Zine, Natalie

From: CARRIE & MIKE O'ROURKE [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2026 10:41 PM
To: Zine, Natalie
Subject: EX: Northern Illinois Recovery Opposition - O'Rourke

Zoning Petition # (4694)
Project Name (Northern Illinois Recovery LLC)

Carrie and Mike O'Rourke
3415 Green Pastures Rd,
Carpentersville, IL 60110

In Opposition to the Petition

Formal Objection to the Proposed Northern Illinois Recovery Center Facility at the Parsons Property (35W543 Miller Rd)

To the Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and Other Reviewing Officials:

My family and I strongly oppose the proposed zoning change that would allow Northern Illinois Recovery Center to convert the Parsons property into a residential treatment facility for individuals with substance use disorders and co-occurring mental health conditions.

We have lived in the Spring Acres Hills planned development for 24 years. Our home, along with those of other residents, backs up to the Parsons property. This is an established residential neighborhood with many families and young children. The proposed facility raises significant concerns regarding land-use compatibility, traffic safety, emergency access, staffing, parking, and the long-term quality of life for surrounding homeowners.

We respectfully ask that the proposed zoning change be denied unless and until the applicant can adequately address these substantial concerns.

1. Incompatibility With the Existing Residential Neighborhood

The Parsons property is immediately adjacent to an established residential neighborhood. In more than two decades of living here, I have never known the property to be used for farming. We were surprised to learn that it is zoned for agricultural use rather than a residential estate or comparable residential classification. Given the property's history and its relationship to the surrounding homes, the existing zoning designation and the appropriateness of the proposed change warrant careful examination.

Converting this property into a facility housing 30–35 residents, with staff working in shifts, would introduce a substantially different use into an area that has long functioned as a quiet residential neighborhood.

The commission should carefully evaluate whether a facility of this size and intensity is appropriate for this location and whether its proposed operations are compatible with the established character of the surrounding community.

2. Serious Traffic Safety and Emergency Access Concerns

The proposed facility would generate additional vehicle trips on Miller Road, a busy two-lane roadway with significant safety concerns. The Parsons property's driveway is situated near a hill that creates visibility challenges for vehicles entering and exiting the property.

The intersection of Miller Road and Route 31 has experienced serious accidents, including reported fatal and near-fatal incidents. Winter weather and the roadway's elevation changes create additional concerns about visibility, stopping distances, and vehicle control.

Introducing additional traffic from employees, shift changes, visitors, service providers, deliveries, and emergency vehicles could increase the risks on this already challenging roadway.

The limited width of Miller Road also raises questions about whether police, fire, and ambulance services could access the property safely and efficiently during an emergency, particularly if vehicles are entering or leaving at the same time.

Before any approval is considered, the applicant should be required to provide a credible traffic impact study, a documented assessment of driveway sight lines, and an evaluation of emergency vehicle access under both normal and adverse weather conditions.

The commission should also determine whether the proposed use would create additional roadway maintenance or infrastructure costs for local taxpayers.

3. Questions About the Proposed Capacity, Living Space, and Supervision

The applicant proposes to house approximately 30–35 residents in a home containing approximately 9,275 square feet. According to the application materials as we understand them, the proposed sleeping arrangements would include rooms with two, three, or four beds.

The applicant's plans raise important questions about the actual dimensions of the sleeping rooms, the amount of usable common space, the number of bathrooms, resident privacy, and the adequacy of the overall living environment for individuals receiving treatment.

A facility serving people with complex treatment needs must have sufficient space, appropriate accommodations, and adequate supervision. The commission should not assume that the proposed number of residents can be accommodated safely and comfortably without a detailed review of the building layout, applicable occupancy requirements, and the operational plan.

We are also concerned about the proposed staffing level of approximately four employees per shift. The application should clearly explain the responsibilities and qualifications of those employees, the number of direct-care staff present at all times, how staff coverage will be maintained during shift changes, and how medical emergencies, behavioral crises, and other incidents will be handled.

We request that the applicant provide a detailed staffing and emergency-response plan demonstrating that the proposed capacity can be managed responsibly without compromising resident welfare or placing unreasonable demands on local emergency services.

4. Insufficiently Documented Parking and Operational Traffic

The proposed facility's parking requirements deserve further scrutiny. A residential treatment center serving 30–35 residents may generate traffic from employees, shift changes, visitors, contractors, deliveries, maintenance personnel, and other service providers.

The commission should require a complete parking analysis that accounts for actual staffing schedules, overlapping shifts, visitor activity, service vehicles, and applicable parking requirements. It should also establish whether the proposed parking arrangement can accommodate these demands without overflow parking or unsafe vehicle movements.

The applicant should additionally explain how housekeeping, sanitation, infection prevention, laundry, food service, groundskeeping, and general maintenance will be handled. These are necessary operational functions that require adequate staffing, space, and logistical planning.

These questions are not minor administrative details. They are essential to determining whether the proposed facility can function safely and effectively at the stated capacity.

5. Potential Impacts on Neighboring Homes and Raceway Woods

Our neighborhood is valued for its peaceful residential character and its family-friendly environment. We are concerned about the potential effects of introducing a high-capacity treatment facility immediately behind existing homes.

We also question how the facility will manage residents who leave the premises without authorization or who otherwise need assistance outside the property. What procedures will be followed when a resident leaves unexpectedly? How will staff respond? What measures will be in place to prevent situations from becoming emergencies?

The surrounding residential streets and nearby Raceway Woods are used by residents and outdoor enthusiasts, including people who hike and enjoy the natural surroundings. The applicant should explain how it will manage off-site incidents and coordinate with emergency services when necessary.

We recognize that individuals receiving treatment deserve dignity, appropriate care, and a safe environment. Our objection is not to treatment or recovery services themselves. It is to the placement and proposed scale of this particular facility without sufficient evidence that its operations, access, and safeguards are appropriate for this specific location.

6. Need for Transparency and Independent Review

The application leaves us with significant unanswered questions about staffing, parking, traffic generation, resident capacity, and day-to-day operations. We believe these issues must be addressed through specific documentation rather than general assurances.

We ask the commission to independently evaluate the applicant's representations and require supporting evidence for the proposed operating model. This should include:

1. A detailed staffing schedule and resident-supervision plan.

2. A traffic impact study addressing peak periods and employee and contractor shift changes and will there be security.
3. A driveway sight-distance and roadway safety assessment. For the traffic study that was conducted, the east entrance failed for stopping safety and observation safety.
4. A complete parking plan accounting for employees, visitors, and service vehicles.
5. A building floor plan showing sleeping-room dimensions, occupancy, bathrooms, and common areas.
6. Documentation demonstrating compliance with applicable building, fire, life-safety, and occupancy requirements.
7. An emergency-response and incident-management plan, including coordination with local police, fire, and emergency medical services.
8. An operational plan covering housekeeping, sanitation, maintenance, deliveries, and groundskeeping.

Until these questions are answered with credible, verifiable information, the commission cannot reasonably conclude that the proposed use will be compatible with the neighborhood or that its operational impacts have been adequately addressed.

Conclusion

My family and our neighbors have invested decades in our homes and community. We believe that decisions affecting this established residential neighborhood must be made with careful consideration of public safety, land-use compatibility, infrastructure, and the long-term interests of surrounding residents.

The proposed conversion of the Parsons property into a facility housing 30–35 residents raises substantial concerns that have not been adequately resolved. The combination of a challenging roadway, driveway visibility issues, limited emergency access, questions about parking and staffing, and the immediate proximity of established homes warrants serious scrutiny.

We respectfully request that the commission **deny the requested zoning change** because the applicant has not yet demonstrated that the proposed facility, at its stated capacity and with its proposed operating arrangements, can be accommodated safely and appropriately at this location.

Our community deserves a thorough, evidence-based review before a decision is made that could permanently alter the character and daily life of this neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Carrie and Michael O’Rourke

Concerned Spring Acres Hills Residents
24-Year Residents of the Neighborhood