

PLAN

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF A PUBLIC HEARING  
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS  
PLAN COMMISSION

COMMISSION

RE: CHAPTER 28 TEXT AMENDMENT - R-7 DISTRICT - PC# 17-005

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of  
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village  
Hall, 33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights,  
Illinois on the 8th day of August, 2018 at the hour of 7:31 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

LYNN JENSEN, Vice Chairman  
MARY JO WARSKOW  
JOE LORENZINI  
GEORGE DROST  
JOHN SIGALOS  
SUSAN DAWSON

ALSO PRESENT:

BILL ENRIGHT, Community Development Deputy Director

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: This meeting of the Arlington Heights Plan Commission is hereby called to order. Please rise with me and join me in the pledge to the flag.

(Pledge of allegiance recited.)

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: So, Bill, I guess we need to take a roll call?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, sure. Commissioner Cherwin.

(No response.)

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Green.

(No response.)

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Jensen.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Here.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Warskow and Commissioner Ennes not present.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Okay, I think our first order of business is to approve the minutes from our July 25th meeting, both the Napleton/Arlington Lanes parking lot and the Arlington Downs.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Any opposed?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I was not here for those meetings.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Oh, I was not here as well.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Okay, I think then we need to go to Chapter 28, Text Amendments for the R-7 District. Bill?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, thank you, Chairman or Chairman for a time. Thank you all for being here, but we really want to get to a quorum. As you're aware, the Village proposed several amendments to Chapter 28, and that was in two phases. We completed the first two phases. One of the phases, phase two included text amendments to various zoning districts dealing mostly with setbacks. With the R-7 District though, we held off on moving forward at that time because CA Ventures was proposing a downtown project and this was their second proposal at the same time as we were moving forward with the text amendments, and we didn't want to have a text amendment going through concurrent or before that project. So, we held off on that.

So, we're moving forward with that now. We did present some of these ideas with the phase two of the amendments, had a little bit of discussion on it, but I just

want to rehash it. But basically, the R-7 District, one of the things we changed in the multifamily districts that we'd like to do with the R-7 District is this requirement of building separations. Now, typically, you don't have multiple buildings in the R-7 District; it's usually just one building on a PUD lot. So, really it hasn't come into play much, but it doesn't mean that it couldn't. But we do have this quirky code requirement that you have to have a separation between walls depending upon if it's two buildings facing each other with a living room faces a bedroom, you have to have X number of feet, and it varies depending upon the type of room that's facing the other type of room. We found that to be kind of archaic and a little bit nonsensical.

So, for the other R-5 and R-6 Districts, those were changed to just a straight 25 feet for principal buildings. What we found in our research of multifamily districts with multiple buildings, that 25 feet has been about the average space in between buildings. So, you know, we think that's a reasonable number. So, these changes here to Section 5.17.9, spacing between buildings, would very much simplify it and just make it 25 feet. So, that will be consistent with what we've already done in the R-5 and R-6 multifamily zoning districts.

So, just for the record, Commissioner Warskow is present, so we have six.

The other area that we're looking at that is more substantial is, and I want to point out that there is language in here about 60-foot height, that's already in the code in a different section of the code for R-7, but for some reason it explicitly is not in the R-7 area. So, we're adding that in but it's not a change, it's not something new. It just was missing from this part of the code.

The other two areas we're looking at for the multifamily districts were the required minimum yards. The R-6 Zoning District had a similar requirement that if you go up in height, you have to add a foot of setback to the front and side yards. We feel that that's a bit onerous for the R-7 District, not only just for the Block 4215 project but other potential R-7 type areas in and around the downtown. As you know, the R-7 is pretty much regulated to within 300 feet of Downtown District, so a lot of the lots are pretty, not very deep. They're not huge development sites. So, in order to get, but we do allow 60 feet, so if you have the old way the code is written, you know, it required very large setbacks.

If you look at this graphic here, the yellow hashed areas are existing zoned R-7. The red are potential R-7 Districts; they're currently mostly R-3 but they do have the potential to be R-7 because the Comprehensive Plan shows these areas in red as high-density multifamily. Some of these sites, you know, have been developed upon to a certain extent but some are, you know, potentially ripe for development in the ring around the downtown and then up here to the northeast part of the downtown. Then even some of the existing R-7 across the North School Park is vacant, you know, and two churches over here although they're probably going to be here for a while. So, there are some sites that are either currently zoned R-7 or could be zoned R-7 where you could see additional development, although a lot of the R-7 has been built out in the 60's and 70's. But if you look at the areas in the yellow where we do have a lot of buildings built, the standards that we're proposing are consistent with a lot of those buildings in terms of setbacks. So, what we're proposing with the R-7 is not out of whack with what's already happened in the downtown fringe area wrapping around the downtown.

We're also recommending a slight modification to the maximum building lot coverage from 45 to 55 percent, which is of course slightly over half of the lot. Again, these lots, development sites, are fairly small in general which is not atypical for a downtown

environment. So, we're recommending a slight modification to that to be more in line again with other existing developments in and around the downtown.

So, these changes would be consistent with what we did in the, you know, to a certain extent the B-5, or I'm sorry, the R-5 and the R-6 with the building separations but then also the R-6 with the minimum lot yards just being a standard 25 feet to the front, 10 percent of lot width for the side, and then the exterior side yards basically 20 feet. So, that's what Staff is recommending, and I'll just open it up for discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: So, we're going to go to the Commissioners. Why don't we start with John? John, you want to start?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I really don't have any questions. I already read through it and I'm fine. So, you can go ahead with the others.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Mary Jo?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: There is still the option of in lieu of detention in these areas?

MR. ENRIGHT: There's only that option for, well, the short answer is no.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Okay.

MR. ENRIGHT: No.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Because if we're going to increase lot coverage by 10 percent, and the downtown already experiences flooding issues, I don't want to see that exacerbated.

MR. ENRIGHT: Right. We've only allowed fee in lieu of for two-lot subdivisions, single family, and for the B-5 Zoning District.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and to your point, I believe there will be some remediation of the flooding issue in the downtown area starting this fall I think, it's continuing.

MR. ENRIGHT: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So, that may allay some of that concern.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Right, but if we keep adding more impermeable surface, then we might just be overdoing what we're fixing now.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: So, I just want to, I would prefer not to have in lieu of detention when there's --

MR. ENRIGHT: We don't allow it in the R-7.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Okay.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and then to her point, this wouldn't impact adversely the new sort of remediation or flood control projects that are scheduled for this year and next year?

MR. ENRIGHT: No, because there really aren't that many sites left to redevelop in the R-7 around the downtown. So, it's a pretty small addition. Plus, we're building quite a bit of infrastructure in the downtown area to the west, on Campbell and on Sigwalt, so there's going to be some pretty large pipes going in.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Anything else?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: No, that was it.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: No questions.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Commissioner Lorenzini?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes. Bill, the larger residential buildings downtown, the ones up to 80 and 90 feet, what is the lot coverage minimum on those?

MR. ENRIGHT: There is no maximum.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, and these lots are right next to them pretty much.

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, either, generally they're across the street. Very rarely are they right next, I mean some border.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: It just seems a little drastic to go from 100 percent lot coverage and then we cut it to 55. It seems like it should be more of a gradual coverage with that.

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, you know, I do think though when you factor in the setbacks in the R-7, it's a lot more residential in the downtown where we encourage zero lot line development with commercial on the first floor. So, I do think the nature of R-7 is quite a bit different than the Downtown B-5. As Commissioner Warskow alluded to, you know, some of the issues that we have with flooding in the area is because, you know, the downtown developed without detention and, you know, without adequate sized pipes. So, I don't think you want to go much beyond the 55 percent, and looking at the R-7 buildings around the downtown area, most if not all would fit that more or less.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Anything else?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: That's it.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Commissioner Drost?

COMMISSIONER DROST: When you were studying these changes, how competitive are we with neighboring municipalities? Is this consistent with what you did to, will this make us a more attractive place for developers?

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, you know, I don't know. But we did not compare ourselves to other towns because not every town has this, you know, secondary district around their downtown. So, you know, a lot of downtowns don't have that transition, and if they do, they may have an R-7 District or something similar but it might be vastly different than ours in terms of density. Just like height in the downtown, there aren't many downtowns in the northwest suburbs that have the height and density that we permit. Even our friends to the, you know, east and west don't, you know, allow this type of height or density. So, it reads all different, so it's hard to really, it's always comparing apples and oranges.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I'm just looking at it from the standpoint of a community that is, you know, ahead of the curve maybe or wants to be ahead of the curve, that we're really trying to be accommodative to major changes. I mean this doesn't just drop out of a tree.

MR. ENRIGHT: Right.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Somebody's thought about it and said, well, this makes some sense for some sensible development of the urban areas within the Village.

MR. ENRIGHT: Well, I think the R-7 changes with the setbacks is sensible because I think it was, as you experienced from the CA Ventures, they needed some pretty

significant variations for the yards.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: You really couldn't get a building that we see in the downtown area around the fringe with those kind of onerous setback requirements. So, I think we're making our code more viable to encourage additional development.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Good. That's it, thanks.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Actually, I neglected to ask for someone to vote on the Staff report, make a recommendation that the Staff report be included in the public record. So, can we go back and add a motion to do that?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Good. All those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Okay, we have no public comment to be had since there is no audience. So, would someone like to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll make a motion.

**A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC# 17-005, Amendments to Chapter 28, Section 5, as outlined in the Staff memo dated July 30, 2018.**

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll second.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: So, we've got a motion and a second. Bill, would you take roll call?

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Dawson.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Jensen.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: Oh, Commissioner Warskow, sorry.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Yes.

MR. ENRIGHT: I did just an X and I needed to replace -- great.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Okay.

MR. ENRIGHT: We have another item, that's the budget for 2019. Are there any comments on that?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, we need to raise our fees, and eliminate them.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Any comments? I'm not going to raise my usual comments.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: So, do we have a motion to accept, do we need to accept the budget?

MR. ENRIGHT: Yes, if you could do a voice vote to approve?

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Sure. Do we have a motion to accept the budget?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'll make that motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: All those in favor say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: The motion carries.

MR. ENRIGHT: Great.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Any other business?

MR. ENRIGHT: No.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Okay, then we need a motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER WARSKOW: Second.

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: All those in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: Any opposed?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIRMAN JENSEN: The meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the above-mentioned petition was adjourned at 7:46 p.m.)