

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF  
**THE PLAT & SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE**  
OF THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS PLAN COMMISSION  
HELD AT VILLAGE HALL ON:

April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2017

**Project Title:** CA Ventures Sigwalt St Apartments

**Address:** 300 Block W. Sigwalt St

**Petitioner:** Mark Hopkins  
HKM Architects  
43 S. Vail Avenue  
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

**Requested Action:**

1. A rezoning from R-3 One Family to R-7 Multiple Family
2. A preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) to allow the construction of a five story, 86 unit apartment development.
3. Plat of Resubdivision to consolidate six lots into one lot.

**Variations Required:**

1. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.4 Minimum Lot Size
2. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6 Required Minimum Yards (Interior Side/North)
3. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6 Required Minimum Yards (Front / Highland)
4. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.6 Required Minimum Yards (Front / Chestnut)
5. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.7 Maximum Building Lot Coverage
6. Chapter 28, Section 5.1-7.13 Maximum Floor Area Ratio

**Attendees:**

Mark Hopkins – HKM Architects  
Mike Porto – CA Ventures  
Matt Katsaros – CA Ventures  
Lynn Jensen – Plan Commissioner  
John Sigalos – Plan Commissioner  
Jay Cherwin – Plan Commissioner  
Bruce Green – Plan Commissioner  
Sam Hubbard – Planning Department  
Bill Enright – Planning Department

---

**Project Summary:**

The subject property is located along Sigwalt Street between Highland Avenue and Chestnut Avenue, and is currently vacant. The developer proposes to rezone the property to R-7 multiple family, Planned Unit Development, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan which designates the site as High Density Multi Family. One of the Board's 2017 Strategic Priorities is to facilitate development of this block (block 425). Block 425 has sat vacant and underdeveloped for years as is an important part of the downtown.

The proposal includes 86 rental apartments in a well designed, five floor building. 98 parking spaces will be included in the building with one level underground and additional parking on levels one and two. Additional parking can be provided in the Vail Avenue municipal garage per Chapter 28 Section 11.3-2. Variations requested include density, floor area ratio, building lot coverage, as well as setbacks along the east, west and north property lines. The Sigwalt setback meets code. The height of the building is approximately 60 feet and will need to be verified by providing the average grade at the front of the building. The developer will be required to dedicate 8 feet of property along both Highland and Chestnut for public right of way, which increases the variations due to the loss of land privately held. The current site is 42,000 square feet reducing to 39,600 square feet after dedication.

**Meeting Discussion:**

**Mr. Hopkins** briefly described the proposed building and the site it would occupy. The building would be a 5 story apartment building with parking on the first and second floors. The building would face Sigwalt, with the parking area accessed off of Highland Avenue. The first two stories of the building will be full rectangles and floors 3 through 5 would have a central courtyard, allowing for the inclusion of amenity space. The building will observe the 8 foot setback on Sigwalt Street, however variations are being requested for the building to encroach into the setback on the other 3 sides of the property.

Ground floor units will have sidewalks connecting them to the surrounding streets and landscaping to give privacy to ground floor patios. The 2<sup>nd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup> floor units will feature cantilevered balconies except those adjacent to the rooftop deck. The roof will house an elevator override parapet wall, as well as screened air conditioner and HVAC equipment.

There will be two colors of brick used on the building, one for the two "base" floors, and another for the higher floors. It is the petitioner's hope that this will soften the look of the flat 5 story wall. Stone trim will also be used in select areas. Metal trim will also be used in areas, with an 8 inch profile giving it a "corrugated" look.

The Highland side of the building will feature an overhead door for the garage, as well as a door for residents to access the bike storage areas. Trash will be collected inside the building and rolled outside on collection day. The basement will include a single ramp for access, which the petitioner notes is not optimal, but is what the geometry allows in order for them to fit as much parking as possible, as well as bike storage areas, a machine room for water and electrical service, and bike parking. The first floor will feature more parking in the center of the structure, with 9 units and the lobby surrounding it on the Sigwalt and Chestnut sides. The trash room will also be located on this floor. The lobby will include a mail area, as well as an advanced electronic parcel room. The second floor will also include parking in the center, with units wrapping the parking area on the Sigwalt, Chestnut, and Highland sides. The third floor will include the rooftop deck, as well as a community room and fitness center. The floor plans are identical for the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> floors, except for the roof deck, community room, and fitness center.

**Mr. Enright** expressed confidence in CA Ventures, citing the multitude of projects featured on their company website, as well as confidence that that the project would be able to work. He noted that the proposed development is exactly the type envisioned by the master plan for the ring surrounding the downtown.

Density is not a concern, as household sizes are much smaller than they were 30 years ago, when the code for the R-7 zone was first written. Specifically, there are more single-person households and empty-nesters. The developer has provided a market study for the project. The study stated that similar developments require 1.1 to 1.2 parking spaces per unit, and the developer is currently working to increase onsite parking to 1.25 spaces per unit, so that the Vail Garage does not become over encumbered with parking. If the developer is unable to fit more parking into the plan, there is confidence that the Village would be able to provide spots in the garage to accommodate the overflow. The study also showed that while there are similar projects currently being constructed in surrounding municipalities, there are none in the immediate area, indicating demand for this type of housing that is currently not being met in the community.

While the developer is asking for multiple variations, the Planning Department believes that the proposed project fits in with the downtown area. The northern portion of the block, if it was rezoned as B5 to be consistent with the Master Plan, would allow even greater density and height than what the developer is proposing. The 2006 Downtown Plan, created by a 19 person panel of citizens and elected officials, proposed that the site in which this new development would be located should be in the 4 to 6 story range, which is consistent with the developer's proposal. Additionally, the height of the proposed building is similar to the existing building on the corner of Evergreen and Sigwalt, which was built around 1986.

He also noted that the developer is not only asking things of the Village, but also contributing by offering a \$325,000 payment to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund, and that fact should be taken into account when deciding on approval for the project and the number of units allowed. Loading would most likely be accommodated on Highland Avenue, similar to the zone provided for Dunton Tower.

It is being researched whether or not the majority of the development's storm water needs could be met through the

addition of new sewers, which the Village was planning to install as part of an overall upgrade plan. The Village has \$2 million in a CIP fund that could be used to upsize sewers in the area, and the developer would be responsible for a prorated share of any cost increases if these sewers are installed. Timing could pose as an issue for this option however, as the Village may not be installing sewers as quickly as the developer is looking to start.

The developer would still need to go through the Design Commission review process, provide a traffic and parking study, as well as data on density, persons-per-household, and parking demand. Per-unit contributions to the School, Library, and Park districts would be provided as required by code. He then reiterated that the development was a great opportunity for the community to begin developing the block, which has been sitting empty for a long time.

**Commissioner Cherwin** was concerned about how the development would fit in with future development on the northern end of the block, and how it would impact access as well as pedestrian and vehicular traffic. More specifically, he wanted to make sure that the proposed development would not limit opportunities to develop the northern portion of the block in the future.

He stated that the parking counts provided seem reasonable, as do the variations, and that the design of the building is nice. He stated that he didn't see any red flags related to the project. The building would be a good transition between the single family homes on the west side to the larger buildings of downtown on the east. He was curious if the developers had considered any additional rooftop amenities.

**Mr. Hopkins** stated that the third floor deck would include amenities, such as the pergola, fire pit, tables, and the grilling station.

**Commissioner Cherwin** clarified that he was referring to the top of the building, not just the third floor deck, as many buildings make use of rooftop space and he was curious as to whether any consideration had been made by the developers as to utilizing this roof space.

**Mr. Katsaros** stated that they had not looked into utilizing the rooftop as amenity space, but if there was a need for more space they would.

**Commissioner Cherwin** said he'd mention it because it was a big building, and the third floor deck and space around the building was somewhat limited. He'd seen other plans for buildings downtown and they were able to do great things with rooftop space, so he thought he'd mention it. Overall, he was supportive of the development.

**Commissioner Sigalos** agreed that the building had a nice design, but was curious about the layout of the corner units with the diagonal wall, and whether that was a practical layout.

**Mr. Hopkins** stated that he had unit plans that make use of the oddly shaped space, and added that it was not too uncommon for units to have diagonal walls in modern construction.

**Commissioner Sigalos** asked whether all the units would be rental units for the foreseeable future, and that there wasn't a plan to convert them to condo units.

**Mr. Katsaros** confirmed that they would be rental units, and that CA Ventures stays away from condo projects.

**Commissioner Sigalos** asked about the 4 clustered parking spaces on the basement level, and how the spaces by the wall would be accessed.

**Mr. Hopkins** explained that those spaces are tandems, with one person renting the two spaces.

**Commissioner Sigalos** asked if there would not be retail or commercial on the first floor.

**Mr. Hopkins** confirmed that there would be no commercial on the first floor, as it's not intended to be a mixed use building. He noted that the northern portion of the lot would most likely be mixed use, and stated that the lack of the commercial component is what led the design to include an "activated" first floor, with street access for first floor apartments and windows. He believes that it is a good transition between the mixed use downtown and the residential area immediately south and west.

**Commissioner Sigalos** stated that he thinks the proposed building is great for that location and that he is fully supportive of it.

**Commissioner Jensen** stated that he believes it is a very good project, and asked where the proposed apartment building stood in relation to other projects such as Arlington Downs, or the proposed apartment building across from Hancock Square.

**Mr. Enright** added that the apartment building across from Hancock Square is going to have 45 units, of which a third will be affordable rent units.

**Commissioner Jensen** asked if the petitioner was planning on pricing the units to be comparable with those in Arlington Downs

**Mr. Katsaros** confirmed that the units would be very comparable to those in Arlington Downs, but that he believed the proposed project was in a better location, with access to downtown amenities.

**Commissioner Jensen** asked the petitioner to clarify if the area is underserved when it comes to apartment housing.

**Mr. Katsaros** confirmed that that was the case, stating he believed that there were about 1,000 units undersupplied for the greater Arlington Heights area, including neighboring suburbs.

**Commissioner Jensen** asked what size of apartments the building would consist of.

**Mr. Katsaros** stated it would be an almost 50/50 mix of 1 and 2 bedroom units.

**Mr. Enright** said he believed it would have 46 2-bedroom units and 40 1-bedroom units.

**Mr. Hopkins** stated that as of the meeting, the plan consisted of 47% one bedroom units, 7% 1 bedroom plus den units, 41% 2 bedroom units, and 6% 2 bedroom plus den units.

**Commissioner Jensen** asked how cars in the garage will get back down, as the plan states "ramp up" for the ramp.

**Mr. Hopkins** clarified that they were two way ramps, "ramp up" only meant it led to the floor above.

**Commissioner Jensen** stated he believed it was a great project, it would do a lot for the corner of Sigwalt and Chestnut as well as downtown, and that he was excited about the project.

**Commissioner Cherwin** asked if the developers had looked at opportunities to include smaller, more affordable units.

**Mr. Katsaros** stated that they had looked into that option, as it's a common trend in several markets. However, because the developer was worried about the density variations they would be requesting they had decided they would not make units smaller and more numerous. Additionally, more units would require more parking.

**Commissioner Cherwin** stated to Bill Enright and Sam Hubbard that, from his perspective, he would be willing to give greater leeway with regard to density and parking requirements if CA Ventures were to add more market-affordable units to their plan.

**Mr. Hopkins** asked for clarification that Commissioner Cherwin was not referring to micro-units, but rather efficiency type apartments.

**Commissioner Cherwin** stated he had no particular plan in mind, and that he would defer to the developer and their expertise in what type of units would be affordable. He stated that, if possible, this would be a great opportunity to add actual affordable units to the Village rather than just add money to the Housing fund, and reiterated that he would be willing to give greater leeway in regard to density and parking requirements in exchange for the addition of affordable units to the plan.

**Commissioner Jensen** asked Bill Enright if he was looking to get all of the required parking on-site.

**Mr. Enright** stated that the code requires 1.5 parking spaces per unit, which he doesn't believe they would need because if they were on the northern portion of the block and in the B-5 District they would only need 1.25 spaces per unit. The Village Board had some concern about the fact that, in order to meet the 1.5 spaces required by code, the development would need 31 spaces in the Village garage.

**Commissioner Jensen** clarified that he was asking if, using a requirement of 1.25 spaces per unit, all of the parking for the development would be included on site.

**Mr. Enright** stated that it is the goal to have all the parking be on-site, however at present time he is unsure whether or not that can be accomplished. It is his impression, however, that the developers would prefer to have 1.25 spaces per unit on-site rather than have only 1.15 spaces per unit on site and 10 spaces in the garage.

**Mr. Katsaros** stated that it was always their goal to fulfill their parking requirements on-site, rather than utilizing the Village garage. He stated that there is an option a week behind schedule that is currently being worked out, which would allow for all the required parking to remain in the building. While 1.5 spaces per unit is unattainable, he believes 1.25 spaces per unit can be accommodated.

**Mr. Enright** stated that he was working with the developers to get the project back on schedule.

**Commissioner Green** asked if there were spaces currently available in the Village garage.

**Mr. Enright** stated that there were, in his opinion.

**Mr. Katsaros** stated that he had originally talked about utilizing 10 spots in the Village garage, and that with a requirement of 1.5 spaces per unit they would have needed to utilize 31 spaces.

**Commissioner Green** said there are 31 spaces available if the developer needs them.

**Mr. Enright** stated that the Village Board had said they would not want to give up that many spaces for one project, but that 5 to 10 spaces was doable. However, he reiterated he was going to continue working with the developer to accommodate all the parking onsite if that is what the developer prefers.

**Commissioner Green** agreed, and said it was a good project. He stated he liked the fact it didn't have first floor commercial, which makes it a great transitional building from downtown to the surrounding residential neighborhood.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Plat & Subdivision Committee was supportive of the proposal and advised that the petitioner should move forward.

**Bruce Green, Chair**  
**PLAT & SUBDIVISION COMMITTEE**  
**Sam Hubbard, Recorder**