

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CONCEPTUAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION

HELD AT VILLAGE HALL ON:

February 27, 2019

Project Title: Taylor Morrison Townhomes
Address: 37-45 S. Chestnut St., 36-40 S. Highland St.
Petitioner: Marc McLaughlin
Taylor Morrison
Address: 1834 Walden Office Square - Suite 300
Schaumburg, IL 60173

Requested Action:

1. A rezoning from R-3, One-Family Dwelling District into the R-7, Multiple-Family Dwelling District
2. A Planned Unit Development (PUD) to allow the construction of a 16-unit residential rowhome development.
3. Preliminary Plat of Resubdivision to subdivide the subject property into individual lots for each rowhome unit.

Variations Required:

1. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.2, Minimum Area for Zoning District, to allow the R-7 District to be approx. 1.39 acres where code requires a minimum of 2 acres for the R-7 District.
2. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a front yard setback along Highland Avenue to be 14' where code requires a 25' setback.
3. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a front yard setback along Chestnut Avenue to be 16' where code requires a 25' setback.
4. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6, Required Minimum Yards, to allow a side yard setback (north) to be 8' where code requires a 15' setback.
5. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.10, Spacing Between Multi-Family Buildings, to allow 5' spacing between principal buildings where code requires 25' spacing.
6. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-8, to allow a two-way driveway width of 22' where code requires a minimum of 24' for a two-way drive aisle.
7. Variation to Chapter 28, Section 10.2-9, to allow tandem parking spaces.
8. Variations will be required for each lot based on the R-7 setback and bulk standards, although the overall development will comply with bulk standards and with most setback standards.

Attendees: Marc McLaughlin, Taylor Morrison
Scott Barenbrugge, Taylor Morrison
Mark Hopkins, HKM Architects
Jay Cherwin, Plan Commissioner
John Sigalos, Plan Commissioner
Bruce Green, Plan Commissioner
Lynn Jensen, Plan Commissioner
Sam Hubbard, Development Planner
Jake Schmidt, Assistant Planner

Project Summary:

The subject property consists of six lots of record comprising a total of 41,987 square feet (0.96 acres) and is approximately one-fourth of the larger "Block 425" site, which is the area of land bounded by Sigwalt Street to the south, Campbell Street to the north, Highland Avenue to the east, and Chestnut Avenue to the west. Block 425 has sat vacant and undeveloped for several years. As it is an important piece of downtown, one of the Board's 2017 Strategic Priorities is to facilitate development

of Block 425. Currently, the subject property is zoned R-3, One-Family Dwelling District.

Taylor Morrison, a national homebuilder headquartered in Arizona, has the property under contract and is proposing a resubdivision of the property to accommodate the construction of a four-story 16-unit residential condominium rowhome development consisting of three separate rowhome buildings. Each rowhome unit would include a ground floor garage and a small entry room on the first floor, kitchen and living room/dining room space on the second floor, three bedrooms on the third floor, and a recessed fourth floor with space for a small office/den as well as an outdoor rooftop deck for each unit.

Access to the site would come from Highland Avenue, which would provide entry/exit to the rear loaded garages at the back of each unit. Each unit would include a minimum of two garage parking spaces and there would be 12 guest parking spaces in the rear motor court area. Two on-street parking spaces along Highland Avenue would be removed to accommodate the driveway entrance (there are currently five on-street parking spaces along Highland Avenue adjacent to the site).

Meeting Discussion:

Mr. McLaughlin began by giving a brief overview of the development; a 16-unit rowhome project proposed on the southern 150 feet of "Block 425". The site would be laid out so that five units faced Chestnut, six units faced Sigwalt, and five units faced Highland. Units would be accessed via rear loaded garages and a rear motor court, accessible with a single curb cut off of Highland. They would be requesting a couple of variations.

Mr. Hopkins described the rowhome structures as three story buildings with each unit sitting on a 20' x 40' lot. The unit would each have a two-car rear loaded garage and a front entry for each unit would face the street. The units would have a partial fourth floor, however, the two corner units would be only two stories at their rear. The site was designed to provide a continuous street wall along Sigwalt that would block the view into the motor court at the rear of the property. There would be a small five-foot separation between the Sigwalt rowhome building and the two rowhome buildings on each side, which would require a variation. The reason for this separation was to provide access to the rear guest parking stalls.

The interior would feature a small room on the first floor along with the garage parking spaces at the rear. The second floor would have the main living room, dining room, kitchen, and breakfast space. The third level would have the bedrooms, either two bedrooms or three bedrooms. The fourth level would have a small den that would provide access to the rooftop deck area. Each unit would have their own private rooftop deck with a partial screen wall between each deck to provide privacy.

The variation requests were a result of trying to fit the 20' x 40' the townhome footprints onto the site. Without the setback variations they would not have enough space behind the buildings to accommodate for the rear loaded garage, and without the setback variation to the north they would have to eliminate a unit. The proposed buildings would be less than 44 feet tall, although 60 feet is allowed by code. The townhomes would be fee simple so there would be a subdivision involved. He presented the renderings and discussed some of the architectural elements of the buildings.

Mr. Hubbard stated that the subject property was currently zoned R-3 and so the petitioner would be requesting a rezoning into the R-7 district to accommodate for the development. This rezoning was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, which designated the property as suitable for High Density Multi-Family development. The Staff Development Committee supported this rezoning. The proposed development was well below the maximum allowable density for the R-7 district and provided parking in excess of code requirements. All developments within the R-7 district were required to receive Planned Unit Development approval. Since the developer was proposing each rowhome to be on its own platted lot for fee simple ownership, a plat of subdivision would be required. This would create multiple variations for each rowhome lot, but these variations were due to how the code applied to each individual lot and did not really relate to the overall development.

The petitioner was requesting setback variations on the north side of the side, along the east side of the site abutting Highland Avenue, and along the west side of the site abutting Chestnut Avenue. These variations were fairly consistent with the previous proposal for this site from about a year ago, which had proposed a five story building. Staff was generally supportive of these setback variation requests. The requirement for eight feet of ROW dedication along both the east and west sides of the site was one of the reasons these variations were needed. The overall development appeared to conform with height

and bulk standard requirements, however, there would be certain variations required for the drive aisle width, building separation, and tandem parking spaces.

Design Commission approval would be required. The petitioner met with the Design Commission for a preliminary hearing on February 26th, and the commission was fairly supportive of the proposed architecture. As this project move forward, staff recommended that the petitioner hold a neighborhood meeting prior to appearing before the Plan Commission, and for all requested variations the petitioner would need to provide the necessary justification based on the approval criteria outlined in the Zoning Code. Overhead utility lines running through the center of the site would need to be buried. Lines that ran parallel to Sigwalt abutting the property would need to be analyzed to ensure that they wouldn't obstruct fire access to the buildings. If so, those lines would need to be buried or relocated.

A traffic and parking study would be required, as well as a market assessment. Staff will require that all utility infrastructure be appropriately sited and screened. Overall, staff was generally supportive of this project.

Commissioner Jensen asked staff how this project compared to the previous proposal on the site relative to opposition from the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Hubbard replied that staff would know more about neighborhood opinions as the project became more public and moved through the Plan Commission process. He noted that this project was not as tall, less dense, and provided more parking relative to code requirements in comparison to the previously proposed project on this site.

Commissioner Jensen asked the petitioner if they had any sense of neighborhood opposition at this point.

Mr. Hopkins responded that he did not. Up to this point the project had been confidential.

Commissioner Jensen asked about affordable housing.

Mr. McLaughlin replied that since these units would be for sale and would not be rental units, he anticipated paying a fee in lieu of affordable units.

Commissioner Jensen stated that the Plan Commission, and likely Village Board, would be less receptive to paying the fee in lieu of affordable units in the future.

Commissioner Sigalos said that the petitioner stated that the building would be around 42 feet tall, he asked if this was measured to the roof of the partial fourth floor or to the roof of the third floor.

Mr. Hopkins replied that the 42 foot measurement was to the top of the fourth floor. The top of the third floor would be about ten feet lower.

Commissioner Sigalos asked about pricing for the units.

Mr. McLaughlin said that with base price plus options, they expected that these units would close in the \$600,000 range.

Commissioner Sigalos stated that the previous proposal for the site was for more units and more height, and the developer at that time had stated that they could not reduce the height or unit count and still have an economically viable project. He asked the developer how confident they were in the viability of this development and said he wasn't sure if the price of the property had gone down since the last proposal.

Mr. McLaughlin replied that the price of the property had not gone down. Given their expected sale price, the proposed unit count was economically viable.

Commissioner Sigalos said that he thought that this project was great and that it was a great transitional development.

Given that the fourth floor would be setback from the street, this project would only appear like a three-story building. He thought the developer had done a nice job with this development proposal. With regards to affordable housing, he was not sure how the developer would be able to incorporate affordable units within the development given the price range that they were expecting.

Mr. McLaughlin responded that he agreed that affordable housing would be difficult to incorporate into the development and said that this is why they were looking at the fee in lieu option.

Mr. Barenbrugge stated that it was more difficult to incorporate affordable units into the development given the low number of units proposed.

Commissioner Cherwin said that he thought the site design was great and the buildings looked good too. He was glad to see some rooftop space and that this was something he usually looked for in new developments and that it would be a great selling feature. Some of the issues he had with the previous development proposed for this property did not appear to be present in this proposal. He agreed that utility infrastructure needed to be appropriately placed and screened. The fee in lieu of affordable housing made sense to him for this project.

Commissioner Green stated that he thought the developer had done a good job with their preliminary proposal and he noted that he hadn't had as many issues with the previously proposed project for this site as some of the other commissioners. The elevations were good and the five foot separation between the buildings was also a good feature. He encouraged the petitioner to move forward

RECOMMENDATION

The Conceptual Plan Review Committee advised the petitioner to proceed forward with their application.

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