

August 9, 2021

**Sam Hubbard**

Development Planner  
Department of Planning and Community Development  
Village of Arlington Heights  
33 S. Arlington Heights Road  
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

**RE: 1400-1500 W. Dundee Rd., Arlington Heights – Review Letter Response**

Arlington Heights, Illinois (Cook County)  
PEG Job No.: 2283.00-IL

Dear Sam Hubbard,

Thank you for your comment letter dated July 21, 2021. Please find the following documents, provided digitally, for your review, along with responses to your comments.

- nine (9) Comment Response Letter
- nine (9) Preliminary Civil Engineering Plans (for both Ridgeline & Lexus sites) (4 full size & 5 11x17)
- nine (9) Preliminary Landscape Plans (for both Ridgeline & Lexus sites) (4 full size & 5 11x17)
- nine (9) Lexus Fire Truck Turning Movement Exhibit (4 full size & 5 11x17)
- nine (9) Lexus Photometric Plans (4 full size & 5 11x17)
- nine (9) Overall PUD Site Plan Exhibit (4 full size & 5 11x17)
- nine (9) Preliminary Plat
- nine (9) Future East Ingress & Egress Easement Exhibit
- five (5) Traffic Impact Study Report
- nine (9) Nissan legal description
- nine (9) Letter from Liston & Tsantilis regarding Interpretation of Easement Letter
- nine (9) Link letter regarding the cross-parking easement
- nine (9) Main Entrance and Fire Hydrant Location Exhibit (11 x 17)
- One (1) Jump drive with digital copies of the entire submittal

**Plan Commission**

53) The petitioner's response to comment nos. 45-50, and 51 a, b, c (i) and d and e are acceptable.

**Response: Understood.**

54) The petitioner's response to comment no. 51, item c (ii) is not acceptable. The Village will not accept maintenance of the private utility line for the existing Lexus building. Establishing a private utility easement would be acceptable.

**Response: The preliminary plat has been revised to include the requested Private Utility Easement over the sanitary sewer.**

**Arlington Heights Fire Department**

- 1) The Fire Department Connections shall be located at the main front entrances. It shall be fully visible and accessible and within 100 feet of the nearest accessible fire hydrant capable of delivering the required flow.

**Response:** The main entrance for Building 1 is located at the southwest corner of the building. There is a labeled 'anticipated FDC location' shown there on the utility plan, with a fire hydrant within 100' to the south of that area in the parking island located between required proposed parking island trees. The main entrance for Building 2 is located at the southeast corner of the building. There is a labeled 'anticipated FDC location' shown there on the utility plan, with a fire hydrant within 100' to the southeast of that location.

### **Planning & Community Development**

66) The response to the following comments is acceptable: #39, #46, #47, #49, and #60.

**Response: Understood.**

67) The response to comment 40 is not acceptable. Shade trees are required at the ends of all parking rows. Shade trees are missing in the following locations. Either incorporate the required shade trees or request a variation and provide the required written justification, which includes a response to each of the 4 approval criteria.

**Response by Lexus project team representative (JCA): See Revised Landscape Plan (will be forwarded once received).**

68) The response to comment #41 is noted. Please provide the response within the following framework, addressing each criteria individually.

#### **Standards for Variation approval:**

- The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses and zoning of nearby property.
- The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, which may include the length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned.
- The proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Chapter.
- The variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property.

**Response by Lexus project team representative (JCA): Standards for Variation Approval: Tandem Parking**

- **The proposed use will not alter the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with existing uses of nearby property** - Since the proposed tandem parking on the Lexus site existed previously throughout the area, it will match the essential character of the locality and will be compatible with the existing uses of nearby property. The variance has been granted as part of previous PUD approvals of this area.
- **The plight of the owner is due to unique circumstances, which may include length of time the subject property has been vacant as zoned** – The areas of the site redevelopment have been vacant since the last PUD revision in 2008. The owner is making changes in the overall site so that these vacant areas can be redeveloped to the benefit of the community. As part of the proposed changes the owner has given up significant areas of vehicle storage and thus the need for the requested variance.
- **The proposed variation is in harmony with the spirit and intent of this Chapter** – As indicated by previous PUD approves which included the requested variance, spirit and intent of the Chapter are met by allowing flexibility in the redevelopment that would not other be possible.
- **The variance requested is the minimum variance necessary to allow reasonable use of the property** – The requested variance is only being used in limited area and not throughout the site to provide the greatest flexibility of the redevelopment of property surrounding the Lexus dealership while maintaining the minimum vehicle storage areas required for the success of the dealership.

69) The response to comment #42 is noted. Please double check the legal description provided for the Nissan lot; staff has noted the following errors and questions the accuracy of the legal description:

- The address for the Nissan lot is incorrect.
- The PIN # provided for the Nissan lot does not exist.
- The square footage for the lot does not match the square footage as shown on the recorded Final Plat of Subdivision.

**Response:** The revised legal information for the Nissan lot is included in the resubmittal. It was forwarded to Sam early for making the publishing deadline, but the legal being submitted is the same document that was sent.

70) The response to comment #43 is noted. Staff has verified that the Curtiss Wright property contains sufficient parking to conform to code requirements as existing and without the need for the overflow area as identified within and provided by the easement on the Ridgeline Lot.

However, Doc. 00364848 does not give the owner of the Ridgeline lot the rights to improve the easement area as proposed. While it is understood that Ridgeline is negotiating vacation of the easement or the reduction of the easement with permission to improve the area as proposed, unless said change or vacation is executed, the beneficiary of the easement has the legal authority to block the improvements as proposed by Ridgeline. Please provide a conceptual plan that outlines how the Ridgeline site would be redesigned to avoid modifications to the easement area should the beneficiary of that easement object to the proposed site improvements. Alternatively, Ridgeline can provide an executed easement vacation or an executed revised easement document that grants permission for the improvements as proposed. To maximize the parking supply on the Ridgeline lot, it is recommended that this easement be vacated as opposed to reduced in size.

**Response by Ridgeline:** After further review of easement Doc. 00364848 with my legal counsel, Liston & Tsantilis, it was determined that the existing easement does not block the fire/truck lane road that wraps around the parking.

As discussed with Charles Perkins and Sam Hubbard on Thursday, 7/29/2021, Ridgeline is to provide two letters: 1.) A letter from Liston and Tsantili, defining the interpretation of the easement Doc. 00364848 and 2.) A letter from Link (owner of Curtiss Wright building), stating that Link will work with Ridgeline on the modification of the easement. Both letters are attached in the packet. The write-up from Liston and Tsantilis is below.

[In our review the integral text is the easement's statement on the first page, within Paragraph #2 that states, "...nonexclusive ingress and egress from Parcel 2 to the parking spaces designated on Exhibit C and for the exclusive right to park in that portion of the Ingress, Egress and Parking Easement Area designated as parking area."

When reviewing Exhibit C there is a clear delineation of the Easement Area, which is outlined with a thick black line. Within the Easement Area there are two different markings. The first are angled parallel lines that represent the "nonexclusive ingress and egress from Parcel 2," and the second being dots that represent the "exclusive parking area" that represents 40 parking spaces.

Outside of the easement area there are two boxes that likely were to serve as a legend for these two markings where one box says "nonexclusive ingress & egress area" and the second box says "exclusive parking area." These boxes are left empty, likely due to error.

This exhibit and these markings can only be interpreted in one way and that only the dots would represent the exclusive parking area and that the parallel lines solely represent areas of ingress and egress. The dots solely cover parking spaces and do not extend into any drive aisle. The intent for this can only be interpreted as created an exclusive area for parking. If the intention was to have the ability to park within the drive aisles then there would be no need to delineate a separation between the two markings, or there would be an overlap in both types of markings to include both dots and lines.

Further, it is of our opinion that the inclusion of parking in the drive aisles (where the parallel lines delineate the nonexclusive ingress and egress) it would create a blockage of the drive aisles thus creating potential backups and safety hazards.

**Therefore, it is of our opinion that the Easement Area was meant to provide the specific 40 parking spaces with ingress and egress access given to them via the outlined drive aisles.]**

- 71) The response to comment #41 is acceptable. As a condition of approval, the applicable CCR's shall be amended to provide for adequate maintenance shared elements (utilities, stormwater infrastructure, etc.) and appropriate ingress/egress easements shall be established, which shall be at the discretion of the Village.

**Response by Ridgeline: CCR's will be provided after Preliminary Approval, but before Final Plat Approval.**

- 72) The response to comment #48 is noted. Based on the revised KLOA study, the following comments have been generated:
- a. Please double check the Capacity Analysis results, which on certain movements appear to indicate improvement in the level of delay within the year 2027 Projected Conditions in comparison to existing conditions. Why would these movements decrease in delay given 5 years of regional growth factor increase plus the increase in traffic attributed to this development?
  - b. Does the capacity analysis and delay timing take into consideration that 20% of the new vehicles will be trucks, which need additional space for stacking and are slower to complete turning movements? Particularly in regards to the evening EB left turn movements at the Dundee/Wilke intersection and the evening EB left turn movements at the Dundee/Kennicott intersection.
  - c. Would IDOT require revised striping to accommodate for the increased stacking capacity projected as necessary for the evening EB left turn movements at the Dundee/Kennicott intersection?
  - d. The traffic study does not address the newly proposed passenger vehicle access from the Ridgeline lot to the Rohrman signalized intersection along Wilke Road.
  - e. Parking should be evaluated based on a breakdown of 10% of the development used as office related uses and the remaining 90% used as warehouse uses.

**Response by KLOA: The response to comment #48 is noted. Based on the revised KLOA study, the following comments have been generated**

- a. **Please double check the Capacity Analysis results, which on certain movements appear to indicate improvement in the level of delay within the year 2027 Projected Conditions in comparison to existing conditions. Why would these movements decrease in delay given 5 years of regional growth factor increase plus the increase in traffic attributed to this development?**

The capacity analyses have been reviewed for accuracy. The traffic signals within the study area are fully actuated with loop detectors that respond to traffic demand by sending a request to the traffic controller for additional green time until it reaches the maximum allowable green arrow

time, if needed. Currently, on average the traffic controller may not require the full maximum green time for every approach/movement.

Under projected conditions, when additional traffic is projected to utilize the various turning movements, additional green time can be allocated to these movements, resulting in a slightly reduced average delay per vehicle. The resulting levels of service for 2027 projected conditions indicate an increase delay for the intersections overall and for generally every approach. It should be noted that a majority of these delays are lower by less than one second.

- b. Does the capacity analysis and delay timing take into consideration that 20% of the new vehicles will be trucks, which need additional space for stacking and are slower to complete turning movements? Particularly in regard to the evening EB left turn movements at the Dundee/Wilke intersection and the evening EB left turn movements at the Dundee/Kennicott intersection.

The capacity analyses take into consideration the new truck trips generated by the proposed development, including the eastbound left-turning movements at the Dundee Road intersection with Wilke Road and Kennicott Avenue.

- c. Would IDOT require revised striping to accommodate for the increased stacking capacity projected as necessary for the evening EB left turn movements at the Dundee/Kennicott intersection?

The existing turn bay length at the intersection of Dundee Road with Kennicott Avenue is adequate to accommodate the average queue lengths during the peak hour.

The 95th percentile queue lengths are approximately one vehicle longer than no-build conditions and should these queues extend beyond the left-turn lane storage, they can be accommodated within the taper and/or the striped median on Dundee Road.

- d. The traffic study does not address the newly proposed passenger vehicle access from the Ridgeline lot to the Rohrman signalized intersection along Wilke Road.

The newly proposed passenger vehicle access to the Rohrman signalized intersection will enhance the passenger vehicle access for the development; however, this connection was not assumed to present conservative condition for the proposed unsignalized access drives which are projected to operate at acceptable levels of service.

- e. Parking should be evaluated based on a breakdown of 10% of the development used as office related uses and the remaining 90% used as warehouse uses.

The parking evaluation has been revised to evaluate the adequacy of the parking supply assuming 10 percent of the development as office related uses and the remaining 90 percent as warehouse uses.

- 73) The response to comment #50 is noted. Future building permit plans for the Rohrman parking lot improvements must include a detail of the light pole, which shall depict the pole to be 24' from grade to the top of the light fixture.

**Response by Lexus project team representative (JCA):** The requested light pole detail has been supplied to the Village at a recent meeting with staff.

74) The response to comment #51 is noted. Enclosure shall not exceed 6' in height, or a future variation will be required.

**Response by Lexus project team representative (JCA): The dumpster information on the architectural plans has been revised to address this item.**

75) The response to comment #54 is not acceptable. As outlined in the comment #54 and as discussed during the meeting on July 2nd, the info provided within the table on sheet C2.0 is not sufficient and lacks the detail necessary to calculate the parking for the Lexus Dealership upon demolition Honeywell building. Please provide the highlighted information as outlined in comment #54. Please be sure the format and information is as shown in the table in #54.

**Response by Lexus project team representative (JCA): The requested building use information has been supplied to the Village at a recent meeting with staff.**

76) The response to comment #55 is noted. While the general location of the West Ingress & Egress Easement is acceptable, staff has concerns relative to the geometry/configuration of the intersection between the Rohrman/Ridgeline properties. Please evaluate adjustments to the connection point (wider and shifted to the east) and parking areas/drive aisles on the Ridgeline lot for a more streamlined connection between the two properties. Additionally, the Future East Ingress & Egress Easement should be extended up through the Ridgeline site and out to Kennicott Avenue to allow lots 2 and 3 access to Kennicott Avenue. Finally, please note that the extent and layout of both easements will need to be refined as part of the Final Plat approval process. However, the general location as depicted in both exhibits is acceptable. Finally, please note that implementation of the Future East Ingress & Egress Easement will be required, at the discretion of the Village, should any connection to Dundee Road at the western terminus of the easement be implemented (i.e. a full access non-signalized curb cut,  $\frac{3}{4}$  access curb cut, right-in/right-out curb cut, or a full access signalized curb cut).

**Response by Ridgeline: The ingress/egress configuration between Ridgeline – Building 1 and the Lexus Lot was adjusted after the meeting with Village Staff on 7/29/2021. The Future East Ingress and Egress Easement is now adjusted to extend through the Ridgeline site to Kennicott to allow lots 2 and 3 access to Kennicott Avenue. Agreed and noted for the Future Access Easement if there is a curb cut on Dundee.**

77) The response to comment #56 is noted. Staff recommends that the "Existing Lexus & Nissan Ingress & Egress Easement" be a blanket easement across the entirety of Lot 2 and 3 in the proposed 1st Amendment to the Bob Rohrman Arlington Heights Auto Mall Subdivision which shall be to the benefit of the Nissan lot, and a blanket easement across the entirety of the Nissan lot for the benefit of Lot 2 and 3 in the proposed 1st Amendment to the Bob Rohrman Arlington Heights Auto Mall Subdivision. This is similar to how the existing ingress/egress easement within the Bob Rohrman Arlington Heights Auto Mall Subdivision is established. The defined easement area shown in the "Existing Lexus & Nissan Ingress & Egress Easement" doesn't allow access to anywhere of substance and does not fully encompass the Right-In/Right-Out on the Nissan lot.

It should also be noted that Doc. 0921849003 will need to be revised and/or vacated with new shared maintenance established (unless the existing shared maintenance as defined within the exhibit is sufficient?). As referenced above, this document grants blanket access across all lots within the Bob Rohrman Arlington Heights Auto Mall Subdivision (which corresponds to all lots within the proposed the 1st Amendment to Bob Rohrman Arlington Heights Auto Mall Subdivision). It is the Village understanding that only certain shared access is to be established between the

Ridgeline and Rohrman lots, as opposed to the existing blanket access currently established via Doc. 0921849003. To reiterate, the four easements proposed are generally acceptable but will need to be further refined as part of the Final Plat of Subdivision approval process.

**Response: The Rohrman team has agreed to the blanket cross access across Lots 2 & 3 and the Nissan lot. The preliminary subdivision plat has notes added that this easement document will be provided under a separate document, which will be submitted with the Final Engineering submittal**

78) The response to comment #57 is noted. As noted above, Doc. 0921849003 also establishes a blanket easement for access across all lots within the proposed subdivision.

**Response by Ridgeline: Ridgeline and Rohrman agreed to vacate the blanket easement under Doc. 0921849003. This is reflected in the preliminary plat of subdivision.**

79) The response to comment #58 is noted. Please see #70.

**Response by Ridgeline: Please refer to the response to item 70.**

80) The response to comment #59 is noted. Staff agrees that Lot 2 does not need access to Kennicott through the Ridgeline lot. However the Plat shows a new easement to be established over Doc. 00266841, for the benefit of Lot 2, which provides access to Kennicott. Please clarify the need for this or remove it from the Plat. As stated above, Lots 2 and 3 within the proposed subdivision should have access to Kennicott via a revised Future East Ingress & Egress Easement document.

**Response by Ridgeline: Ridgeline and Rohrman agreed to vacate the easement under Doc. 00266841. This reflected in the preliminary plat of subdivision. Agreed; as stated in #76, there will be a future easement for Lots 2 and 3 to have future access to Kennicott.**

81) The response to comment #62 is not acceptable. For Lot 1, which shall be rezoned into the M-1 District, the setbacks are as follow and must be added to the Plat:

- a. Front Yard Setback (west side): 50' – already shown on Plat.
- b. Side Yard Setback (north side and south side): 50'
- c. Rear Yard Setback (west side): 30'

Setback lines for Lots 2 and 3 can be removed as they will be within the B-3 District which requires no setbacks for those lots.

**Response: This has been revised on the plat as requested.**

82) The response to comment #65 is not understood. Please see #80 above.

**Response by Ridgeline: Please refer to the response to 80.**

83) Please ensure all plan revisions include a revision date. The most recent revisions to the many of the plans did not include a new revision date.

**Response: Revisions dates are included on plan sets in this submittal.**

84) Recent documents provided by Rohrman depict a different parking lot layout and building demolition for the Honeywell building in comparison to the plans submitted as part of this application. Please clarify and modify the plans accordingly as applicable.

**Response by Lexus project team representative (JCA): The provided plans have been updated to show only a partial demolition of the existing building along the east side of the main Lexus building.**

### ***Landscape Comments***

#### Ridgeline Distribution Center

- 1) There are six parking islands where the code required shade trees must be provided. Please include 4-inch caliper shade trees in the four islands located west of the Lexus building and south of building one. In addition, provide a shade tree at the southeast corner of building 2 (Chapter 28, Section 6.15).

**Response: The 6 parking islands have had the trees added as requested, even though some of the parking island trees are located over existing utilities to remain.**

- 2) Per the comments on June 4, additional evergreen trees have been provided; however, please rearrange the evergreen trees along the north property line in the northwest corner so that they fully screen the loading area from Wilke Road. Please see the attached sketch. Also, please locate the evergreens along the north property line so that they buffer the loading area from the existing buildings to the north. As proposed the evergreen trees are located adjacent to a retention basin. Please increase the size of the evergreens so that they are a minimum of 6 feet high at time of installation.

**Response: The trees have been rearranged as requested.**

- 3) Per the comments on June 4, additional evergreen trees have been provided; however, please rearrange the evergreen trees so that they fully screen the loading area from Dundee Road. Please see the attached sketch. Please increase the size of the evergreens so that they are a minimum of 6 feet high at time of installation.

**Response: The trees have been rearranged as requested.**

#### Lexus

- 4) Please include the code required shade trees (4 inch caliper) in the island located in the west corner adjacent to the entry/drive aisle and in the island located near the southeast corner of the building (Chapter 28, Section 6.15).

**Response by Lexus project team representative (JCA): The landscape plan has been revised to conform to the code requirement related to shade trees located in islands.**

We appreciate your time and assistance. If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (847) 551-5300 or [jbryant@pinnacle-engr.com](mailto:jbryant@pinnacle-engr.com).

Best Regards,

**PINNACLE ENGINEERING GROUP, LLC**



Jana Bryant, PE, CFM  
Senior Project Manager