


PLAN COMMISSION PC #23-009
Arlington Downs Four Plat of Resubdivision
3400 Stonegate Boulevard
Round 2

17. The petitioner's response to comment nos. 11-16 are acceptable.
18. With regard to the August 4, 2023 Parking Study prepared by Eriksson Engineering:
 - a. At this time the minimum warrants for a traffic signal at Euclid Avenue and Stonegate Boulevard are not met; however, the warrants for a traffic signal will need to be reevaluated in the future as the development continues towards full buildout of the Arlington Downs PUD.
 - b. The potential right turn lane on Rohlwing Road at Euclid Avenue will need to be evaluated as development continues towards full buildout of the Arlington Downs PUD.
 - c. The petitioner shall acknowledge that they accept this understanding.



Michael L. Pagonis, P.E. 8-24-23
Village Engineer Date

Planning & Community Development Dept. Review

August 27, 2023



REVIEW ROUND 1

Project: Arlington Downs Plat Amendment
Lot 1A in Arlington Downs Two Subdivision

Case Number: PC 23-009

Zoning:

7. The response to comment #7 is noted. The final list of required zoning approvals is identified below:
 - a. Preliminary and Final Plat of Subdivision to subdivide one lot into three lots.
 - b. Variation to Chapter 29, Section 29-307a.1, to allow Lot 1B and Lot 1D without each lot having their full frontage abutting a street.
8. The response to comment #8 is acceptable.
9. The response to comment #9 is noted. Please confirm that all owners (and individuals who have property within the PUD under contract) aware of and amenable to the requested subdivision.
10. The response to comment #10 is acceptable.
11. The response to comment #11 is acceptable.

Amendment and Restated Declarations:

12. The response to comment #12 is acceptable.
13. The response to comment #13 is acceptable.
14. The response to comment #14 is acceptable.
15. The response to comment #15 is noted. Provided that the final version of the Amended and Restated Declarations does not establish restrictions that are contrary to the approved PUD, no PUD amendment shall be required at this time.
16. The response to comment #16 is acceptable. Lot 1B is now open to parking for all within the PUD.
17. The response to comment #17 is noted. Based on the revised Declarations, exclusive parking is only allowed within the One Arlington underground garage, the residential garage and surface parking lot as part of ADR-II (Lot 5A), any future parking area for residential uses on Lot 3A, and any future parking area for the residents within the future ADR-IV building. Please confirm this to be accurate.
18. The response to #18 is noted. Section 4.(b), Barriers and Controls, add language to clarify that the Access Drives are not exempted from the restrictions on segregations/barriers.
19. The responses to comments #19, #20, and #21 are noted. Section 3(b)(ii) exempts the use of the Lot 3A Parking Lot and 5A Parking Garage for ingress/egress/access. For the avoidance of any doubt, this section should state that the Access Drives are not exempted from Parking Lot Easement.
20. The response to comment #22 is noted. The Village does not take issue with the Affected Lot Owner having to construct any parallel parking installed within Outlot 1, the maintenance and repair of any such parking area

should fall with the Master Association as the parking would be within the Master Association Outlot 1C and would be available for all users within the PUD to use for parking.

21. The response to comment #23 is not acceptable. The Village is still evaluating whether the design and construction of the pavilion (and the portion of the plaza that falls on Outlot 1C) should be deferred until the design of the larger portion of the plaza on Lot 4C is finalized and constructed. The cost of the improvements that fall within Outlot 1C must be borne by the Master Association. This should be clarified in the revised Declarations.
22. The response to comment #24 is unacceptable. As discussed, the obligation for the Euclid Avenue signal falls with the Master Association as per condition #3 in Ordinance #12-039, and the petitioner is willing to modify the Declarations to make this clear, and shall do so in a forthcoming revision and resubmission.
23. The response to comment #25 is not acceptable. The remaining sidewalks should have been constructed during the next phase of development after the rehabilitation of the One Arlington tower. These sidewalks are a cost that must be borne by the Master Association and the Declarations should be revised to make this clear.
24. The response to comment #26 is unacceptable. As discussed, the crosswalk and pedestrian signal are a Master Association cost, and per the existing PUD (Ord 12-039), they shall be constructed at such time as the City of Rolling Meadows installs a sidewalk on the east side of Rohlwing Road from Cardinal Street to Euclid Avenue. This must be made clear in the revised Declarations.
25. The response to comment #27 is noted. The Declarations have been revised to include the right-hand turn lane on Rohlwing Road as a cost to be borne by the Master Association if approved by the Village and the City of Rolling Meadows after a traffic warrant analysis requires it.
26. The response to comment #28 is noted. Please make the following additional change: Section 5(c).ii, remove the word "required" from the following: "...if such median is approved and required by Cook County DOT..."
27. The responses to comments #29 and #30 are acceptable.

Plat of Subdivision:

28. The responses to comments #31-#35 are acceptable.

Additional Comments Based on Revised Declarations:

29. The definition of "Access Aisles" is very specific. Does the petitioner foresee the potential for future access drives constructed within the PUD that may require an amendment to the Declarations?
30. On the definition of "Traffic Signal", please remove the language "may be" and "after sufficient traffic warrants are met from the PUD"
31. Section 4.f, please remove "parallel" and substitute with "future on-street parking".
32. The definition of "Lots" does not appear to contemplate the Future Lot 6 lot. Please either revise the definition of "Lots" to contemplate the Future Lot 6, or include within Section 34 language that clarifies Future Lot 6 shall be included within the definition of Lots if and when it is created.
33. Section 34: Please remove reference to Lot 16 not being part of the PUD. Lot 16 was added to the PUD in 2014 via Ord. 14-025.
34. The definition for "Lot 1B Garage" should be changed to "Lot 1B Parking Garage" for consistency with the recent redlined changes. Section 5(b) title should reference Lot 1B Parking Garage.

Prepared by: 