

Building & Life Safety 2nd Round Comments

March 15, 2023

116-120 W Eastman – Multi-family housing, underground parking and retail space.

These comments are conceptual only. A formal plan review will be required.

Previous comments from Round 1 are approved, except comment 6.

1-5. Okay

6. Fire separation between R, S-2 and M shall comply with 2018 IBC Section 508.4 and Table 508.4. Details of the required fire separation shall be shown on the plans in the Code Analysis section. Additional response not needed.

7-37. Okay.

PLAN COMMISSION PC #23-002
MYLO Residential
116-120 W Eastman St
Round 2

40. The petitioner's response to comment nos. 11-13, 20, 22-23, 27-30, 32-35 and 37 are acceptable.
41. The petitioner's response to comment no. 14 is noted. The stormwater narrative is acceptable. The remaining items related to final detention calculations, fee-in-lieu, volume control and the MWRD permit can be addressed at final engineering.
42. The petitioner's response to comment no. 15 is noted. The photometric lighting diagram and the associated catalog cut sheets shall be provided. This can be addressed at final engineering.
43. The petitioner's response to comment nos. 16 and 17 is noted. The fire lane shall be the heavy-duty pavement section. This can be addressed at final engineering.
44. The petitioner's response to comment no. 18 is noted. Provide an additional exhibit showing the truck entering the site from eastbound St James St.
45. The petitioner's response to comment nos. 19 and 20 are noted. The sidewalk shall carry through the curb, with the curb stopping at the sidewalk. This can be addressed at final engineering.
46. The petitioner's response to comment no. 21 is noted. In the event any of the curb separating the shared drive aisle and the bank parking lot is damaged as a result of construction, the curb shall be replaced. Provide a note on the plans. This can be addressed at final engineering.
47. The petitioner's response to comment no. 24 is noted. Additional information must be provided to verify that the accessible route to the entrance on Eastman is compliant. This can be addressed at final engineering.
48. The petitioner's response to comment no. 25 is noted. Additional information must be provided for the accessible route along the west side of the building, at the loading bay and the entrance to the garage. This can be addressed at final engineering.
49. The petitioner's response to comment no. 26 is noted. A striping and signage plan shall be provided at final engineering. Due to the increase in traffic, it is recommended that stop control be added for the bank parking lot entrances off of Highland Ave. This should be coordinated with the adjacent parcel.
50. The petitioner's response to comment no. 31 is noted. The location of the existing sanitary sewer service for 116 W Eastman St must be determined and the services shall be abandoned. This can be addressed at final engineering.

Traffic:

51. The petitioner's response to comment no. 33 is noted. The parking restriction in the PUD ordinance should direct all deliveries to use the loading bays.

Public Works:

52. The petitioner's response to comment no. 36 is noted. A note shall be provided to address the pavement on W Eastman St and W St James St. This can be addressed at final engineering.
53. The petitioner's response to comment no. 38 is noted. A note shall be provided that the manholes shall be televised to verify condition. This can be addressed at final engineering.
54. The petitioner's response to comment no. 39 is noted. The Engineering Division can be contacted to provide the downtown streetscape brick cross section. This can be addressed at final engineering.


Michael L. Pagones, P.E. 3/23/23
Village Engineer Date

Planning & Community Development Dept. Review

March 24, 2023



REVIEW ROUND 2

Project: 116-120 W. Eastman Development
116-120 W. Eastman Street

Case Number: PC 23-002

General:

32. The response to the following comments is acceptable: 9, 12, 14a, 14b, 19-23
33. The response to comment #7 is noted. Based on review of the revised plans, the following approvals are required:
- a) Planned Unit Development to allow a 154-unit multi-family residential development.
 - b) Land Use Variation to allow a predominately multi-family residential development in the B-5 District.
 - c) A variation from Chapter 28, Section 5.1-14.1, to allow 154 units on a 43,438 square foot lot where code requires a minimum lot size of 47,000 square feet.
 - d) Conceptual Special Use Permit approval for a restaurant on the subject property.
 - e) A variation from Chapter 28, Section 6.1-5.1, to allow tandem parking stalls.
- Additional variations may be required depending upon your response to certain comments and review of the revised plans.
34. The response to comment #8 is noted. The Staff Development Committee is not supportive of the 4-unit density increase beyond the 1-to-1 density bonus as eligible with 8 affordable units. Please either propose all 12 units as affordable, or reduce the overall unit count by 4 units.
35. The response to comment #10 does not directly address the comment. To clarify, the Village would like to ensure that the development team has communicated with the abutting property owners to the east (AT&T building) and to the west (Village Bank & Trust building) to make them aware of your project and understand any concerns they may have as abutting property owners. Please reach out to these owners and summarize any concerns they may have.
36. The response to comment #11 is incomplete. No market study was provided on March 10th.
37. The response to comment #13 is noted. The impact fee chart has previously been provided to the development team.
38. The response to comment #14c is incomplete. No memo detailing move-in/out times and days was provided, no information on trash collection times was provided, and no details on estimated deliveries for the restaurant were provided. Please provide this information. Additionally, please note that deliveries will be prohibited between the hours of 10:00pm-7:00am and all loading/unloading must occur within the dedicated onsite loading zone(s) and on-street loading shall be prohibited.
39. The responses to comments #15 and #16 are acceptable. Please continue to provide revision dates on any plan sheets that are revised as a result of these comments and future resubmittal documents must be provided electronically and in paper format.

Site/Infrastructure:

40. Per code, only one loading zone is required for this development. The Staff Development Committee recognizes the benefit of having a second loading zone located adjacent to the restaurant tenant space, however, please

explore the potential benefit and feasibility of eliminating the second loading zone and relocating the garage entrance to this location and aligning the entrance with the bank driveway. This would allow approx. two additional parking stalls within the garage and approx. two additional parking stalls along Highland Avenue. Additionally, the relocated garage entrance may help to address concerns raised by the property owners to the north of the development with regards to the impacts of the garage entrance location. Also, evaluate and describe in detail how loading operations for the restaurant would occur from the loading zone off Eastman, if this relocation is feasible. Loading on Highland would not be permitted.

41. The response to comment #17 is noted.
42. The response to comment #18 is noted. Any ground mounted mechanical/utility equipment shall be appropriately sited and screened, which shall be subject to final review and approval by the Village. A condition requiring such shall be included within any recommendation to the Plan Commission.
43. The ADA parking stalls within the garage do not match between the engineering plans and the architectural plans. Please correct the applicable plan sheet. Additionally, the ADA stalls shown on the architectural plan do not appear to conform to IAC regulations with regards to the size of the shared accessible aisle. Please revise the stalls to comply with IAC regulations or provide documentation explaining how they conform to Section 502 of the IAC.

Building:

44. Additional modelling showing the proposed building height in relation to surrounding structures must be provided. It is recommended that you create a 3D model of the structures in the vicinity to show how the proposed building height interacts with surrounding structures. Additionally, it is recommended that you prepare an exhibit illustrating the impact/appearance of the existing buildings on the subject property for comparison. This will be beneficial when presenting the plan to adjacent neighborhood.
45. Please provide information on any sound attenuation equipment that is proposed around the three chillers located on the roof and explore relocation of the northern most chiller further south to reduce the potential for sound impact on neighboring property owners.
46. Please provide additional details on usage of the 3rd floor amenity deck (hours of operation, controlled/prohibited afterhours access, cameras, speakers/music, policies/procedures for usage, etc.).
47. The response to comment #24 is incomplete. Please provide the revised photometric plan and catalog cuts for the proposed fixtures.
48. The response to comment #25 is noted, however, additional details are needed. Please outline what pedestrian safety measures will be used and provide catalog cuts for any warning lights or speakers. These elements must be designed to minimize impact on surrounding property owners.

Parking and Traffic:

49. There is general concern around the provided parking supply and ratios used to determine the onsite parking demand for this project. The ratios and parking supply are lower than any other previously approved development in Downtown Arlington Heights and this is shown in the data that has been provided. This concern is compounded by the proposed 1-bdrm + den units, which will include walls and a door and have the potential to be utilized as bedrooms and increase the parking demand/change the parking ratios. Please explore the possibility of the den's being opened up without enclosing walls to make them true den spaces. Due to continued concerns regarding parking, please explore expansion of the lower level by extending the parking garage further south under the building to add additional spaces to the parking supply.
50. Specificity and greater details are needed on how the onsite parking supply would be managed and operated. Please provide a **separate** Parking Management and Operation Plan that includes the following information:
 - a) Which spaces will be available for each use (residential/non-residential)? Will any parking stalls be shared/open to parking by the other use?

- b) Will parking stalls be automatically included within each residential lease or will they be optional and only included with a separate charge?
- c) What is the expected demand for 1-bdrm and 2-bdrm units needing two stalls? If a unit requests two stalls, how would these stalls be allocated?
- d) Will a unit be able to lease more than two parking stalls?
- e) Will a single unit be able to lease two single spaces even if tandem stalls are available?
- f) Will specific parking stalls be assigned to specific units or will the parking stalls be open to all whom have leased a parking stall/leased a unit?
- g) Where/how will guest will parking occur?
- h) Plans and project renderings show the garage access as unrestricted. How will access and parking within the garage be controlled?

51. The responses to comments #27 and #28 are noted. Based on the revised Traffic and Parking study, please address the following comments:

- a) How does uncontrolled access impact the availability of parking for the commercial uses and/or guests? If commercial customers/tenants and residential guests are prohibited from accessing the garage, the analysis must be separated as well. The 19 stalls on the private lot to the west cannot be counted towards the residential parking supply.
- b) At peak demand per Table 11, what uses are using what spots? Based on peak hourly demand, it appears demand is above the overall supply.
- c) What is the rationale for the resident peak shown in Table 11 occurring at 10:00pm but then reducing overnight?
- d) Please update Table 9 (both of them) and Table 10 to include the proposed development for ease of comparison.
- e) Please clarify "Vehicles Parked" in Table 10. Is this the number of parking stalls provided/available for these developments or based on observations on the number of vehicles parked during peak times.
- f) Clarify whether the hourly parking demand in Table 10 was based on ULI projections for peak parking within the residential building. At peak occupancy, what is the metric/ratio that ULI uses to forecast peak demand for the residential component?

52. Please provide parking data on comparable developments completed and/or managed by Compasspoint (bedroom mix, number of units, square footage of any non-residential spaces, number of stalls allocated to residential vs. non-residential uses, details on how parking is managed and allocated for each use, etc.).

53. The response to comment #29 is incomplete. Please provide the parking and access easement for the 19 stalls on the Village Bank & Trust property.

PUD/Construction Phasing:

54. The response to comment #31 is not acceptable. A preliminary construction schedule and construction staging plan shall be provided, per Section 9.1i, or a variation would be required. This must be provided as part of the Plan Commission review process and cannot be provided only as part of a building permit submittal.

Prepared by: 

Mylo Development
 116-120 W. Eastman Street
 PC #23-002
 March 23, 2023

Landscaping

Public Property

1. **The streetscape along Eastman Street must be consistent with the Downtown standards. Please identify the brick pavers, street trees, grates and the Sternberg light fixtures.**

Please coordinate with the Department of Engineering regarding the standards and update the plans identifying the streetscape elements.

Private Property

1. **Provide landscaping and decorative pavement at the corner of St James Street and Highland Avenue.**

Please update the plan to reflect the changes.

2. **Along Highland Avenue it is recommended that specialty pavement be used for the north/south walkway. In addition, provide crosswalks with specialty pavement for the walkway at the drive aisle and at the loading area. Please evaluate the overall width of the walkway on the west elevation near the southwest corner of the building.**

Please update the plan to reflect the changes.

3. **Along St. James Street, the foundation plantings are in the public right of way. Please note that a license agreement and maintenance agreement will be required.**

Response noted.

4. **Please indicate the plan for the planter boxes identified on the west elevation and provide landscape details. In addition, please provide details for the planters/green space identified on the terrace on the north elevation.**

Please update the plan to reflect the changes.

5. **A tree fee of \$4 per lineal foot for frontage must be provided as part of the building permit process and a landscape compliance bond of 30% of the estimated landscape cost.**

Response noted.