

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF  
**THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE**

OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION

HELD AT VILLAGE HALL ON:

May 9, 2018

---

**Project Title:** 614 N. Haddow Ave. Lot Consolidation

**Address:** 608-614 N. Haddow Ave.

**Petitioner:** Robert Flubacker  
Robert Flubacker Architects, Ltd.  
1835B Rohlwing Rd.  
Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

**Requested Action:**

1. Preliminary Plat of Resubdivision to consolidate the two lots into one.

**Variations Required:**

- None identified at this time

**Attendees:**

Terry Kurzynski, Homeowner  
Robert Flubacker, Project Architect/Petitioner  
Jay Cherwin, Plan Commissioner  
Bruce Green, Plan Commissioner  
John Sigalos, Plan Commissioner  
Lynn Jensen, Plan Commissioner  
Sam Hubbard, Development Planner  
Jake Schmitt, Assistant Planner

---

**Project Summary:**

The subject property consists of two platted lots of record. The first lot contains the single-family home located at 614 N. Haddow, the second lot is addressed 608 N. Haddow and is currently vacant and serves as an additional yard/landscape area for the home at 614 N. Haddow. Both lots are owned by the resident at 614 N. Haddow Avenue, and each lot is approximately 66 feet by 132 feet. The 614 N. Haddow lot is 10,890 square feet, and the 608 N. Haddow lot is 10,730 square feet (although the Plat of Survey shows the property as including 33 feet of Haddow Avenue within the boundaries of the property which land must be dedicated to the Village). A previous owner of the vacant lot had applied for a variation in 2001 to make the vacant lot buildable, but the request was rejected by the Zoning Board of Appeals. The vacant lot was later obtained by the owner of 614 N. Haddow and has served as a portion of his yard ever since.

If approved, the combined lots would yield a 17,424 square foot singular lot (which takes into consideration the required ROW dedication) that would be 132 feet wide. The petitioner would construct an addition to the southern and western elevations of the home, which would result in an approximately 7,000 square foot residence when complete. The existing two-car detached garage would be removed from the rear yard, and a new 3-car attached garage would be added to the home. The driveway on the north side of the house would be removed and returned to landscaping, and a new driveway would be constructed at the southern side of the site.

**Meeting Discussion:**

**Mr. Kurzynski** explained that the project started out as simply a desire to create additional garage space to park his vehicles, and it led to a need to create mudroom, which in turn led to updating the kitchen, and eventually the project encompassed a large addition to the home as is currently proposed. The existing house does not have a very conducive layout for his family, and one of the goals of the project was to open the house up so that thing weren't so chopped up. The basement would be extended as part of this project.

**Commissioner Green** asked if they would be making the basement deeper.

**Mr. Kurzynski** replied that they would be slightly, and that the height of the basement would be around 10 feet. The project would also involve the creation of an outdoor porch space, which would have a wood burning fireplace, a electronic retractable screens, and infrared heating in the roof to allow for use into the winter. The existing detached garage would be demolished and an attached garage is now proposed. The demolition of the garage would free up backyard space for his children to play.

**Mr. Hubbard** explained that the property existed as two legally platted lots of record, and it wasn't until after 2003 that they both became owned by the same individual. The Subdivision Code stated that only if two contiguous lots have been under common ownership prior to 2003 could these two lots be used together and be considered as one "zoning" lot. In order to accommodate for the proposed addition without any variations, the property had to be consolidated via the subdivision process. The property was zoned R-1 and was shown as "Single Family Detached" on the Comprehensive plan, and the proposed subdivision was compliant with the existing zoning and compatible with the Comprehensive Plan.

A sidewalk would be required along Haddow, which is a code requirement when any property is subdivided. Additionally, the existing lot included 33 feet of land that extended out into Haddow Avenue, and this portion of the property would be required to be dedicated as Right-of-Way as part of the subdivision process. Based on an analysis of the lot sizes in the vicinity, the size of the consolidated lot would be within the range of existing lot sizes in the neighborhood. The required setback for the lot would be based on the existing home on the frontage, and so the petitioner would need to provide information on the setbacks for these existing homes in order to allow staff to determine what the required front yard setback would be.

The petitioner had the option of going through separate preliminary and final plat of subdivision approval hearings, or combining those two into one hearing with the Plan Commission. If they wished to combine both processes into one, they would need to provide final engineering plans within their Plan Commission application, as opposed to simply just preliminary engineering plans.

**Mr. Kurzynski** asked about engineering plans.

**Mr. Hubbard** replied that engineering plans needed to show the proposed lot grades, utility connections, and stormwater calculations. Final Plat of Subdivision approval would also require the provision of any required bonds/deposits for required public improvements. The proposed home addition brought the consolidated property close to maxing out on allowable F.A.R., and so staff wanted the petitioner to be aware that this could restrict future additions or detached garages on the site. Finally, a fee in lieu of detention would be required. The subdivision process triggers the need for on-site detention. For small subdivisions, the Village allows this detention to be accommodated within our stormwater system rather than providing an onsite detention area. However, a fee for accommodating the stormwater within the Village's system is required.

**Commissioner Cherwin** asked the petitioner is they believed that they could address the items raised by staff.

**Mr. Kurzynski** asked about the requirement to provide a sidewalk. He stated that the project was quite expensive as is, and the additional cost of a sidewalk was not something that he would choose to incorporate if not required. He asked if there was any negotiation on the need for a sidewalk.

**Mr. Hubbard** responded that the petitioner could request a variation for relief from this requirement, however, he thought that staff would probably not support this variation.

**Mr. Kurzynski** asked about the bonds/deposits.

**Mr. Hubbard** explained that the bonds/deposits were needed to guarantee the work done on the sidewalk and any other required public improvements, since eventually those improvements would become the responsibility of the Village to maintain. Therefore, the Village needed assurance that if the improvements were not constructed properly, then there was funding for the Village to bring them up to code standards. He said he believed that the amount of the bond would be 115%

of the overall construction cost of the public improvements.

**Commissioner Cherwin** said that he didn't have any concerns with the proposal and thought that the petitioner should take the opportunity to streamline the approval process for preliminary and final plat of subdivision in to one hearing, although if there were engineering items that made combination of the process impossible, then obviously those could prevent this.

**Mr. Kurzynski** asked how the engineering items could hold up the process.

**Commissioner Cherwin** explained that in order to combine the process, all engineering items such as the design of the sidewalk or the final detention calculations, would be needed upfront with the Plan Commission application. If those plans were not developed yet, then they could still proceed with preliminary plat of subdivision approval and would have to return to the Plan Commission for final plat of subdivision approval once those plans were finalized.

**Mr. Hubbard** added that final engineering plans would also be required along with any building permit application submittal, so it was a question of whether the petitioner wanted to finalize them now and combine the preliminary and final plat process, or finalize them later and go back before the Plan Commission for final plat of subdivision approval.

**Commissioner Jensen** asked if the petitioner was required to go through the Design Commission process.

**Mr. Hubbard** confirmed that the proposed addition would require a Design Commission application.

**Commissioner Cherwin** asked what was required in the way of stormwater detention details.

**Mr. Hubbard** replied that the petitioner would need to provide a calculation outlining how much stormwater runoff would be generated on the site.

**Commissioner Sigalos** said that he did not have any questions and said that he thought it looked like a good project.

**Commissioner Green** said that he liked to see people combining two smaller lots into one larger lot. He encouraged the petitioner to move forward.

**Mr. Flubacker** asked if full engineering drawing were needed for the consolidation process.

**Mr. Hubbard** explained that if they wanted to request only preliminary plat of subdivision approval when they filed an application, only preliminary engineering would be required. This would allow them to proceed to the Plan Commission and Village Board for preliminary plat of subdivision approval. It would also require that they come back before the Plan Commission and Village Board for a second appearance once they provided final engineering plans, and they would receive final plat of subdivision approval at that time. Alternatively, they could provide final engineering at the time of Plan Commission application submittal, and they would receive both preliminary and final plat of subdivision approval at the same time without needing a second appearance before the Plan Commission and Village Board.

**Mr. Flubacker** asked if the fee in lieu of onsite detention was based on just the change between the existing coverage and the proposed coverage.

**Mr. Hubbard** responded that they would need to confirm this with the Engineering Department and that he was unsure if they could get credit for the existing impervious surface coverage on the site.

**Mr. Flubacker** made the point that if they had chosen not to consolidate the two lots and instead asked for variations to allow the proposed building addition, no fee in lieu of detention would be required and the end result of the construction on the lot would be the same.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

614 NORTH HADDOW AVENUE LOT CONSOLIDATION – TEMP FILE 1618

The Conceptual Plan Review Committee advised that the petitioner move forward.

**Bruce Green, Chair**  
**CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**Sam Hubbard, Recorder**