

**From:** Chiqui Johnson <[chiqui32@comcast.net](mailto:chiqui32@comcast.net)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 30, 2023 11:28 AM  
**To:** Long Grove <[longgrove@mundelein.org](mailto:longgrove@mundelein.org)>  
**Subject:** Re: 5159 Aptakisic Road.

**“The comments herein provided are true to my best knowledge and belief under penalty of perjury.”**

**TO:** Plan Commission & Zoning Board of Appeals  
**RE:** Fire Station - Public Hearing - October 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2023

After four meetings--and a 16-pages letter from the Chief's Attorney--I can't help but sense some resistance on the part of the Chief to follow the Long Grove Special Use Permit application criteria.

But why the Chief resistant to follow the permit criteria from the very start (?!)

After four meeting on this same item, I had the impression that Chief Segalla does not want to commit to spending any money on preliminary plat documents. Unless he gets that Special Use Permit approve first because their own Fire House Department Board do not allow them to waste any money. The very Chief Segalla and one of his attorneys alluded as much.

The Fire House Board District, their attorneys and the Chief do not seem to understand that there is a Long Grove zoning criteria to follow, if they truly want the Special Use Permit (SUP) approved.

The Chief seemed a tad anxious to get the SUP approved, so he could move on with the land purchased because as he alluded—it is good price.

I just hope that the Chief is not expecting that the SUP be approved “just because” of whom they are with no additional paperwork required at this time.

Of course, we all know that the Fire House service is an indispensable service to all communities.

But no one should be exempt from meeting the Long Grove SUP paperwork required in order to get this initial process approved.

More so, when a projected building structure of significant size has been planned in a residential area--- --with one subdivision on the north; facing another subdivision 200 feet across the street and a few other residents (not in subdivisions affiliation) but living 400 feet away the north side of the road.

Only Chief Segalla own lack of follow thru caused the initial PZCBA denial to the Special Use Permit and the re-sending back to the PZCBA by the Board of Trustees for another chance.

But hopeful by the October 3rd Public Hearing the Chief and his team are going to come "more than fully prepared".

But once the SUP is approved, there is no going back. The resident s' chance to say anything in favor or against will be over.

One of Long Grove many objectives since the late 1970's include: **"to promote and protect groundwater recharge thru the protection of aquifer recharge areas" ...**

I hope that closer attention is going to be paid to the so-called "drainage way soil" and the "orientation of the land"---because there is a pond in one of the lots (5161).

Since I have never been inside that property, I am only assuming that the pond might play an important part on capturing excess rainwater because the orientation of the land might lean towards that side of the 7 acres.

Only an expert could verify, if with such a large structure being planned, any excess of rainwater could move next door to the "existing tree business" or towards the back of the property or would it end up in the culvert along the road.

I read somewhere, *possibly* the Village Comprehensive Plan or maybe the Zoning documents that:

"There are certain topographic features on the land orientation to help heavy rainwater runoff, so the soil has time to absorb excessive run off water and to ensure that important natural recharge areas are not lost."

Somewhere in those 7 acres there is going to be an approximately a - 24,000 square feet building structure with a cement or asphalt 41 parking spaces and a "wide" right in-and-out driveway. In addition, the Attorney's letter also list: future expansion.

I sure hope that the "applicant" feels encourage to hire a trained wetlands conservationist or soil specialist that could determine any constrains with "drainage way soil". Of course, only if this kind of report is necessary by the Zoning Board.

IF, conservancy or soil specialist is required, I hope the report comes in writing and not just a verbal report from a fly by night specialist that comes to verbally just say "all is fine!"

Considering the overall size of the building structure that is planned---a flood elevation (or water surface elevation) and the itemization of any floodways documents maybe should be required--since it is not known if any unusual conditions exist on any of those seven acres.

Maybe, their preliminary plat document includes the land elevation, slopes and contours. But let us hope the "contours" numbers are not just copied from a US/Lake County map but that is actually measured for exact verification. I am sure the preliminary plat will include any other water detention besides the existing pond.

In the Long Grove Comprehensive Plan --or maybe it was in the zoning documents that I read this other line:

**“Other access to properties from Aptakistic Road is to be limited to right-in/right-out due to the planned median as part of the Lake County's improvements plan.”**

But based on the Attorney's letter, factors that were **not favorable for the Aptakistic property use as a Fire Station...**

Among the items listed, I set these two aside:

1. **Multiple access possibilities:**

What are those multiple access possibilities that are not suitable for the Station in the Aptakistic Road? It is either the right-in or out -to the property! Or is it the Lake County planned median to Aptakistic Road that they are concern about under these multiple access possibilities? Or are they planning to have more than one in-and out driveways?

2. **Major detractions:**

Why they did not mention exactly what are those major detractions? Could it be that they are concern about the proximity to the RT 83 corner with the traffic gridlock that

sometimes drivers encounter at RT 83 and Aptakistic Road? They could have been more specific.

I do recall that during some of the hearings, residents asked Chief Segalla: whether he had checked with the Lake County to verify that they don't add any median obstacles to that segment of the new road under construction.

Residents also shared with Chief Segalla the traffic gridlock that sometimes takes place at the RT 83 & Aptakistic intersection.

But Chief said that all was taken care of-- referring to the median on the new road. Chief also said that they are used to gridlock traffic and that they have an electronic device to change the light, so traffic gets moving.

Other point of concern is-- that on the event of a fire emergency during rush hour, the drivers that are waiting in traffic along Aptakistic Rd and before the Valentino's Vineyard--those drivers are not going to hesitate to make a right turn into Hilltop Road to cut thru Briarcrest Subdivision to get to RT 83 faster. More so, if they are heading north. The cut thru can eventually put tear and wear on Hilltop Road --the main road inside Briarcrest Subdivision and paid by Briarcrest HOA.

Needless to add, the many residents that enjoy daily walks along Hilltop Road in our Briarcrest community. They will have to become very mindful when they hear the siren during rush hours --because drivers cutting thru our subdivision are not going to slow down to our subdivision speed limits.

In our humble opinion, we still think this Fire Station relocation would have been better suited at the south end of Sunset Mall, next to the well house.

We also believe that the relocation of this Fire Station to Aptakistic Road could set precedence for other non-residential home developments to come. And those that live at this end of town will be the ones that have to live with any future negative impact.

And to think that the Referendum results of April 4th, 2023!

Lake County: had only 400 votes with 347 votes against the referendum.

When Lake Active Register Voters is: 224,494.

Cook: only had 40 votes with 11 against the same referendum.

Total: 440 votes casted and 358 against.

And according to the Long Grove Fire House District own website **they currently service 12,000 residents!**

**But only 82 voters decided the outcome for this Fire House referendum.**

**Did that referendum mention the possible relocation to Aptakistic Road?**

**Did the Fire House District Board ever considered meeting with the residents that would be more directly impacted before Chief committed himself to buying the Aptakistic property?**

We will abide by the ultimate decision from the PZCBA and the Board of Trustees for the greater good of the community at large.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Magdalena & Brian Johnson  
5244