problem, just so you are aware.

COMMISSIONER URBAN: I am fully aware of it, as I brought it up with John and Timmy Kovel and everybody about the sewer issue that you guys had.

My primary concern is Ruth Doyle not dying and having to end up in probate or whatever or purchasing the land without an agreement, because the first thing I would have done was say we need to do something about the sewer.

I have since had plans drawn up that would allow the house to be behind the sewer, with just the 20-foot easement or whatever, in case anything needed to be done, and thought that we should have conversations about this, since it's been clearly defined as our intent for multiple years. We want to keep our house, we want to move it within the Village, and everything south of the fence was what we always said we want.

MR. STRUVE: John would like to respond to this.

MR. O'CONNELL: If we can, Bill, let's keep that discussion --

COMMISSIONER URBAN: I agree. We should have had it first, but before we talk about any of this, I think ...
MR. O'CONNELL: I think the real question here is, our discussions with Stonetown Capital was that we would trade that property currently owned by Mrs. Doyle for office and storage. This proposal which is reflected in the drawings is to have -- they suggested -- five new mobile homes.

So that isn't a direct response to our request to trade, to provide them with an office and storage space. So it's a whole --

MR. STRUVE: That's a rebuttal to our original offer. Basically they are saying, "We reject your offer, but if you did this we would" -- that's what I am assuming.

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes.

So I think, Trustee Struve, you made your views known that you did not support anything other than office or storage as a --

MR. STRUVE: Basically, had I thought that this was going to lead to the expansion of the park, I would have never made the offer to begin with. To me it was either take it or leave it.

Okay. Thank you.

MR. O'CONNELL: Any other thoughts?

MR. SALERNO: I have a question, John.
So they are going to tear down the house you said; right?

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes.

MR. SALERNO: So they are saying that they have enough storage on another facility. Why don't they just tear down the garage also?

MR. O'CONNELL: Well, what the garage would be used for is the incidentals. The indication they gave to me that those cars would be out of there.

So the cars take up all three portions of that garage right now. They have skirting, they have other things that are not -- would not be put into this larger facility they have, which would be motorized winter equipment.

MR. SALERNO: So that would still stay here; correct, all that stuff?

MR. O'CONNELL: Yeah.

MR. SALERNO: The skirting and everything?

MR. O'CONNELL: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Are we looking at the second -- from what we discussed -- the second page, the removal of the building?

MR. O'CONNELL: We can discuss either option.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: All right. The first option or
the second that would still require a zoning change but not for the planned office and mobile home, it is just for storage; is that correct?

MR. O'CONNELL: No, no.

For purposes of this hearing the first option, which included Parkview retaining the R-2 9300 square foot lot which contains the old building, the garage and the proposed office, that will be Option 1. So in looking at Option 1, the legal discussion would be a special use to put a modular home on that site. It would not be changing it. It would be a special use.

And you can provide restrictions on that special use. As a special use it is not a blanket utilization of modular homes anywhere other than this location, simply because of its proximity to property that this applicant owns. It's within 20 feet or so of -- well, it's adjacent to the mobile home park.

Any zoning enactment would provide those limitations and would zero in on this location only. It would not apply to anyplace else in the Village. There would be a unique distinction between this property and this use and everything else. So it's unique, which is the essence of the special use.
CHAIRMAN BELKA: So this would -- This would be part of the -- This would be the second page you provided and the house removal; correct or not?

MR. O'CONNELL: It's the house removal which is being defined as Option 1 for purposes of this conference.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Got you.

MR. O'CONNELL: Again, just to reiterate, the legal criteria that we discussed at our last meeting in offering a special use.

So the special use of putting this modular home here along with all the other conditions -- removing the house, changing the opening to the garage -- it would have to be so that it does not damage the property values of the surrounding area.

It would place a burden -- if it was denied -- place a burden on the applicant and overall conformity with the surrounding area.

So those are legal considerations. Frankly, those legal considerations did not exist at the last proposal that they had.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Can I ask, since the special use you mentioned we could have restrictions, what restrictions would be under consideration at that
point?

MR. O'CONNELL: Well, one of the conversations is presently that property is a mess, for lack of a more diplomatic word. All the tented area or whatever is in that would have to be removed. All the dirt and debris, all the construction material would have to be removed. It would have to be maintained.

You could remove the apron to the garage on the south end to make certain that it would not be accessed off of Lyons Street, and there's any number of issues that the Village Board and somebody could place on that special use. It's a special use with restrictions.

It would be helpful if someone could suggest that option No. 2 should be further entertained. I know one of our trustees made it clear that he would not vote for opening that area up for additional mobile homes or expanding the mobile home park.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: May I request that you discuss Option No. 2 or explain it again please briefly.

MR. O'CONNELL: So Option No. 2.

The Village would obtain title to the property in Option No. 1. In return, first of all, the mailboxes that presently abut the property in Option
No. 1 would be shifted to the south, so that the mailboxes would be on Flamingo Drive, but it would be on the south of Canary Lane or Lyons Street.

They would also provide for expansion or extension of Flamingo Drive, and on this drawing Flamingo Drive would be an expansion of the park to include -- the number of units told to me was -- five mobile home units that would be rented or leased out similar to the other. Basically amounts to an expansion of the park. That's Option No. 2.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Would this require a change to any of the existing zoning?

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: All right. Would that go to the Zoning Board as opposed to --

MR. O'CONNELL: No, it's here. It's already in the Zoning Board.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: All right.

MR. O'CONNELL: But it would -- It could be a special use for mobile home parks -- mobile home units rather. It could be a total transfer of zoning from R-2 -- which is what it is right now -- to T for trailers.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Just for clarification, people,
what is being referred to Option 2 is the first page probably of your stapled unit. So we have a clarification.

This is Option 2 on Page 1, and Option 1 is on Page 2. So you understand exactly what is being stated here.

So at this point may I entertain any questions, any concerns, any preferences what people in the Village might prefer concerning this?

Option No. 1 would possibly request or require a special use with restrictions of the existing parcel in question.

And then Option No. 2 would possibly require a special use or a change to R-2 to T for trailers with the property existing in question being deeded over to the Village.

So hopefully that's clear as mud to everybody and people can understand exactly what the options are here before we discuss them.

Mr. Struve, you have a comment or question?

MR. STRUVE: I want to clarify.

We are looking at two options. Neither one of them have to be accepted. Just so everyone understands.
COMMISSIONER URBAN: First of all, Tracy, do you have anything to say?

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Tracy, if you could please state your name please?

MRS. URBAN: Tracy Urban, Resident from Hodgkins, plus an owner of the one of the mobile homes in that park.

My questions are for Option 2, the mobile homes that they would be putting there -- if that's something that is going to take place, are those doublewides, are they manufactured homes, or are they going to be single?

MR. O'CONNELL: They will be manufactured homes.

As to the doublewides or single, I am not certain, but there's only 11,000 square feet thereabouts.

MRS. URBAN: Well, you could probably fit five doublewides in that area.

MR. O'CONNELL: I think a doublewide takes in 2500 square feet. There would have to be room for a road. You may be right. That wasn't specified.

MRS. URBAN: You don't know if they are considering doublewides or single-wides?

MR. O'CONNELL: No.
MRS. URBAN: Is that sewer a concern for putting doublewide or single-wides there?

MR. O'CONNELL: I think there is a concern for expansion of the park, for the mobile home park. I think that concern was demonstrated when we had a hearing -- I think it was in February or maybe it was January -- when they wanted to acquire the Ruth Doyle property and expand the mobile home park to Kimball.

MRS. URBAN: So what's changed? Why wouldn't it still be a concern?

MR. O'CONNELL: It may well be.

COMMISSIONER URBAN: For the record, as soon as somebody wants to talk about a planned unit development or whatever and what we have going on at the house. We are interested in everything south of that fence line. We would develop the whole street, Kimball.

Tracy has -- Do you have the drawings with you?

MRS. URBAN: No, I don't.

MR. O'CONNELL: I really think this is an application from Stonetown Capital. This is a proposal made which may or may not be accepted.

But Bill, with all due respect, your discussion is a whole new meeting, and this is on
record --

COMMISSIONER URBAN: I know, but it's --

MR. O'CONNELL: This is on record, Commissioner, and if it goes to court, I don't want to be discussing your properties.

COMMISSIONER URBAN: I want to keep everybody up to speed and everything.

MRS. URBAN: Sure. It's a discussion for another time.

COMMISSIONER URBAN: My opinion would be "no" on the trailer park expansion because I thought we already went through that.

MR. O'CONNELL: The whole discussion is amongst the ZBA of which you are a member, but it's on what has been proposed by Stonetown Capital, who paid for the ZBA application. Please, let's discuss your matter at another time. Not tonight.

MRS. URBAN: My last question is for the possibility of the manufactured home, where the manager would live, why is that necessary? Why isn't a regular mobile home acceptable for that person?

MR. O'CONNELL: They didn't dismiss a mobile home, but we have already -- I think the discussion -- It's just never been brought up until now. So this is their
first proposal.

They could -- You know, what's more -- I think what they are trying to do is find something that's more palatable to the Village and the Village Board and Village ZBA.

MRS. URBAN: It just seems kind of odd to have a manufactured home, one, in the rest of the park.

MR. O'CONNELL: I think it emanated -- was it a year or two years ago -- they originally proposed that they would replace the old house with a modular home, and I believe that the reason why that was rejected is because it would front Lyons Street.

MRS. URBAN: Sure.

MR. O'CONNELL: This would be a different configuration. It would front Robbin Street.

MRS. URBAN: Just one half dozen or the other. It's still just one in the mobile home park.

MR. O'CONNELL: Right.

MRS. URBAN: And I am trying to get my mom's house all set to sell, but the park is just horrible. The facilities are terrible. They are not following any of the rules and the regulations.

I have got her lease and all the information in there, and I went through everything on that lease
of all the violations I am seeing, and it's just
incredible. So that's my piece.

MR. O'CONNELL: How old is your mom's house?

MRS. URBAN: It's an '88. So I know if it's a '77
or earlier --

MR. O'CONNELL: So it's the modern HUD?

MRS. URBAN: Yes, yes.

Just my 2 cents.

CLERK GARDNER: Can I speak as a resident?

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Of course.

CLERK GARDNER: I would be against the expansion
of the trailer park because of the traffic that we are
seeing now on 67th Street -- and I am sure Tim can
vouch too -- and down Lyons here.

The cars just fly up and down these streets
in the morning, in the afternoon, at night, and if we
put any more mobile homes in that just means more
families that are going in there. So I would be
against that expansion.

MR. O'CONNELL: And just to reiterate what
Commissioner Urban said at our last hearing, there is a
density question too. The new doublewides make it very
difficult -- from what our inspector -- Building
Inspector said -- even if the cars -- get the car doors
open.

CLERK GARDNER: They come down 67th Street and cut over on Kane over that way and they just fly up and down. Even standing by the park the other day there's cars, you see them coming out of the trailer court, and they blow all the stop signs, and the kids are playing at the park. So I just don't think it's a good idea.

MR. MAYER: Excuse me, Mr. Belka, Chairman. I heard a lot of descent on Option 2. Anybody from the resident, objection to where the house is going to be tore down and this first option, any residents against that?

CHAIRMAN BELKA: That's a good point, Mr. Mayer. We actually have really three things we are initially looking at here.

The original proposal which was to change the zoning from R-2 to special use and put in the mobile home and office with the renovation of the existing home there and with the cleanup of the garage facility and any debris in the area. That is actually the first thing that was initially proposed, and that is something that we have to decide on.

We have three options really here. The first one, the original proposal, and then we have Option 1
and Option 2 which has been specified here.

We have Option 1. We have any concerns or issues with the removal of the existing house, where the mail facilities would be put and the office? If we have any concerns, issues, questions, please step forward and express them.

MR. CAMBONI: Mr. Chairman, Item No. 1, I believe they are giving nice concessions here. The removal of the old house, the dressing up of the garage in the view from Lyons Street is a nice concession, moving the doors either to the --

MR. STRUVE: East.

MR. CAMBONI: -- east side so for the towns people it wouldn't be viewed I think is another nice concession, and then putting a new modular home, we know that lot is a mess, and I am afraid it will continue to be a mess, unless they are allowed to dress that up.

And with putting a new modular home in there, that will be their show home, it will be their office, and it will also be the manager's residence, can only be good for a community on all sorts of levels, with safety and having a place for the seniors to actually go to pay their rent or voice their opinion.
I think this Position 1 is the best option. I think they are giving concessions. Option 2, I mean I just can't understand why -- I can't consider that one. You are adding homes, you are removing storage, which they need desperately. I don't think Option 2 for myself is an option that I could even consider.

Option 1 I think has a lot of positives that could be not only for the community, also for the owners, I suppose, but I think more it would be beneficial to the town and the residents of that community.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Mr. Camboni, thank you.

Do you have any suggestions for a special use with restrictions, since this would be a vote for special use with restrictions?

MR. CAMBONI: We have to make sure that somebody who has an open lot in the middle of the town can't use these -- can't put a modular home on that sort of lot. So the restrictions would have to be pertaining to, you know, 20 feet, the owner of a mobile home park. There's got to be ways to make sure that somebody in the middle of town can't ask for a special use for a modular home.
CHAIRMAN BELKA: That would be the only restriction you would suggest?

MR. CAMBONI: Well, I hadn't actually thought about the restrictions. I think there's got to be ways of --

MR. O'CONNELL: I think the restrictions can be developed when we finally have the vote, and if there is, but there's any number of restrictions that can be placed on it.

But what I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Jones, you live right next door?

MR. JONES: Yes.

MR. O'CONNELL: Could you comment on what your views are to Option 1, especially Option 1 versus Option 2?

MR. JONES: If the Village ends up with that property --

MR. O'CONNELL: Skipper, can you come up here.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Please state your name clearly.

MR. JONES: My name is Ed Jones.

On Option 1, if the Village ends up with that property would it still be R-2, where they can put another four flat on there, like they did two doors away from me?
MR. O'CONNELL: Well, first of all, Option 1 is
where we allow Stone Capital to remain as owner.

MR. JONES: Okay. I have the wrong sheet then.

MR. O'CONNELL: Our code does not allow for a four
flat.

MR. JONES: There's one two doors away from me.

MR. O'CONNELL: Yeah. But that was put in before
we changed the code. We changed the code so that there
would be nothing more than a two flat.

MR. JONES: That would be my concern, if they did
swap for that property, that they would put in some
kind of monstrous building in there.

MR. MAYER: Mr. Jones, how do you feel about them
tearing down that house?

MR. JONES: It should have been torn down 40 years
ago.

MR. MAYER: How do you feel about that idea?

MR. JONES: It's a good idea to tear it down. I
am not crazy about the modular, but the way John is
saying it now, if there's restrictions on it where
somebody else can't put something on a lot within the
Village. You know, it definitely would look nicer, but
that would be one of my concerns, where somebody buys a
lot for 50 grand now and put a modular home on it. I
mean, there's a surefire way that that wouldn't happen?

MR. O'CONNELL: If we put restrictions on it. And special use is only for this property. It would not be for any other property.

But just to reiterate what we said before, we have eliminated anything more than a two flat. So even if we were to acquire that, the Village, it could only be a two flat.

MR. JONES: Yeah. That would be my concern. Like I say, that house should have been torn down.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Would you find this option more favorable?

MR. JONES: If push came to shove, where I would have to choose on option, it would be this one. I don't know if that's 1 or 2.

MR. O'CONNELL: That's 1.

MR. JONES: I am not crazy about either one of them, but if I had to choose. Anything is better than what's next door to me now.

I just got reassessed on my house. It went up $111,000, and there is no way in the world somebody is going to pay $364,000 for that house, even though it's a duplex. But if somebody offered me 300 they could own it in a heartbeat. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BELKA: Mr. Urban, you have a comment please?

COMMISSIONER URBAN: So the big concern that everybody has is that it's an R-2, where the trailer is going to go, which was the special-use type of agreement because of the ownership before with the Yzermans. Does this lot need to be changed to trailer?

MR. O'CONNELL: No.

COMMISSIONER URBAN: With special uses or considerations?

MR. O'CONNELL: No.

COMMISSIONER URBAN: Leave it R-2?

MR. O'CONNELL: It would remain R-2, but there would be a special use with the restrictions that we would place on it, that the proposal was a modular unit go on the northeast corner of that lot.

COMMISSIONER URBAN: Right.

MR. O'CONNELL: If you remember, the original proposal was there would be two dwellings on that lot, but the fact that we -- they are eliminating the old house, there would only be one dwelling.

MR. SALERNO: So the modular home they are putting up, John, are they going to have a garage on it?

MR. O'CONNELL: No.
MR. SALERNO: They are not?

MR. O'CONNELL: No.

I should have brought -- If you can bear with me, I will get pictures that they gave.

MR. SALERNO: The reason why I was asking, if they put a two car garage on there would they be able to eliminate this garage and just use the modular?

MR. O'CONNELL: What I saw did not have a garage.

TRUSTEE MOXLEY: I am Vicky Moxley. I have lived across the street caddy-corner from the property for 28 years. My parents have lived in Parkview for 40 years. So I have a lot of history with the area.

I have seen over the past two years garbage, trash, car repairs, just all kinds of bad things for our Village going on right across the street from our housing, and it just seems like it just gets worse. When people come that are management and leadership of the area, it gets better, and then it gets worse again.

I took a picture on Tuesday. It looks like a garbage bin all over the place. Now, it's cleaned up again, because there is a meeting going to be happening.

I think when I am looking as an owner -- when I am looking at these options, Option 1, the second
page?

CHAIRMAN BELKA: That is correct.

TRUSTEE MOXLEY: Going by history and track record I really would be concerned, could they keep it up, could they keep it nice, could they do what they say they are going to do when they are having trouble doing what they say they are going to do now.

I have problems with Option 1 because of the density issue. I thought that was a very good issue that was brought up at the last meeting, and I wanted to hear more about that. So adding more mobile homes to the site, I don't know if that's going to be feasible.

MR. O'CONNELL: Vicky, that's Option 2.

TRUSTEE MOXLEY: Yes, Option 2 with the five mobile homes. Thank you.

MR. O'CONNELL: Right.

TRUSTEE MOXLEY: Thirdly, you are looking for storage? I am not quite sure what's going on at 6504 Kimball Avenue, next door to me, but there is a big trailer there, there's big pallets there with green tile on top of them, green carpet, which is the same that's in front of the garbage at this property, the R-2 property.
So have we added more storage on a residential area for the mobile home court? That's something that needs to be looked into as well. I don't know what kind of deals have gone on to make that happen, but I have seen the management of the property over on that site hauling things back and forth, and if they eliminate their storage on this property is it now going to be moved over to Kimball Avenue, 6504? I think we should look into that as well.

Any questions for me?

MR. O'CONNELL: The 6504, is that considered Ruth Doyle's property?

TRUSTEE MOXLEY: No. That is the Ms. Crane's property. It's the three story next door to my home. And there is a big trailer there that gets moved back and forth by the tractor that's owned by Parkview, and those giant wooden pallets with the green carpet on them that are in front of Lyons Street, there's a stack of them now on the gravel driveway in 6504.

And again, I don't know. I don't know what's happening there. I don't know if there's some deal been made to get some construction done, some repairs to the home, letting them use that area, but that
driveway, because it is a three-flat, is supposed to be used for residential parking in there, and if they have a big trailer there, they have just congested that parking for their residents as well.

MR. O'CONNELL: Who owns the trailer?

TRUSTEE MOXLEY: I believe it's owned by either the park or somebody that works for the park.

MR. O'CONNELL: Parkview?

TRUSTEE MOXLEY: Uh huh.

So thank you.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Bill Urban, you have a statement, question?

COMMISSIONER URBAN: On another note, the last meeting that we had, the Dax and crew said they were going to provide the Village with letters of recommendation and how happy the residents are or anything. Did you ever get anything in that aspect or whatever?

MR. O'CONNELL: No. But again, they may have been bringing it here tonight, but no, the answer is no.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Do we have any other comments, questions, concerning these issues?

MR. MAYER: I do.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Yes.
MR. MAYER: Can this be voted on tonight or is this just informational?

CHAIRMAN BELKA: We can vote on this, and in fact we can vote to either accept, agree to or deny any and all of this. We can vote yes on all of them and leave the option to Stone Park, LLC or we can vote to deny all of them or we can vote to accept one or two of them.

This will be -- We will put this to a vote and agree to either suggest to the -- or recommend to the Trustees to either accept or deny any or all of them.

MR. O'CONNELL: Well, for clarification purposes, No. 1, you don't have to accept either option, as Trustee Struve pointed out before.

Again, for clarity purposes we are looking at Option 1, which is the property that the old house would be torn down.

Option 2 is basically the adding five mobile home units by extending Flamingo Drive.

So in making your decision/recommendation remember Option 1 is the property with the house that would be torn down, a modular home would be placed on the back of the property, and the garage would be...
reconfigured so that the opening is not facing Lyons Street.

Option 2 means the extension of Flamingo Drive, which would entail -- recommended by the Parkview people -- they wanted to put five new mobile home parks -- mobile home units on that site. That's Option 2.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: So yes, the Chair recognizes Mr. Rice. Step forward please, state your name.

TRUSTEE RICE: Larry Rice, Resident/Trustee of the Village.

I would just like to know, this garage we have been talking about, it's been there for a long time, is it suitable to keep it going, revamp it or --

MR. O'CONNELL: Explain.

TRUSTEE RICE: The garage that you are talking about tearing down.

MR. O'CONNELL: No, no. We are talking about the house, tearing down the house.

TRUSTEE RICE: I understand.

MR. O'CONNELL: The garage would be reconfigured so it's facing to the east.

TRUSTEE RICE: But is it good enough to stay up, is what I want to know.
MR. O'CONNELL: Well, it's not that old of a garage.

TRUSTEE RICE: It's been there as long as I have been in this town, I think.

MR. O'CONNELL: No.

MR. STRUVE: Ten years, approximately ten years.

TRUSTEE RICE: Ten? Okay.

MR. O'CONNELL: You may be thinking of the house.

The house has been there --

TRUSTEE RICE: Yeah, the house has been there for a long time. Okay. Thank you.

MR. O'CONNELL: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Do we have any other comments, observations? Please step forward. This is an important decision we will have to make and will affect a number of people, so please don't be hesitant. I know it's a bit tedious, and this is the third meeting we have had on this, but please step forward.

Mr. Struve?

MR. STRUVE: One more time, just to kind of add to what Mrs. Moxley had to say.

I believe Rick's option makes a lot of sense, but it all comes down to, you have to trust what's going on. None of the things and these options that I
see that are all here right now deal at all with any
storage area maintenance facility, anything. Every
option that's on line that we have brought up tonight
does not address a major issue, as far as I am
concerned, and that's the storage.

If they don't have a place to store where is
it going to end up? We see where it ends up now.
That's at their entrance already. They know that's
their entrance.

So from my point of view, I don't know who is
going to own that park in a year or two from now, and I
want to make sure that that area is kind of foolproof
personally. I want to make sure that the wrong things
don't end up there.

COMMISSIONER URBAN: That garage, if it was
utilized for the purpose of park maintenance, is plenty
large for a salt spreader, a tractor and whatever else
equipment that they would need to support that park.

MR. STRUVE: You just heard tonight there's other
things that are stored.

COMMISSIONER URBAN: That is not park-related, and
most of that was brought up by the residents at the
last meeting of Jeremy or allowing a quasi car
business, whether personal or for profit, to be
operated, which the owners condone per their own words. They said, "We allowed it." So but with special use that would have to be clarified and denied that those types of activities and only park activities.

MR. STRUVE: So then the question becomes, where do they store, and that's the big thing that I think -- this all started from a different option than what you guys are -- the option that I described to begin with to offer them a spot to correct the storage. That turned into your -- at least two other options out of the three. So I mean that's where everything emanated from. They built on that option that I thought that we offered them that would correct an issue without hurting anybody in the community.

So I just wanted to clarify that there is a matter of trust with who you have to do things, and that's the reason why we have all of our rules and regulations in the community now, so it doesn't get out of hand, and so we have -- sometimes you have to make sure that there's certain safeties placed. That's all I am getting at.

COMMISSIONER URBAN: With the amount of lots that the Village currently owns that haven't really been marketable or I think when we offered them out last
time one has been sold. I can't see, especially in
that proximity, of anybody wanting. It will end up
being another piece of property that the Village can't
sell, if they were to do any kind of swap or anything,
which hurts all of the residents, but that's my
opinion.

MR. STRUVE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Thank you.

Mr. Cummings, Village President?

PRESIDENT CUMMINGS: Hello everyone. My name is
Noel Cummings. I am really the one that suggested to
make this change.

I have been over there so many times and
looked at this here, going back this way, and looked at
this empty space back here, away from all the homes
that's been back in the corner next to the railroad,
and the powerlines back here, and I said, "Well, wait a
minute. If we can trade this property over here for
this here," these people on Lyons Street here has put
up with this here for years, with the mess that's over
there now.

And my intentions were to try to clean this
up, and let them move it back over here and put a fence
along here where you couldn't even see that back there,
where it was at, and this property is just going to be back there next to the railroad and the powerlines doing nothing, and it would be so easy if we could trade this here.

People been down there and seen what this looks like over here, and if we can trade this parcel here for this here and clean that up for the people living on Lyons Street and Kimball there. It's been that way, you know, for so many years, and it's time I thought for us to try to clean it up, and I thought this was a way of doing it without costing the Village an arm and a leg. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Thank you, Mr. Village President. What the Village President Mr. Cummings was referring to I believe was Option 2.

Do we have any other comments, observations, statements, complaints please? Anyone?

MR. MAYER: I have a motion that we vote on this.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: We have a motion to vote on this.

Do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER URBAN: I have a second.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Very good.

In lieu of Stephanie Gardner, who is away, I will go ahead and take the vote. What I want to vote
on are the three options:

The original option which was originally
proposed to accept or deny, which was the special use
for the -- for an office trailer and also the
enhancement of the existing home there.

COMMISSIONER URBAN: That doesn't exist any more.
It's Option 1 or Option 2 or nothing.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Well, it still does exist.

MR. O'CONNELL: They withdraw that.

COMMISSIONER URBAN: They pulled it.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: They actually withdrew that. I
stand corrected. That option which we have been
discussing the previous two meetings has been
withdrawn.

MR. KOVEL: I am Tim Kovel, the Building Inspector
for the Village of Hodgkins. I think that prior to
these options we are placing in place tonight maybe we
should give these guys a couple months to prove to us
they can clean their park up and get it to a condition
where we are satisfied with it and our Trustees and
residents don't have such an eyesore to look at, and
once they prove to us they can clean it up, then maybe
we should discuss working with them to expand or
possibly get a special use for their park. That's all
I have.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Do we have any comments concerning that?

MR. O'CONNELL: A motion has been --

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Yeah. The motion has already been...

All right. Since the original option is not available any more, since that has been withdrawn, we now have two options:

Option No. 1 is the special use to R-2 and the improvement. Stone Capital retains ownership, and they will tear down the house. That will be on Page 2 of your little handout.

Option 1 and also we will vote on Option 2.

So I have a motion to vote on Option 1.

COMMISSIONER MAYER: Right.

MR. O'CONNELL: Mr. Chairman, because this is a little confusing if in describing which option you are voting on, please indicate on Option 1 the property where the house is going to be removed and a modular home would be inserted.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Okay. For everyone who has this, Option 1, make sure you are on the right page, and the removal -- Option 1 is the removal of the existing
home. It will be torn down and a modular office or home will be installed at the back end of the property on this page towards the top of the page. The garage storage area will be retained. It will not be removed.

All right.

And Stone Capital will retain ownership. They will agree to tear down the house, and then this structure will be erected -- or rather a modular office will be put in place, and we would be voting for a special use, R-2 special use with possible restrictions. Restrictions can be determined at a later date.

So for Option 1 I will call each individual and ask for a yes or no vote.

So Mr. Mayer?

MR. MAYER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: All right. Option 1, yes?

MR. MAYER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Mr. Camboni?

MR. CAMBONI: Option 1, yes.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Very good.

Mr. Urban?

COMMISSIONER URBAN: Option 1.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Yes?
COMMISSIONER URBAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Very good.

Mr. Salerno?

MR. SALERNO: Option 1, yes.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Option 1, yes. Very well.

And for myself, Mr. Belka, will make it unanimous.

So Option 1 we have voted to recommend to the Trustees to accept Option 1.

Now we, will consider Option 2. Option 2 is on Page 1.

MR. O'CONNELL: I think it was an either/or, Mr. Chairman. Unanimous vote for Option 1 would preclude any vote.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: If Option 1 is accepted then Option 2 does not need to be voted on?

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: The proposal was an either/or by Stone.

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Very well, then we do not need to proceed any farther. Very well, I move that we request a motion to adjourn.

MR. MAYER: I motion.
MR. SALERNO: I second.

ALL PRESENT: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BELKA: Very well. Thank you people for your patience your time in this proceeding.

(Proceedings concluded at 8:06 p.m.)
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